DOMINION OF CANADA

OFFICIAL REPORT

OF

DEBATES

HOUSE OF COMMONS

SECOND SESSION—FOURTEENTH PARLIAMENT

13-14 GEORGE V, 1923

IN FIVE VOLUMES

Volume I: Pages 1-1025 **Volume II: Pages 1027-2045**

Volume III: Pages 2047-3044 **Volume IV: Pages 3045-4005**

Volume V: Pages 4007-4756

VOLUME CLVIII

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE TWENTY-THIRD DAY OF MAY TO THE FIFTEENTH DAY OF JUNE, INCLUSIVE



OTTAWA
F. A. ACLAND
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1923

HOUSE OF COMMONS

DEBATES

OF THE

OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA

CANADA

House of Commons Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT

Wednesday, May 23, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

LAKE FREIGHT RATES

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Trade and Commerce): I move, seconded by Mr. Lapointe:

That eight hundred copies in the English language and two hundred and fifty copies in the French language of the report of the Royal Commission appointed to inquire into Great Lakes freight rates, laid on the Table of the House on the 18th May, 1923, be printed forthwith, and that rule 74 be suspended in relation thereto.

Mr. SPEAKER: By unanimous consent of the House.

Motion agreed to.

RADIOTELEGRAPH REGULATIONS

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries): I beg to lay on the Table of the House certain amendments which have been made to the Radiotelegraph Regulations and to the form of licenses of private commercial broadcasting.

INSURANCE ACT, 1917, AMENDMENT

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 184, to amend the Insurance Act, 1917.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Explain.

Mr. FIELDING: The first part of the bill is designed to avoid the duplication of returns in certain insurance matters. The larger part of the bill provides certain conditions of insurance policies with respect to automobile insurance. There is a correction of the French version of the previous act. These are the chief purposes of the bill.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST READINGS

Bill No. 181 (from the Senate), for the relief of James Dunnett.—Mr. Sheard.

Bill No. 182 (from the Senate), for the relief of Laura MacBrien.—Mr. Sheard.

Bill No. 183 (from the Senate), for the relief of Chester Abbott Redmond.—Mr. Church.

WHEAT BOARD LEGISLATION

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Trade and Commerce): At a previous sitting the hon. member for Last Mountain (Mr. Johnston) inquired:

Has the government had a request from either the government of Alberta or the government of Saskatchewan, or a joint request from both, to extend the wheat board legislation by order in council, as provided by the act of last year?

Further have any names been suggested to this government to handle the proposal for the present year?

It will be recalled that by the legislation of 1922 providing for a wheat board covering one year, the government was authorized if requested, to extend by order in council, for a further period of one year. Under date of February 27 last the Premier of Saskatchewan forwarded to the government a copy of a resolution passed by the legislature, and requested the government of Canada to immediately pass an order in council extending the operation of the Canadian Wheat Board Act, 1922, for one year from the 15th day of August, 1923. The resolution referred to expressed the opinion of the Saskatchewan government as follows:

The government of this province should request the government of Canada to immediately pass an order in council extending the operation of the Wheat Board Act of 1922 for one year from the 15th day of August, 1923.

The government of this province should indicate to the government of Manitoba its intention to extend the operation of the Canadian Wheat Board (additional powers, Saskatchewan) Act, 1922, for one year from the 15th day of August, 1923, provided the necessary federal order in council be passed.

The government of this province should communicate to the government of Manitoba the willingness of the government of Saskatchewan to immediately co-operate with the other prairie governments and farmers' organizations for the purpose of evolving a co-operative method of marketing for subsequent years, but without in any way restricting discussion and co-operation to the precise type of organization outlined by the Premier of Manitoba.

Under date of March 10, the Premier of Alberta forwarded a copy of a resolution passed by the legislature of that province on February 13, and stated it was the intention of his government to pass the necessary order in council extending the provincial legisla-

tion for one year. Mr. Greenfield further stated:

I am writing to urge upon you the desirability of the federal government passing the necessary order in council extending the federal legislation for a like period.

The resolution referred to was an expression of opinion of the legislature that:

The government should continue the negotiations carried on last year with the governments of the Dominion of Canada and the province of Saskatchewan, for the establishment of a wheat board, and that every effort should be made this year by the said governments, together with the government of the province of Manitoba, if that government passed the necessary legislation, to establish such a board in time to handle the crop of 1923.

In accordance with the above notification, the Canadian government passed two orders in council on the 7th April, 1923, that is to say, P.C. 610 and P.C. 611. The first order in council referred to ordered that the Canadian Wheat Board Act, 1922, be brought into operation as provided by section 19 thereof; the second order in council referred to ordered that the operation of the said act for all purposes be extended for one year from the 15th of August, 1923.

BUDGET CHANGES

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): I purpose laying on the table of the House notice of several changes in the budget resolutions. They will reach the members in the Votes and Proceedings in the morning; but perhaps the House will be pleased if I state at once, without comment, the nature of the principal changes. If there be no objection, I will do so.

In the resolutions as they stand the change in connection with the sales tax is to take effect on the first of August. We have decided to make the date January 1, 1924, inasmuch as it will cover existing contracts and avoid embarrassment which might otherwise arise.

According to the resolutions before the House, the tax on beverages and also the tax on confectionery would be abolished on the first of August. We propose that the abolition shall take effect practically at once, on the first day of June.

There is a readjustment of the silk duties, the details of which I need not mention.

The item of newsprint is omitted from the exemptions to the sales tax. There was a misunderstanding; this was not asked for by anybody, and it was inserted for customs purposes. But at all events we are not pressing it.

Another item I might mention is with regard to what is called the dumping duty on sugar. The resolutions as they stand provide that the dumping duty shall not apply when sugar reaches a certain price, eight cents per pound. We are proposing to make a limitation; we propose that the dumping duty shall continue, but that it shall be limited; that at no time shall it exceed three-quarters of a cent per pound.

I think those are all the matters of sufficient importance to speak of now. The details will appear in the Votes and Proceedings in the morning. In the meantime, I will give copies to my hon. friends opposite.

Mr. STANSELL: Does the tax exemption as applied to drain tiles apply at once?

Mr. FIELDING: I would prefer that the hon. member should read the resolution in the morning. The idea is that it is to come into effect at an early date, I forget the date.

OLD AGE PENSIONS AND MOTHERS' ALLOWANCES

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. L. H. MARTELL (Hants): Have any negotiations been carried on by this government with the governments of the various provinces for the purpose of arranging for conferences between the provincial and the federal authorities in the matter of old age pensions and mothers' allowances?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): My impression is that the Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock) had a conference last fall with representatives of the Labour departments of the provincial governments, in the course of which conference a number of matters relating to the question to which my hon. friend refers, were discussed. I cannot say at the moment what further conference there has been, but I know that the matter has been the subject of conference between the provincial governments and our own.

THE BUDGET

CONCLUSION OF DEBATE ON THE ANNUAL FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF THE MINISTER OF FINANCE

The House resumed from Tuesday, May 22, the debate on the motion of Hon. W. S. Fielding (Minister of Finance), that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair for the House to go into Committee of Ways and Means, and the proposed amendment thereto of Mr. Robert Forke.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the Minister

of Finance (Mr. Fielding), to whose wide experience and sound judgment in financial and tariff matters the country is mainly indebted for the essential features of the budget which has been presented to the House, will speak again in the course of the debate with reference to some of the criticisms that have been directed against it by hon. gentleman opposite. In the circumstances, I should much have preferred to leave to my hon. friend such further reply as may be necessary. Inasmuch, however, as my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) has seen well to go beyond the subject matter of the budget to direct his attack against the Liberal party as a whole in what, with characteristic use of opprobrious epithets, he declares to be a lack of honour and fidelity to pledges and a repudiation of principles, and as certain other hon. members in the course of this debate have sought by their remarks to give to the public a wholly erroneous impression as to the character of the budget, I may perhaps be forgiven for taking up more of the time of the House at this stage of the debate in a few general observations upon some of the matters referred to in criticism.

First, let me speak of the charge that the action taken by the Liberal party in this budget has not been in accordance with the platform of the Liberal party as laid down at the convention of 1919. I say that any such charge is wholly unwarranted. I think I am as familiar as any member of the House with the platform of 1919 and with what took place at the Liberal convention in reference to it. When I was honoured by the members of that convention with the position of leader of the Liberal party, I did not wait until those present at the convention had dispersed, to express what I conceived to be the purpose of the platform which had been laid down and the spirit in which the party would expect to have it interpreted. Indeed, the first remarks I made on the occasion were to the effect—and I used at that time a simile which I thought was obvious to all, and which I still think is as appropriate as any that could be used—that I regarded the platform drafted by the convention as a chart on which had been plotted the direction the Liberal party would be expected to take, should it be returned to power. I made it perfectly plain at the time in the use of that simile, that I did not regard the party as bound by the platform literatim et verbatim, pledged to carry out each line and letter of it during the first year or two we might be in office. Indeed, I made another fact equally plain, which was that I should not attempt, if at the head of the government, to follow the example of the then Prime Minister the present leader of the Opposition, of trying to direct the operations of government pretty much, if not wholly, by myself; I stated that I would endeavour to surround myself with the ablest men whom this country might send to parliament, and from their collective wisdom, I would seek to derive the guidance necessary to decide how far at any particular time it might be wise to go in pursuing the course plotted for us by the convention. That was the statement I made in the presence of all the delegates on that occasion. There was no exception taken to that attitude; there has been, so far as I know, no exception on the part of the Liberal party as a whole to that attitude from that day up to the present.

Some little time after the convention had been held, and I had again the privilege of having a seat in this House, while the Liberal party were still in opposition, I had the honour of seconding a resolution which was introduced by the present Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) setting forth the attitude which we believed was the one the party was expected to take towards any matters of tariff revision. I shall not read the whole of that resolution, but I will quote the concluding paragraphs of it. It was moved by the present Minister of Finance on May 10, 1921, and seconded by myself:

> That such changes should be made in the customs duties as may be expected to reduce the cost of living, and to reduce also the cost of implements of production required for the efficient development of the natural resources of the Dominion;
>
> That, while keeping this aim clearly in mind, the House recognizes that in any readjustment of the tariff that may take place, regard must be had to existing conditions of trade, and changes made in such a manner as will cause the least possible disturbance of business.

That was the position of the Liberal party as it was asserted in this House of Commons after the Liberal convention of 1919 and before the general election of 1921. And that was the position we took when we went to the country.

I noticed in the remarks of my right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) yesterday, that although he introduced many subjects in the course of his speech, there was one very significant omission from all that he said. He made no reference whatever to a single speech of mine delivered during the campaign of 1921. I spoke in every province of the Dominion with the exception only of the

province of British Columbia and in every province in which I spoke, from every platform upon which I stood, I took occasion on this subject of the tariff, to refer to the convention of 1919 and the interpretation which the Liberal party put upon the Liberal platform as adopted at the time of that convention. I spoke in terms exactly similar to those which I am asserting at this moment. I made it plain, using indeed, the very simile I have used this afternoon, that if returned to power I should regard the platform as a chart on which was plotted the course the Liberal party was expected to take. I said that I would not seek to follow it literally, that I felt it would be unwise to do so, but that I would seek to bring about me, from the different provinces of the Dominion, men upon whose judgment the country would have reason to rely with confidence and that I would be guided by their collective wisdom in moving in the direction indicated. I also made it clear that whatever the Liberal party might do with respect to the tariff, it would do in relation to conditions existing at the time; and I know I made the further assertion that no established industry in this country operating at that time and which was earning a legitimate profit need have any fear, if the Liberal party were returned to power, that its legitimate business would be injured by any revision of the tariff. That was the position I took throughout the campaign; I took it in every province; and I challenge my right hon. friend and those around him to search the journals of this country from one end of it to the other and bring into this House of Commons, if they can, a single statement of mine, truly reported, that is contrary to what I am saying at this moment.

Now, Sir, I say that that is the pledge by which we are bound; that is the position we took when we appealed to the country. We were returned on that representation and on no other. What we have done in this budget is to carry out the spirit of the platform as laid down in 1919, in the light of conditions as we see them at the present time.

Some of those who sit opposite have referred to this budget as a protectionist budget. What are its features? In the first place, there are in it, so far as tariff matters are concerned, a very large number of reductions in duties. I have in my hand a list of tariff reductions in which some 21 different items have been affected by considerable reductions, apart altogether from the general reduction made through the British preference on all articles. Twenty-one different articles, which I will not detain the House by reading, have been affected by an immediate reduction of duty. Then, as respects all commodities, the British preference has been increased. This is equivalent to a reduction in the customs duty on articles coming from Great Britain of a 10 per cent discount on all goods coming in through our Canadian ports. There again is a further general reduction of duties. But let me point out to hon. gentlemen that this budget must be considered not only in relation to what we are doing at the moment but in conjunction with what we did last year. Last year we made some material reductions in customs duties, some of them with respect to the British preference; and if one takes occasion to study carefully the items that were affected, one will find that as regards goods coming from the Old Country there has been a very considerable reduction in customs duties through an increase of the British preference. I have here a list of items that have been affected by the British preference in a very direct way and to a considerable degree by what we have done this session combined with what was done last year. In some 40 cases which I might cite there have been reductions ranging anywhere from 2 to 3, 4, 5, 7 and 9 per cent increase in the British preference. Among these let us cite the following: take first the case of flannels; there was a reduction last year and again this year, the two together making a total reduction of 4½ per cent. In wool fabrics, the total reduction is 5¼ per cent; in clothing, the total reduction is 4½ per cent; wool clothing and tweeds 5¼ per cent; blankets, in one case 9¾ per cent, in another case 4¾ per cent, and in another 2¼; in cotton fabrics there is a reduction of 4¾ per cent; in collars and cuffs 7 per cent; in corsets of 4¾ per cent; in harness 4½ per cent, besides other items that I might mention. These are all items that enter into the cost of living; they are articles that affect every home; and this means a material reduction in the cost of living. But that is not the only change made so far as the effect upon the customs tariff through the British preference is concerned. I have here another and much larger list, a list of something like 180 articles, many of them important, which have been materially affected by the change in the tariff that we have made through the British preference. Of these 180 articles, in the case of 80 of the items the present rate is over 50 per cent, while in the case of the 100 others the preference runs anywhere from 40 to 50 per cent. One of the planks of the platform was that we should aim to bring about a British preference of 50 per cent. Well, we have brought it about in these 80 items of

the tariff to which I have referred. In 100 others we are above 40 and approaching 50 per cent.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In how many of these cases do we bring the goods from England at all?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: With the exception, I think, of three or four all the goods come into this country from England.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Practically none.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Perhaps my right hon. friend will tell me the ones that do not come from England.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The amount of goods coming from England is negligible compared with the amount coming from the United States, which is the controlling factor.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I have before me a list prepared with some degree of care by one of the officials of the government. Included in this list are two items, sewing machines and drain pipes, which have been affected by the two last reductions, and in regard to these there is the following footnote:

> Practically no importations of these items from Great Britain at present, or likely in the near future.

All the other items which constitute those affected by the changes of this year and last combined, come into this country from Great Britain. The point I wish to make clear is that the platform of the Liberal party called upon us to aim in the direction of a 50 per cent British preference. We have that 50 per cent applying now in a large number of cases, and we are approaching it in a still larger number of cases; but we have also gone beyond this 50 per cent in some instances. If we had adopted the attitude of mind which some hon. gentlemen take towards platforms we should have stopped the minute we reached the 50 per cent. We take the position that there has been indicated to us the direction in which we should go provided the circumstances of the times so permit. As I have said, we have carried out that policy in a manner which I think will help materially the consumers and producers while it will also help the trade of the country.

Then again in this budget we have emphasized our belief in the importance of reciprocity. That was another plank of the Liberal platform. Let me not forget also to make mention of an important article on which a very marked reduction has been made—50 cents on every 100 pounds of sugar coming in not only from Britain but from all other countries. There is a reduction which affects every household in this country. There are a few cases where the tariff has been readjusted, but for the most part the entire revision, both last year and this, has been in a downward direction; and in addition to that a very substantial relief has been afforded through the specific items I have mentioned.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when one considers that the essential features of this budget are: No increase in taxation; a substantial revision downwards of many items in the customs tariff; a large reduction so far as sugar is concerned; an increase in the British preference on all articles coming by way of Canadian ports; a revival of the offer of reciprocity to our neighbours to the south—when we consider these essential features how can it possibly be stated that this is a protectionist budget? By an identical process of reasoning, assuming that we had taken a reverse course, assuming that we had increased the duties all along the line, reduced the British preference, added 50 cents per 100 pounds to the sugar duty, denied any further faith or belief in the merits of reciprocity, hon. gentlemen opposite might have brought in and supported an amendment declaring that we had introduced a free trade budget and that they would not support it on that account.

Another feature that I think it is right should be taken into account in the consideration of this budget is what has been enacted, or is likely to be enacted, in the way of legislation this present session. Commercial treaties have been made with France and Italy which will bring considerable relief to the consumers of the Dominion, and we believe will materially help in the expansion of our trade. Then there is the enactment, we hope, of a Combines Investigation Act, which contains a clause giving the government power, wherever it appears as a result of investigation under that act that the tariff is being used as a means of enabling groups of interests to gain an undue profit, to reduce duties by order in council. These are all part and parcel of the legislation which we are presenting to the House and which is associated with this budget. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that far from being capable of the interpretation which some hon. gentlemen opposite have endeavoured to place upon the budget, on the face of it this is clearly a budget leading to freer trade and reduced cost of living for the masses of the people of this country.

Now, may I say just a word to my hon. friends who believe strongly in free trade? The hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) referred last night to his early studies in political economy. I think probably that is where most of us, in the first instance, get our conceptions with respect to matters pertaining to the tariff. But many forget that there is a difference between the theoretical study of a particular subject and its practical application where there are concrete circumstances which have to be taken into account. Many men carry their academic training into the business world and cease to be of any practical use just because they do not realize the difference between theory and practice. If every country of the globe followed a free trade policy, if there were no protective walls erected by other nations, certainly free trade would be the best policy for the world. No man can argue successfully against free trade on theoretical grounds. It is obviously to the interest of all mankind that capital should be attracted to and invested in those industries which in the matter of comparative cost of production afford the greatest natural advantages. That is absolutely sound doctrine. But when you have the countries of the world following not a free trade policy, but instead erecting tariff walls higher and higher, a man ceases to apply his theory accurately when at a given moment he is prepared to concede to other countries the placing of a handicap against the trade of his own. For that reason, as one who believes in the theoretical soundness of the free trade argument, I contend that in the application of all our economic ideas and principles we must take account, as economists do take account, of world conditions as they are and apply our theory in the light of existing conditions.

May I point out, Mr. Speaker, the fact that those who were strongest in the advocacy of free trade, the people of Great Britain, did not achieve their object in a single day, a single year, or even in a generation? Free trade was not brought about in Great Britain in the course of any one parliament. If one leaves out of account altogether the Reciprocity Treaty of 1787 which Pitt negotiated with France, and which was one of the first measures for freer trade, but which was shot to pieces by the Napoleonic War—if one leaves that measure out of consideration, it was some thirty-five years from the time of the first material reduction before the free traders of England were able to reduce the tariffs of their day to the point where free trade became an actuality. And in that period a change had taken place from the England that existed in the day when the movement started. At the inception of that movement England's industries were more or less in their infancy, but in course of time the effect of the so-called industrial revolution made itself felt, the application of power to industry became more and more extended, until England rose to be one of the greatest manufacturing countries in the world. In addition to that, England developed not only her manufactures during that period; she developed also her mercantile marine; her trade upon the high seas; and it was co-existent with the growth of her industries at home and her trade on the high seas that England began to reduce the duties,—a step which ultimately led to free trade. If we were to be logical in this country in what we say with respect to the introduction of free trade, we would study with care some of the essential developments in the English free trade movement. I have referred to the reciprocity treaty with France which Pitt negotiated in 1787. It was in 1825 that Huskisson reduced the high tariff previously existing to a maximum rate of 30 per cent on fully manufactured goods. Peel in 1842 reduced the tariff to a maximum rate of 20 per cent, and abolished the corn laws in 1846. Gladstone in 1853 brought the tariff down to a maximum rate of 10 per cent and finally swept away all protective duties, co-incidentally with the enactment of the second French reciprocity treaty negotiated by Cobden, in 1860. When the British in this cautious way introduced free trade, Britain was indisputably the greatest manufacturing as well as the greatest trading nation in the world. The introduction of free trade greatly helped her traders and did not injure her manufactures, who in almost every product could defy competition. The final step was taken as a result of the reciprocity trade negotiating with the other leading manufacturing nations of the time. Is Canada, which both last year and this has made substantial reductions in her tariff, to throw down the bars completely, entirely irrespective of the policy of our great neighbour to the south, where the high tariff party, as we know to our cost, is in power? The present budget includes a grant of lower tariffs to the one and an offer of negotiations looking toward, lower tariffs to the other of the two great nations with which five-sixths of our foreign trade is carried on, while reciprocity treaties with two other of our leading customers have been brought before parliament.

May I say to my hon. friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster) and to my hon. friends of

the Progressive party, that I do not object in the least to any of the views they may put forward; I believe absolutely in their sincerity with respect to lower duties on commodities and the help that lower duties might be to the country. But what I do take exception to is the method whereby they seek to effect the objects they have in view. Does my hon. friend from Brome believe that Pitt, that Huskisson, that Peel, that Gladstone, that these great protagonists of free trade, never had their days of darkness, of disappointment, and of difficulty? Does he believe that these great statesmen never knew what it was to feel solitary and alone in their inability to realize within a limited period of time the ideal which was so strong in their own minds? Had these men seen well to divide themselves from their party, even to the limited extent to which my hon. friend has found it necessary so to do, would Gladstone's name. would Peel's name, would Huskisson's name stand out to-day in history as they do, as the men who brought about these great reforms in trade?

Mr. BIRD (rising)—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Sit down.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. BIRD: If I am not transgressing—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Louder.

Mr. BIRD: I am sorry if I am transgressing any usages in this regard, but a question did occur to me and I am going to ask it in justice to the hon. member for Brome.

An hon. MEMBER: He can take care of himself.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. BIRD: If I have the permission of the Prime Minister, I want to ask him if England would have had free trade to-day had it not been for John Bright?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Well, Mr. Speaker, I did not omit the name of John Bright intentionally. I happen to have before me the names of those identified with particular reductions of the tariff at the time they were made. I think my hon. friend is quite right; John Bright's contribution was one of the greatest—but John Bright fought within the ranks of his party. John Bright, through his great moral strength and his noble eloquence, was able to influence the men of his own party to his own view, and he exerted that influence by standing in their ranks and commanding them with his majestic power. I say in all seriousness to the hon. member for Brome that I am sorry to see him take a seat opposite. Why? On his own account? Yes. On account of the party? Yes; but most of all because of the very ideal that he has at heart; for the place to realize that ideal is among the men who are helping to bring about its fulfilment. I would say much the same to the members of the Progressive party, because of their attitude; that is to say the attitude of some of them. They feel it necessary not to interpret the difficulties of the economic situation in this country to their constituents, but to create in the minds of their constituents, by their attitude in parliament, the impression that there is, in this parliament some unwillingness to have justice done to western Canada, that there is a need for agitation—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friends applaud that remark; I am happy to say, however, that I noticed only a very few of them do so. They take this attitude, Mr. Speaker, instead of seeking to interpret to their constituents what they know to be some of the problems and difficulties in connection with all these tariff matters, and the extent of which they had not learned as they now know it until they came into this parliament. There is a double duty on the part of members of this House: they owe a duty to their constituents, but it is not the duty merely of advocating in parliament the particular demands of particular sections; they also owe a duty to return to their constituents and to explain to them the problems with which the nation as a whole is faced. I was told by several members of the Progressive party before this budget was introduced that regardless altogether of what the Minister of Finance might say in the budget they would find it necessary to bring in an amendment. Where is there in such an attitude the extending of help to a government that is seeking to effect reform? How can any government be expected to co-operate with men who, though proclaiming a like purpose and a like aim, maintain that—regardless of what is done—for the sake of agitation, for the sake of making clearer and wider a division and a breach in our country, they will bring in some amendment and by their course in debate create an impression throughout the land that a condition of injustice exists so far as the attitude of one section of Canada toward another is concerned? Let my hon. friend from Brome, and my friends of the Progressive party look at the gentlemen directly opposite and take a leaf from their books. You do not find in their ranks any high priest of

protection, simply because he is unable to get all the protection he wants, taking a seat apart and erecting an altar of his own in some far corner of the room. You do not find these hon. gentlemen who profess to believe in protection dividing into two great wings, one saying we have not protection enough and the other saying we must have more protection. "The children of this world"—sometimes interpreted as "the children of darkness"—"are in their generation wiser than the children of light."

May I say just a further word with respect to another feature of the budget—the emphasis which has been placed upon stability as regards the tariff in the government's tariff announcements? Why is it that the present government is seeking stability in the tariff? For the simple reason that what this country needs to-day, as what the world needs, is a little more in the way of stability. What we need to-day is to restore a feeling of confidence in the minds of the business community, and in the minds of the industrial community. The world to-day is still trembling more or less from the convulsion of the titanic struggle of a few years ago, and the highest duty of statesmanship is to seek, so far as it lies within the power of every nation, to restore in the minds of all classes of the community a feeling of certainty, a feeling of confidence, a feeling which for want of a better word we describe as stability. Stability does not mean finality. I notice that some hon. gentlemen opposite have sought to combine the two words. If there was one thing above another which the hon. Minister of Finance was most careful to emphasize when he spoke of stability, it was that as regards all legislation, and in particular as regards the tariff, there was no such thing as finality. He spoke particularly and specifically of the probable need for change as respects some items of the tariff affecting consumers and in relation to the necessities of production. He mentioned these things, and if there be need for greater emphasis as to what he said, may I direct the attention of the House to the fact that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance had no sooner concluded his reference to stability than he began to speak of reciprocity and of trade agreements with the United States, which would mean changes in the tariff the minute they were brought down.

No, what my hon. friend sought to convey to the House in his remarks was that the government, after having carefully studied the situation from all angles, had come to the conclusion that having regard to the situation of Canada to-day in relation to other countries, it should tell the Canadian people that as respects the tariff, unless there were obvious reasons why there should be changes occasioned by necessity, they might be reasonably assured that there would be a steadiness in the tariff for some little time to come. That is what my hon. friend sought to make clear to this House, and he did so for the reason, that what we in Canada can do with justice in the matter of tariff revision is necessarily dependent in large part upon what is done by our neighbours to the south and upon what occurs in Europe.

What is the position with regard to the United States? Since the Liberal convention was held, there has been enacted by the United States a much higher tariff than ever before existed between Canada and the United States. The Fordney-McCumber tariff, so-called, to-day is operating to the disadvantage of Canada. Is there any member of this House who will stand up in his place and say: Notwithstanding that obvious fact we think we should throw down our bars against the United States and give them an opportunity to come in here and affect our industries in a manner even more seriously than they have already been affected.

4 p.m.

Take the situation in Europe—and this accounts in large measure for the troubles that my hon. friends are having in the West. It is not our tariff alone. In these discussions on the budget all ills that any portion of the country seems to have are focussed up against this one target. The reason western Canada is suffering to-day is in large part due to the fact that the demand for our grain and our raw materials is not what it used to be, is not what it should be or will be until conditions in Europe become more settled than they are at the present time. We feel that the settlement of conditions in Europe and the favourable change in the American tariff are not likely to be effected for some little time yet, and for that reason we say that pending a change in this external situation we wish to give to the Canadian people the assurance that we do not purpose having an unstable tariff, because that is the significance of it. The one word has to be used in relation not only to its synonym but also its antonym. We do not propose to have an unstable tariff while this unstable condition exists in different parts of the world.

We have sought however in this budget to take steps which while not so apparent on their face, will we believe, become increasingly apparent as the years go by, and will, we feel sure, be helpful in changing the situation. We have increased the British

preference on all articles coming from Britain through Canadian ports. Why have we done that? One reason, let me say, which prompted the government to that action, possibly the reason which above every other may have inspired the thought in the first instance, is the circumstance that Great Britain, the Mother Country, has removed the embargo on our cattle going into the markets of Britain, and we wish the Mother Country to see and to know when she takes an attitude toward us which means stretching out a hand of which we are in need, that we are equally prepared to stretch a hand across the sea and greet her with goodwill in return. We hope to see continue, as we are seeing now, our ships crossing to the islands of Britain laden with cattle from our western plains, but we hope also to see these ships returning to Canada with goods which will be of service to the people of the western plains as well as of other parts of this Dominion. We hope to see furthered in this way a larger trade.

There is another object we have in view. We have been trying to build up our railways in this country, and no group of men in parliament have talked more of the necessity of nationalization of the railroads or expressed more often the desire and hope that the National Railways would succeed than hon. gentlemen of the Progressive group. We believe that if we can develop trade through our own ports we will be helping to develop and assist our National Railways. We think this is a moment when we should seek to bring as far as we can over our own Canadian lines all the trade that we can hope to bring. There again, is a national purpose that we have in mind.

But more than that. It is becoming increasingly apparent that not only on the Atlantic ocean but on the Pacific ocean as well there are possibilities of great trade development. Vessels are leaving the ports of Vancouver and Victoria and sailing down the Pacific around through the Panama canal to the countries of Europe. We hope to see a return trade developed between Great Britain and those western ports by way of the Panama canal, and whatever comes in that direction is all to the benefit of western Canada. We believe that by our policy we will help to make apparent to the world the advantages there are in trade through Canadian ports, and I think I am right in saying that whether we trade through Canadian ports on the Atlantic or through Canadian ports on the Pacific, whatever comes in the way of increased trade through any of these ports will redound to the advantage of all parts of Canada from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

But, Sir, we had another aim, and I think it is becoming apparent to anyone who reads the American press of to-day. The Americans, as I have said, have put up a high tariff wall against us affecting no part of this country more than the part from which my hon. friends of the Progressive group come. They have that wall, but we want to show them that if they wish to sell they must also be ready to buy. There can be no jug-handled proposition in matters of trade. If you wish to sell you have got to be willing to buy. If you wish to buy you have to be willing to sell. I think our American friends will come to see that if, as a result of their action— and it is their own business, of course—if as a result of their action Canada is going to seek and obtain new markets in which to buy and sell in Britain, new markets in France and new markets in Italy, is going to develop a reciprocal trade and effect agreements with Australia and possibly other countries as well, if they begin to see that in all these directions we are striking out into and creating new lines of commerce, and that we can manage very well as we are, I am inclined to think that that line of thought, quicker than anything else, will bring about the change which my hon. friends of the Progressive group opposite hope may come.

Before I leave that matter, may I add this with respect to our endeavour to bring about stability? We are taking in this connection a stand which we believe to be not only in the interests of our own country but in the interests of the world. I have in my hand a copy of the report which was presented to this parliament some little time ago of the Genoa Conference for the economic and financial reconstruction of Europe. Canada was represented at that conference by two able and distinguished gentlemen and there were assembled there, as hon. members will recall, representatives from most of the commercial nations of the world. True, in some respects the conference did not achieve all that was hoped and expected of it, but there were certain matters on which there was general agreement, and in the report of this conference I find the following. It appears on page 37 of the report printed by order of this House:

(A)—Customs Tariffs

Article 43

All customs tariffs should be published; such publication should be accompanied by a clear and precise indication in regard to each category of goods of all the duties which are leviable on the importation or exportation of the goods concerned.

Article 44

The tariffs should be made, so far as possible applicable over substantial periods of time and changes in rates and in customs regulations should be made as rarely as possible and duly published, the practice of frequent modification for the purpose of economic warfare being entirely abandoned.

I would direct the attention of my right hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, particularly to these last words. He has been urging throughout this debate that in trade matters we should use the tariff more or less continually as an instrument of economic warfare. At this conference of European and world statesmen—

Mr. MEIGHEN: I was commenting on the fact that the government was doing so itself.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No, no, I think the right hon. member went much further than that in his comments. Indeed his whole speech on the French treaty was a declamation in favour of economic warfare and the uses to be made of the tariff in that connection. However, this conference at Genoa of men who had seriously at heart the future welfare of Europe and the well being of mankind deemed it advisable to give as their studied and thoughtful opinion that the practice of frequent modification of tariffs for the purpose of economic warfare should be abandoned. Not only did the Genoa conference consider this matter; it was dealt with also by the League of Nations. Canada is a member of the League of Nations, and as such we are specially interested in any step which that body may take to further the object for which it has been created. A great deal has been said about tariffs and their bearing upon world peace. The League of Nations exists for the purpose of furthering the peace of the world. Among matters to which in this connection the League of Nations has felt it necessary to give attention have been some of the questions of economic relations between the different countries. I have here a copy of the latest proceedings of the League of Nations and I find that the economic commission, which is a committee of the council, had under consideration the recommendation of the Genoa conference to which I have referred, and that this committee of the council made its report to the assembly of the League of Nations. The following appears at page 1396 of the official Journal of the League of Nations for November, 1922:

B. The council, desirous that effect should be given to the recommendations embodied in article 3 of the resolution of the Genoa Economic commission, "that tariffs should be made so far as possible applicable for substantial periods of time and changes in rates and in customs regulations should be made as rarely as possible..."

Resolved:

To endorse and communicate to the states members of the League the following resolution adopted by the Economic committee of the League at its last session:

"The Economic committee is deeply impressed with the inconvenience and injury caused to international commerce which result from the uncertainty arising from frequent changes of customs tariffs and associates itself cordially with the resolution of the Genoa conference on this subject.

"The committee strongly recommends that all states should endeavour to ensure that their customs tariffs should remain applicable over substantial periods of time, and that changes in rates and classifications should be effected as seldom as possible and only when they are required by the essential economic needs of the country."

That resolution, according to the report of the assembly, was unanimously adopted by the assembly of the League of Nations at its last session. Now I read these resolutions not for the purpose of helping to foster the impression that in speaking of stability in matters of tariff the action of the government contemplates finality in any particular or in any direction. I rather wish to bring home to the members of this House, as far as may be possible, what has become so apparent to the statesmen of other parts of the world, that if we are to get away from the unsettled conditions of the present, if we are to restore confidence among the nations of the world, if once more this world is to be brought back to the order which prevailed prior to the Great War, we must all seek, in whatever directions we can, particularly in our international relations, to establish something in the nature of a reasonable stability. That is all we are aiming at. We do not intend to sacrifice in any particular the needs of any class of our citizens or the needs of industry, the needs in any direction of consumers or of producers, but what we do wish to make clear is that, so long as conditions continue to exist as they are at present, so long as on the part of the United States, the tariff wall remains what it is against us, and in Europe the unsettled condition continues to be what it is, and so long, may I add, as Canada remains the only country that has reduced its tariff since the Great War, while other countries continue to put up their tariffs, for that period of time at least we shall give to those who are interested in investing their capital and establishing industry in this country, and who are seeking to restore business to a higher level of development, assurance that there will not be unstability where stability ought to prevail.

Mr. GOOD: Does the Prime Minister think that stability on a wrong and false basis would help to allay unrest?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I hope I have made it plain to my hon. friend that the world has been on a wrong and false basis, and that we are trying to get it on a right and sound basis, and the only way in which that can be done is by having regard, not for an imaginary world, but for the world in which we are living. If my hon. friend says that it is a wrong and unsound thing that all the nations of the world should have tariff walls erected against one another, I say that in principle I agree entirely with the hon. member; but if he says the way to cure the evil is for one country, perhaps the smallest of the lot, to throw down its tariff walls, while the rest of the world keeps up its tariff walls, I say that he would be a long way from providing a remedy for the condition which he hopes to cure.

Perhaps the best evidence of whether or not the government's action in proceeding slowly and cautiously, as it has done in the matter of the tariff, is a wise and a good one, may be borne out by a few statistics that more or less speak for themselves.

I shall give the House just a few figures and with that conclude. We have heard from one quarter quite a wail about the alleged deplorable condition of our country; but that is not going to help to improve the situation. It would do much more for Canada if we let it be known throughout the world exactly where and how we stand in the matter of economic revival. I have brought together a few figures as nearly up-to-date as possible for purposes of comparison, and I think they show conclusively the direction in which we are heading at the present time. These figures, by the way, I have obtained from the statistical department of the government. The figures are as follows:

The estimated outlay on building operations during the month of April, 1922, was $14,047,198; during April, 1923, it was $17,544,061, an increase of over three and a half millions of dollars.

Canada's trade for the month of April, 1922, was estimated at $80,347,495, made up of imports, $47,695,454, and exports, $32,652,041. Our trade for the month of April, 1923, was $122,509,396, made up of imports, $68,181,320, and exports, $54,328,076, an increase in the one month of 1923 of $42,161,901. This is equivalent to an increase of about half in the total trade of last year.

Bank clearings, in April, 1922, amounted to $1,213,021,399; in April, 1923, they amounted to $1,267,520,018, or an increase in the one month of 1923 of $54,498,619.

Savings deposits, another barometer of prosperity or the reverse, were for January, February, March, 1922, $1,184,703,596; for January, February, March, 1923, $1,218,295,721, or an increase in those three months of $33,592,125.

The figures on immigration are still small but they reveal a similar increase for the first four months of 1922. There were 16,774 immigrants landed in Canada as against 22,240 for the first four months of 1923, or an increase of 32½ per cent. But that is only the beginning of our immigration for this year.

The question of employment has been referred to at different times. The Department of Labour works out what it describes as an index of employment on percentage basis of the available labour supply. For the 1st of May, 1922, the index number was 83.3; for the 1st May, of this year, 1923, the index number stands at 91.44.

These figures which reflect the trade of our country, the savings of our people, the employment of our people, and which reflect clearly and beyond dispute the national progress, are more eloquent of the position of our country than any words can possibly be. I would say to my hon. friends, instead of striving to make the condition of this country out to be what none of us would wish to have it, they should lay the emphasis and stress rather on those things in which we have good ground to take pride and satisfaction.

With respect to the budget proposals which the Minister of Finance has brought down, let me say just one word in conclusion. If there is one thing above another for which at this time this country has reason to be grateful to Providence, it is that we have had spared to guide us in matters of finance and tariff, the grand old gentleman at whose side in this parliament I have the honour to be seated.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York): Mr. Speaker, up in the York valley where I live, there is an old settlers' road that has been in use now for over one hundred years, and on one side it is backed by a very high hill, very much wooded and very steep. It is altogether sheltered from the sun, and from that day to this the old name given to it by the settlers has been retained, that of Greenland. The snow never melts in the spring, and there are in the hillside two openings through which the winds blow at all times. As I say, the settlers called it Greenland. When I look at the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) down there in the

Greenland of this House, and when I listen to the speech that has just been delivered by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), the thought comes back to me of a statement once made by the late Goldwin Smith, who was a great student of English as well as Canadian politics. He said:

> A great deal of the time of the public men of Canada is devoted to the respective amount possessed by each of the doubtful virtue of consistency.

We have heard a good deal of that to-day; we heard a good deal of it yesterday, and on different occasions we have heard a good deal of it in this House. Still, my sympathy is with my hon. friend down there in Greenland.

I have just this to say about the speech of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King). Having always been a Conservative and a believer in making Canada a self-contained country, I am pleased to hear him make the speech that he has made to-day. He professes to be a protectionist, and he now professes to be in favour of Canada having industries of various kinds of her own. Yet, when he says that, and when I endorse it, still there is a grievance on the part of the people of our western country, and still there is a grievance in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick in connection with the way in which the war has treated the people there, and they believe something should be done for the development of those provinces. If I take the occasion of the discussion of the budget to refer to some public questions, I am not going for the moment any more into the subject before the House than to say that I cannot vote for the amendment and I cannot vote for the budget. Recognizing the urgency before hon. members to get away during this evening so that they may return home for the holiday, I am going to take the little time I have at my disposal to discuss two public questions of some concern to the people.

I begin by saying that the greatest railway in the world to-day is the Canadian National Railway system, the only shareholders of which are the people of Canada. The second greatest railway in the world to-day is the Canadian Pacific Railway, which is not owned by the people of Canada, but which was largely subsidized by the people of Canada by way of land grants, legislation and bonus, and which is owned by a private company. These two roads have come now somewhat into competition One is a publicly-owned road and the other is a company-owned road. The people in the province from which I come, indeed the people in my riding, are great believers in public ownership. Not only have we our share in the National railways; but the province of Ontario has a splendid system of railways, publicly owned up in northern Ontario. In Toronto we own the street railway system and in Ontario we own and control radial roads. We also have a hydro system for the distribution of electricity, and we are absolute believers in public ownership as applied to public services. We are glad to have the National Railways to-day; they are making headway and I have no doubt will soon prove a great success. But it seems that the Canadian Pacific Railway, which has been dealt with so generously by the people of this country, is gradually creating, perhaps, a party in this House, and certainly a sentiment in the country, through the press and in other ways, which has a tendency to destroy confidence in the public-owned railways. The Canadian Pacific Railway evidently wants to have the National system crippled or destroyed, or at all events to have it turned over to itself. That will never come to pass in this country. If such a thing should happen, Mr. Speaker, it would simply establish a sort of boss-ship that would make life in this country intolerable and almost impossible. It would destroy our political institutions, for there would be a railway boss in Canada to whose dictation the government would be subject; indeed, parliament and the press would be equally subject to that dictation. And yet you can see this process working in Canada; the suggestion is being disseminated throughout the country that the National Railways ought to be destroyed or at least turned over to the Canadian Pacific Railway. The Canadian Pacific Railway professes to be, and as a matter of fact, by right of citizenship in Canada, is a shareholder in the National roads; and if my good friend, Mr. Beatty, and those associated with him in the railway business find themselves in competition with the public-owned roads, let them compete with those roads. Do not, however, let them seek to destroy the National system; they must give that system a race for the money, and put up a competition against it in the matter of service. They may win out, but I do not think that is possible. Of course, they can spend the enormous reserve which the Canadian Pacific Railway possesses to-day and devote that money to an intensive competition with the National Railways, but I believe that such a competition would ultimately prove ineffective, and they would not get much support from their shareholders if they attempted a policy of that kind the object of which would

be to squander the reserves of the company in any such competition. But, I say, let them go on; I do not think that the National system need have any fears.

I have not the slightest hesitation in saying that the Canadian National Railway system is the greatest institution of its kind in the world to-day. It is made up of the Grand Trunk, now seventy years old, the old Canadian Northern, the Mackenzie and Mann Northern, the Transcontinental, and many other roads that have been taken in; and this National system to-day has the marked characteristic of possessing almost the entire strategic advantage of transportation from one coast of Canada to the other. It possesses everything on the St. Lawrence, in the old city of Quebec and in Montreal. It comes to lake Ontario by the St. Lawrence route and has all the strategy of position at Toronto and Hamilton. It commands particularly the strategy of the Niagara river and the Detroit river, it has the sites of bridges and tunnels, it has much of the land along these shores, and it possesses wharves and everything of that kind. Similarly, it enjoys all advantages of this kind along the Welland canal to lake Erie and the upper lakes. Now I come to the right-of-way, and I will say for Sir Wilfrid Laurier, as I have always said, that in the building of the Transcontinental railway there was accomplished the greatest piece of railway strategy on the North American continent. The Transcontinental railway built by the Laurier government from the city of Quebec to Winnipeg is a splendid stretch of railway. It has the best grade in America and is on a height of land from which the water runs to Hudson bay on the north and on the south to the lower lakes. It has, I believe, a better grade than any other road on the American continent; and besides this, it has the whole strategy, so far as transportation is concerned, in crossing the Rocky mountains through the Yellowhead pass. So that I am convinced that the Canadian National railway system is bound to be a great success. To-day it is in the hands of excellent men who understand the railway question and most of whom are Canadians; and I believe they are getting a fair opportunity from the government to work out a solution of the problem before them.

The road has been making some deficits, and this fact is constantly brought up against public ownership. But as a Canadian I declare that the roads we have taken over are going to be a great success. They are going to solve the transportation problem of this country, and I have no doubt about their future. I have faith in my country and believe that we are going to surmount the difficulties that have followed in the wake of the war; and one of the greatest means by which we shall recover from the war will be the development of our transcontinental railway system owned by the people.

We have spent a great deal of public money in making waterways in Canada and these are of course complementary of the railways. The two can be utilized together and in that way I am sure they could be more efficient than the Canadian Pacific Railway; and perhaps some day when the air-ways have been sufficiently developed they will be able to work in conjunction with the dual system of the waterways and the railways. Altogether, the people of the West and of the East, being, I believe, of the opinion that the National Railways are a valuable asset to this country, I entertain the hope that they will soon make good. But I think there is room for the Canadian Pacific Railway as well. And if the Canadian Pacific Railway is wise, some day perhaps it will see its way to become a part of the National system. There is no reason for the separate existence of the two, except the reason advanced by some of my friends from the West, that they desire competition between the two systems. Be that as it may, I believe that some day the two roads will have to be consolidated.

And now that I have spoken of these two examples of railways, one an instance of most successful private ownership, the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the other an example of a publicly owned system of railways which I am sure is going to be successful in the near future, I desire to take up the question of the merits of the company-owned road which is being lauded so much in this country, in the press and elsewhere. As a matter of fact the greatest wreckage since the war, and not caused by the war, has occurred in connection with the American system of company-owned railways. These have been absolutely scrapped. Even the private roads of Great Britain are in very bad shape, but the private systems in America are absolutely at the end of their tether to-day. They have three great tasks before them, namely, first, the reconstruction of all their tracks; secondly, the electrifying of their motive power; and last the re-equipment of their rolling stock. They cannot get money, because the public have no confidence in them, and the United States congress has by legislation directed the railway commission over there to put a valuation on all these roads. Further, congress has provided for the consolidation of the roads into ten regional divisions, the weak roads along

with the better roads, the idea being to endeavour if possible to put them on a sound basis. But the only way in which this can really be done is for the treasury of the United States to come to their rescue; and I predict, after a careful study of the proposition, that even the great New York Central will not be able to finance itself now; and I do not think that either the Pennsylvania or the minor roads have any future before them. So clearly was congress impressed by these circumstances that, as I have said, it ordered a re-valuation of the roads; and congress I believe will be forced to come to their relief, and take the position which one of the ministers of the late government in Canada took when relief was sought for the Canadian Northern and the Grand Trunk. He said, "I readily gave them money to help them out, knowing they would come back to me for more, and then I would get the roads." Well, the American government will acquire the company-owned roads of the United States in very much the same way, and they will co-ordinate them into a single system as publicly owned railways. So those who deplore the fact that public ownership of railways cannot succeed in this country had better ponder how the company owned roads have failed in the United States.

There is room in this country for two great railway systems, but there is not room for any ascendancy of the Canadian Pacific either from political or an economic point of view. The executive of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company must be content to face the situation as it is. If they care to work in co-operation with the National Railways, I have no objection. The two companies might very well pool some of the business, for there are unnecessary trains run by both roads that could be cut out. The National road which possesses the best grades and the best strategy in transportation would be willing, I imagine, to allow the Canadian Pacific Railway running rights on terms.

But be that as it may, I have every confidence in the National Railways, and I am sure parliament will enact any necessary legislation for their improvement. I was talking to a friend the other day, a Senator, who has a proposal to meet the situation as it presents itself to him. He told me that probably we might have to put our railways under a somewhat improved board to what we have now, and he suggested that we might very well get men of the standing of Sir Joseph Flavelle, to become members of such a trust or board. I know we can get men of his stamp. But even if we do not, with the management we have at present I have every confidence in the success of our National Railways as against the success of the company owned railways in the United States, and I am certain that under a fair revaluation, which would involve a considerable reduction of their present capitalization, our National Railways, while they may not be able to earn very large dividends, will at least in a very short time show a surplus sufficient to pay a low rate of interest on the debenture issues, and will continue to give the country good transportation service. This is a splendid asset owned by the people of Canada—we are the shareholders. The shareholders of the Canadian Pacific are not confined to Canada, there are some in the United States, some in Great Britain and some in other countries of Europe, but if they have any regard for the future of their investment they will be prepared at no distant date to make an arrangement with the Canadian National System.

This is an appropriate time in which to bring before the House a subject that touches the economics not only of Canada but of the world. Notwithstanding all that we have suffered from the war, notwithstanding the accumulation of riches in some of the countries which participated in the war, and notwithstanding the enormous gold reserve that the United States has created, there is something that is astounding in the condition of the world to-day, and yet our bankers and our economists more or less ignore it. This subject has been brought to our attention in this House and it is coming before us again. I refer to the awful gambling in the staples of life that is carried on on the great stock exchanges of the world. On the Chicago grain exchange and on the New York produce exchange the great staples of life are dealt in—wheat, oats, flour, barley, cotton, sugar, and so on. The rising price of sugar has been a matter of public discussion during the last few weeks both in this country and in the United States, and some relief has been secured here partly because of the action taken by a committee of this House and partly because the women of this country have set their faces against the use of sugar at present prices. There is no doubt that enormous gambling is going on in connection with the sugar supply of the world. A great deal of the discontent that exists throughout the world to-day is due to this heartless gambling in the staples of life. As an apologist for the sugar refiners of Canada pointed out the other day—I refer to the Montreal Gazette—there are a lot of gougers who have

their own money and the credit of the banks behind them and they deal in futures, which is one of the main causes of the discontent that prevails to-day against unfair economic conditions.

Now, the problem before us to-day is: How can we take the gambling element out of these bogus transactions in the staples of life, that is, cotton, sugar, flour, meats, and so forth. One deplorable feature is that nearly all the bankers of the world and the great newspapers and periodicals more or less justify this economic scourge of gambling in staples. If as the bankers and the great newspapers and periodicals say, there must be this dealing in futures, why do they not call for the creation of a department in every government for its further development? Our universities ought to have departments devoted to the elucidation of the principles that underlie this gambling in futures. But nothing is done. I will tell you how bad the condition has become. In the United States the people are thoroughly aroused to the fact that there is something wrong with the sugar market, and the government, through its attorney general, applied to the courts for an order prohibiting the produce exchange and the sugar exchange in New York from dealing in futures. The application was refused, but he is appealing to the Supreme Court of the United States, and I believe he will get an injunction. The United States is building up a great engine for the purpose of regulating this awful gambling in grains, in sugar, in cotton, in hides and all things of that kind. It is gradusually reorganizing its financial and banking system. It has created a great reserve bank system in which every bank of the country has to have membership if it wishes to get along. The whole financial organization of that country to-day is under the control of congress, of the government, just as their railways have been under the control of the Interstate Commerce Commission. What the United States is going to do, as I size it up, through the control they have over the banks, is to take some step which will place this gambling business also under control. My prophecy is that the banks of the United States will be forbidden to use the savings of the people for the promotion of gambling in futures in the great staple commodities. That is the only cure I see for this condition which has come upon us.

You can observe how it is working out in connection with the sport of racing. We have allowed racing in this country, and it is now getting away beyond the people's control. We have some legislation bearing upon the subject, and in England also they have some enactments designed to stop gambling of that kind. Men who never raised horses or who know nothing about the breeding of horses are putting up great sums in connection with races, and most of them lose. The same thing goes on in connection with this speculation in the main staples of the country. I do not quite know how it is to be stopped, but it must come to an end by some means. The sugar troubles of the people of Canada, which were emphasized here in the last week or two, had their origin in this scourge of gambling in futures. I wonder how much attention the farmers of the West have paid to the awful exploitation of wheat and their other crops in connection with ventures on the Chicago wheat exchange? It is time that the parliament of Canada and the congress of the United States took some steps in this matter. I would not like to see the state have to go into the management of the grain business of this country, but such a course may be forced upon the people if there is no other relief from the present condition.

It is out of order to refer to what is going on in the Banking committee or the Agriculture committee in the House, but there is one measure to which I will draw the attention of the Prime Minister, namely, the need of a new franchise act which will recognize equality of citizenship between men and women, which will recognize that all are entitled to some kind of representation and that the vote of one citizen is as good as that of another. We have not so far had that condition recognized in this country. Now, the Prime Minister may go to England this summer to take part in an imperial conference. I would like to hear some explanation in this House before the Prime Minister goes as to what may be the procedure in that discussion. Are the dominions to have equal votes with the Mother Country, or is there to be a leader of some kind? Are commitments to be made concerning Canada before we have had an opportunity of discussing them here? To my mind, before that conference is held there ought to be a full and fair discussion in parliament; the whole question should be threshed out —of what part we are to take in it, or whether we are to be bound by any commitments without parliament having first been consulted, and also whether one of the results of the conference will not be to give us what has been given to Australia, namely, the right to make and revise our own constitution as we wish.

Now, these may not be questions immediately connected with the tariff, but they are questions which concern the welfare of this country, and I bring them up chiefly for the purpose of giving rise to further discussion of them. We have a national system of railways that is going to prove a success. We have a country that will recover itself, notwithstanding the setback it has experienced. While business may not at present be so good, there is a great future ahead of this country. We will get more immigrants; there will be a better settlement of our land, but most of all we must find a way of remedying the grievance of our Canadian West as well as of the Atlantic coast sections. These things are before us and they must be dealt with. The grievances do exist; my sympathy is largely with those who present them. I hope, therefore, that we shall soon have legislation with respect to banking, legislation in the direction of creating a system of credit for the benefit of farmers of the West, and that prosperity will once again come to our country and to all countries of the world. According to this morning's papers there does seem to be hanging over the world the cloud of another war, and we have to devise a fiscal policy for ourselves that will make us independent and able to get along without those nations who would throw the world again into war. Parliament can well afford to give more of its time to the discussion of these things, and to making Canada self-sufficient for her present and her future greatness.

Mr. A. B. HUDSON (South Winnipeg): Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with the members who have spoken in expressing respect and good will toward the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding). I do this notwithstanding the fact that I feel compelled to differ from him in respect to several of the proposals he has put forward.

The budget contains many matters of very great importance to the country, and I propose to discuss very briefly two or three of these. In the first place, the minister asks for authority to negotiate a reciprocal trade arrangement with the United States. With that proposal I am in full accord; I heartily commend it. I do not share the view which the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) expressed, that it would find no favour in the country; on the contrary, I think it would find the greatest favour. It does not seem to have been received with entire approval at Washington, and I think that the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) was quite right in saying that it would probably have received a much better reception had we had there a Canadian representative whose business it would be to encourage better relations between these two countries.

The budget provides for a reduction in the duty on sugar, which is all to the good. It provides for an increase in the British preference which is so slight as far as I can see that it will mean nothing to the consumer.

The most significant part of the budget, however, is the reference of the Minister of Finance to stability. A good deal has been said as to what was meant by stability by various members of the government and others. I think that the Minister of Finance is a master of language, and that we can best accept his own words as conveying what he really meant. He says at page 2649 of Hansard:

> I think the country should be content to accept the tariff as it will now stand as one as fair and reasonable as can be prepared under all the circumstances, and business men should be able to carry on various enterprises without the fear of being soon disturbed by further changes.

I think that is absolutely clear. The minister of Finance regards the present fiscal policy as one which should be fixed. There may be incidental changes, but as a general policy that tariff should be fixed for the present at least, subject only to what may occur in connection with reciprocal trade relations with the United States. Now with that statement I entirely dissent. Apart altogether from the question of free trade or protection, or of a protective policy, I think the time has arrived now when there should be a review of our whole fiscal system, that we should look over the situation that exists in Canada, review what has happened during the last forty or fifty years, and then frame a policy which would be in the best interests of the country.

It was the hope of many in 1879, when the National Policy was adopted that Canada might be made largely a self-contained country, a place where we would produce and make nearly everything we required to use or consume. How far we have got in that direction it is not easy to say, but the trade returns of our imports, comparing 1879 with the last fiscal year, show that in 1879 we imported goods to the value of $80,000,000, and in 1923 goods to the value of $802,000,000, just ten times as much. In the meantime our population just about doubled, so put in another way we now import per capita goods to the amount of $90 whereas forty years ago we imported goods to the value of only $18 per capita. Since then there has been a

change in the value of money, that is, a dollar then would buy much more than a dollar now, but that difference would only account for a small part of the increase. Now that increase in imports is due no doubt to several causes, but there is one cause that I think is well worthy of comment, and it is of much larger operation in the business of the country than is generally appreciated. That is the fact that with scientific discoveries, new inventions, improvements in the arts, the general desire of all civilized people to maintain the same standard of living, to have the same conveniences, the same pleasures of life, the same labour-saving devices and the same transportation facilities, there has been created an ever-widening circle of new wants, making it more and more difficult for any country to supply its requirements from within its own territory. This same rule applies to all countries in the world, all countries at least that are advancing. Take the United States for example, a country with a great diversity of climate, a

5 p.m.

great diversity of products, a great diversity of soils, and yet there we find they are importing more and more from the outside world. Notwithstanding even the Fordney tariff they continue to import more and more. We sell them more goods from Canada now than we did a year ago. The Fordney tariff, high as it is, is not sufficient to form a barrier against that economic law. Now countries in that respect vary greatly. We in Canada are subject to very considerable limitations that do not exist in the United States, for example, climatic, geographical, and a limitation in natural resources of some kinds.

In the debates in 1879, when the National Policy was adopted, one of the strongest arguments put forward was by Sir Charles Tupper, and it ran something like this: He said that in England and the United States they had great deposits of coal and iron; in Belgium they had the same; that by reason of the development of these two resources England and the United States had become great and wealthy, and Belgium wealthy. He said: Here in Canada we have vast deposits of iron ore, vast deposits of coal, and by reason of these two things, if we establish a protective policy, something to care for the industries dependent on the production of iron and steel, we will soon ourselves become wealthy and great. Well, that policy was adopted in 1879, and the protective tariffs in respect of those particular industries were then put in force, and what is the result? In the year 1922 there was not a pound of iron ore produced in Canada that was smelted in Canada. During the last few years the production of iron ore has dwindled to the point of practically nothing. Last year we exported a few thousand tons which was smelted in furnaces in the United States, but here in Canada we find that these great deposits of iron ore which were going to provide the wealth of the country are not being developed, or they are unfit for development, or are so situated that they cannot be economically developed. The mills of Nova Scotia get their iron ore from Switzerland, Sweden and Spain. The mills of Ontario get their iron ore from the United States. All the steel made in Canada is made from foreign ore. The machines we make in Canada out of iron and steel are made out of the products of another country, and the same thing in regard to other products of various kinds sugar, cotton and other textiles.

We are not a self-contained country; we can never be a self-contained country. We have to recognize that we cannot live alone, that we are part of a great world, and that more and more as the years go by we will deal with other countries, irrespective of tariffs. That being so, having to buy more and more, we have to pay for what we buy. How are we going to pay for it. In addition to paying for what we buy, we have to pay $180,000,000 or more per year interest on debts due to foreigners in foreign countries. How are we going to pay that interest and pay for what we have to buy? We can only pay by what we export. What do we export and what can we export? We export the same kind of things that we exported in 1879, largely; that is, the products of the farm, the sea and the forest; they may be in a partially improved form, but, generally speaking, we are confined to these three resources. In the fiscal year ending 31st March, 1922, we exported goods to the value of $931,000,000. Of that sum $772,000,000 was made up of products of the farm, the sea and the forest. There should be a deduction made from the total because of sugar, but a clear eighty per cent of the total exports were made up from those three sources. It was true in 1879, and is still true—and it seems to me that the wise policy in Canada is to recognize the fact—that if we are going to maintain our place in the race of civilization we have to depend on those main sources upon which we depended forty years ago. The products of the mine do not represent a very large percentage of our exports. The exports of manufactured articles amount to a small percentage, this part of our trade being hampered by foreign tariffs. Many of our manufacturers

complain very bitterly about the iniquity of foreign countries imposing tariffs which prevent them from getting their goods into those countries. That is a condition that may exist for some time. Then, take the country where we have an open market. In the United States we have an open market for at least two commodities manufactured in Canada, namely boots and shoes and farm machinery, and yet we find that our Canadian manufacturers who have had the benefit of this protective tariff for forty years are not yet able to compete in the largest and most profitable market in the world which is open to them. For that reason, I say it is folly to spend any time encouraging new manufacturers, especially by artificial means. I think the minister has made a mistake in including in his budget this year provision for new duties. I take as strong exception to that as I do to the proposal to bonus new industries. I think industries in Canada should be established only on the basis of their own economic strength. My view is, first, that the government should have set their faces firmly against these demands for new duties and demands for bonuses; and secondly, that they should have considered, not merely the manufacturers of eastern Canada, but the producers of Canada as a whole as well. One would assume from the speeches which have been delivered in this part of the House that the fiscal policy was designed for the benefit of only one class of people, and my complaint against this budget is that it entirely neglects the other class of people.

There has been a good deal said about the question of sectionalism in Canada. This has been spoken of by the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) and by some members on this side of the House. And it is a serious question, much more serious than many members of this House are willing to recognize. So far as the west is concerned, it is reflected in practical solidarity by one party in this House, a party not connected with either of the two principal and old political parties of this country. That solidarity means something; it means not merely Progressivism or Farmers' party, or anything of that sort, but it means that there is a sense of a real grievance out there, a sense that a wrong is being done to the population of that territory, about 2,000,000 people, who think alike to the extent of probably eighty or ninety per cent. What has been done towards examining the source of their complaints? We hear a good deal of discussion about various things. Some hon. members on this side of the House have said "Why do you talk so much about tariff? You have far greater reason to grumble about freight rates and transportation costs? The tariff does not mean so much in dollars and cents." I would just remind those gentlemen that a tariff is a tax, and an unjust tax means a good deal more than the money exacted. The feeling of injustice is a feeling which produces a great many results that one does not care to contemplate. Hon. members will remember that it was a tax of something like twelve shillings imposed on one John Hampden that ended in the loss of the head of King Charles I. The unjust tax has a psychological effect which many exactions in other ways do not have, and that is something which governments of both political parties have failed to recognize. The situation in western Canada in regard to the tariff is different from that in eastern Canada in one respect, at least. In western Canada we produce, generally speaking, one commodity, namely wheat. That is the great source of wealth there. The total value of wheat and wheat flour for export, which is practically all produced in western Canada amounts to $312,000,000—one-third of the total exports of Canada.

The people who produce that get no benefit from the tariff, though they bear the burden. And that is the reason why they complain; that is the reason why they will complain until some satisfactory adjustment is made; and that is the reason why I say that the government in this instance has failed in its duty in not considering the peculiar position of those people out there. Some of us out there realized the situation; some of us believed that a compromise might be found in the Liberal platform of 1919. We believed that that might be found acceptable to the people of western Canada in regard to that particular question. As far as one can judge from the words of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), there is no hope now of those portions of the plank of the Liberal platform being carried out by the present government. That being so, I feel compelled to vote against the government's proposals in this case.

Mr. J. L. STANSELL (East Elgin): Mr. Speaker, it is with some degree of diffidence that I, as one of the "children of this world" attempt at this time to offer any criticism of the budget, presented by a party that style themselves "the children of light." I can take comfort only in the fact that I have long held the view that saints are created as a result of deeds done in the body, and not as a result of any assertions on their part.

In common with others who have preceded me, I feel that I must extend sincere con-

gratulations to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) on having spent about forty years in the service of his country, a fact which any man might well be proud of, and on having been able in that time to present the House and the country with seventeen budgets, an accomplishment also worthy of mention. I said that I wished to convey my sincere congratulations. I do not propose to qualify those congratulations by a wholesale condemnation of the provisions of the budget. We realize, I think, that the minister has had a difficult task imposed upon him. Under present conditions it is difficult, perhaps impossible, to please everyone, and I presume the Minister of Finance himself, old parliamentarian as he is, does not expect that the bouquets that we throw in his direction will be entirely denuded of any thorns that might be attached to the stems. Therefore, while commending many features in connection with the budget, I desire to draw attention to a few things that, I think, are not so commendable.

Amongst the exemptions from the operation of the sales tax, I am pleased to notice one feature. I had occasion to make some requests for the exemption of the sales tax as applied to drain tile for farm drainage purposes. I can imagine that it is very difficult in applying the sales tax, where it is necessary to raise revenue, to single out a few articles that should be exempted. In a few words, I should like to point out why, in my judgment, this particular article should be exempted from the operation of the sales tax. It is well known that the condition of agriculture at the present time is such that some encouragment is needed. It has been recognized for some time that much can be done to increase production, and at the same time to increase profits, by the practice of underdraining. The provincial governments recognizing this, have in most cases provided, through the municipalities, an arrangement whereby farmers can secure loans for the establishment of under-drainage. This encouragement is provided by a long-term loan repayable in instalments at a low rate of interest. For the federal government to apply a sales tax to the very same article which the provincial government is, in effect, giving a bounty or assistance to, does not appear to be a sound principle. Therefore, in discussing this matter with the Minister of Finance I represented that to be my view, and in addition, I suppose, other similar representations have been made. I am glaid to note that in the interest of the farmers, this item has been included in the exemptions.

There are also some further changes, particularly with regard to the stamp tax. I cannot see that the stamp tax as applied last session, or as changed as it has been this session, is a fair one for the poor man. It is more a tax in the interest of the rich than in the interest of the poor, and I will endeavour to show why. Under the present condition of many business men and particularly the farmers, it is necessary, in order that they may tide themselves over the present financial depression, for them to secure loans from banks or other sources. A stamp to the extent of two cents for every fifty dollars must be placed on the note by which such a loan is secured. Therefore, when a farmer has to borrow $2,000 from a bank in order to tide him over a financial difficulty, he is taxed because of his misfortune, on the loan, and then because in the operation of sound business principles, that money has again to be paid out by cheque, he is taxed to the same extent over again on the cheque. Therefore, because his cheques are not of sufficient size to obtain any benefit from the minimum tax of $1, he is doubly taxed on the transaction. In comparison with the man who has means of his own or who deals in money in large volume, he is very unjustly taxed under the present system. In my opinion, the minister would have been well advised to have made that tax on both notes and cheques, not to exceed two cents for each $100 instead of two cents for each $50.

The minister in the presentation of his budget referred to the fact that he did not expect to be able to please his friends of low tariff persuasion by going to the extent that they would wish; neither did he expect to please the official opposition by making protection as high as they would wish. I should like to challenge that statement in particular, because I wish to point out that with very few exemptions he is adopting the tariff that was in force by this party that he styles a high tariff party. But, Sir, he has gone a little further than that and has even attempted to out-Herod Herod by adding a stability clause which the Conservative party never saw fit to propose. We in this corner of the House have openly professed our faith in a protective tariff, not because we wish to protect any particular industry, but because we believe it is better to use the proper name and call a spade a spade. I was very much impressed with the clear definition of the terms, "protective tariff" and "tariff for revenue" as given by the hon. member for North Waterloo (Mr. Euler). In our platform we ask only for

that measure of protection which will enable men and money to be employed in Canada; we do not ask for any more than that. Should any interest or any hon. member ask for more? Should any interest or any hon. member expect less? This stability clause is evidently a stumbling block to our friends to the left. It is perhaps a new Liberal doctrine, one never before propounded, and not at all in my judgment in keeping with the one presented by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) last year. I refer to Hansard of last session at page 2843 wherein the Minister of Finance uses the following words:

> I say, in all sincerity, that this budget ought to commend itself to our Progressive friends, not as a finality, not as something that is entirely in line with their own views, but as something which follows the right direction, and, so far as it goes it should have their cordial support.

There is nothing whatever in that about tariff stability, and I am not at all surprised that my friends to my left are disappointed that this stability clause has been inserted. This new doctrine of the Liberal party evidently has just a little too much kick in it for my friends to my left; and there is a suspicion that like another article of commerce of considerable strength, it has its source in Montreal.

In my opinion the most serious feature of the budget is its failure to balance. I am well aware of the many claims which there are upon the revenue of this country, but it is over four years since the war concluded and it seems to me that the time has come when in the interest of the country we should be able to balance revenue and expenditure. I know, too, that it would not be popular at the present time to increase taxation. But there are two methods by which the budget of the private individual, the corporation of the country itself may be balanced; one is an increased revenue and the other a decrease of expenditure. I fully realize the difficulties that present themselves to public men in positions of responsibility when they attempt to keep down expenditure. But I remember, as well, that this government, before they attained power, urged that this should be done. The war was over, they said, and the government of that day should balance the budget. Yet, after two sessions in office, the present Minister of Finance still tells us that there will be a heavy increase in the debt this year and we must look forward to another increase next year. This is a matter for serious reflection on the part of every hon. gentleman. Surely some method might be adopted of curtailing expenditures in order to make the budget balance. A great deal might have been accomplished to encourage immigration and restore confidence in the country if heroic measures had been adopted in this respect, so that the attention of the world might be directed to the condition in which Canada should be financially to-day. Among the various criticisms which might be directed at the provisions of the budget, I am convinced that this is one of the most serious, and now, their second session in power, hon. gentlemen opposite should have made some earnest attempt to bring down to the House a balanced budget with a promise of a reduction of debt for the year to come.

Let me direct a few words to a subject of great importance, namely, agriculture. I I listened with interest to the speech of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) a few nights ago and I recalled a statement attributed to the present Minister of Finance —that responsibility sobers men. After listening to the sober reflections, of about three hours' duration, of the Minister of Agriculture, in which he dealt with various subjects including razor-back hogs and dunghill hens and many other things, from the fear of God to the crack of doom, I wondered in what frame of mind the hon. gentleman was before he sobered up. Among other bits of advice that he offered to hon. members of the farming profession on my left, one thing which struck me was his exhortation to pray for rain. He tendered this as a solution of some of the difficulties of the farmer to-day. Well, Sir, in my judgment, if the farming interest in this country was not considered a fit subject for prayer when the minister arose, the House must have been fully seized of the necessity before he sat down.

There is one subject connected with agriculture on which I desire to say something, and that is the accredited herd system operated under the Department of Agriculture. This is something the importance of which has been stressed many times on the floor of the House, and some criticism has been offered because the valuation has been lowered. In my opinion the valuation was not too high, but the trouble was that in many cases an ordinary animal was valued up to the maximum. The real need of reform lay in the proper valuation of animals under the system that we had. I am well aware, however, that the process of accrediting the pure-bred herds of the country is one that entails a tremendous amount of money and is a great drain on the revenues of Canada, and therefore I wish to

point out something which I think should be done in the way of investigation. The ex-Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Tolmie) in his address on the budget emphasized the necessity for an investigation. It may not be popular for me to say so, but I am going to state what is a well recognized fact among those who are conducting these tests and who are in a position to know. It is not claimed by the best informed of these men that this test as at present applied is perfect; in fact they admit it is only so to the extent of 90 per cent. That refers, however to the number of animals condemned and slaughtered which are found not to have been suffering from the disease. The test is also imperfect in another way, that it does not determine whether an animal simply has the germ of the disease or whether it is in the advanced stages.

But in my judgment the most pressing necessity is for us to know whether the animals which remain are affected through failure of the test to disclose their true condition. I think it is apparent to every hon. member that great as the danger might be in the condemnation of animals not infected it is slight compared to the danger of leaving animals in the herd in which the disease has not been disclosed by the test. Therefore I would strongly recommend to the minister that before further money is voted for this purpose some investigation should be conducted with a view to finding how accurate the test is as applied to the animals left in the herd. There is only one way in which this can be discovered, and in comparison with the total amount of money expended the cost would be only trifling. A few herds of different breeds in localities where the disease is known to exist should be purchased outright by the government, and after the test has been carefully applied by competent men in the department the animals should be slaughtered and a thorough investigation made to determine whether by any possibility the test falls short of disclosing the disease and thus leaving some infected animals in the herd, which of course would be a greater source of danger because we would be enjoying a sense of false security by the fact that we thought every animal tested was healthy. This is a serious danger and the amount of money involved is sufficient to justify an investigation being undertaken without delay.

In view of the discussion that has taken place during the past week it is perhaps advisable to consider the needs of agriculture to-day. We have been endeavouring in this House and in a special committee to find out just what these needs are. I have no desire to refer to anything that has taken place in that committee, I merely propose to offer a few suggestions on the point from my practical knowledge of farming conditions. One of the first needs of agriculture is a little sympathetic consideration on the part of other interests in this country. I am well aware, Mr. Speaker, that radical views are held by some members of the farming profession as well as by those of other professions, but one of the first essentials in the solution of any problem is the spirit in which the different interests concerned get together and compare notes and view the problem from various angles. I have never yet heard the statement from a man who has made a careful investigation into agricultural conditions that farming as a commercial proposition could be made profitable. Now, this is a serious state of affairs. I am not one of those who preach blue ruin, but I do believe in looking conditions squarely in the face.

Then there is the attitude of some members of the party to my left, and I trust they will bear patiently with me if I offer any criticism of their conduct. There is a tendency on the part of many of us when we wish to accomplish certain objects in which we are particularly interested to voice the most extreme views in order to make them impressive. I fear the representatives of the farming industry have not been entirely free from this charge. Extreme demands on the part of one class will be met by extremes from other professions and deadlock will result. A disposition to sacrifice a little by way of compromise might furnish a solution for present difficulties. Without such action the situation is almost hopeless.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Would the hon. gentleman tell me just what the agricultural industry could sacrifice to-day to other industries?

Mr. STANSELL: The hon. member is doing just what I was endeavouring by a gentle hint to prevent him doing. I am quite in sympathy with the attitude of other members who think differently from me, and I am always willing to extend to them full liberty of expression of their opinions. As a farmer, I am prepared to say that farmers have made considerable sacrifices; and I must in all justice say as well that many attempts have been made on the part of other interests and of governments to do something to assist the farmers. These efforts may not all have been well directed but it is the part of courtesy and good judgment to give credit for the intentions behind those efforts—just as essential as it is to paint the dark side of the picture regarding agriculture.

Apparently there is a tendency on the part of some to feel that all the difficulties of the farmers to-day are due to the tariff. I am not going to say that the tariff does not play some part in these difficulties, but I do say that there are many other things that can be done to improve conditions—many that can be undertaken by the farming interests themselves. One of the outstanding needs of agriculture at the present time is for provision to be made—possibly by the provincial governments—for a system of long-term loans to enable men with small capital to purchase farms at a reasonable rate of interest and with repayment by annual instalments of principal and interest extended over a term of years, possibly twenty or more. I think that is something that every interest in this country should favour. Such a system would do a great deal to encourage immigration to take up farming and it would also tend to keep young men on the farms. The short loans required by farmers for the feeding of stock and similar operations could very well be handled by our present banking system with perhaps a little adjustment.

Another thing necessary in the interests of the farmers is better marketing facilities. In some respects provision may be made for these facilities through government assistance, but I believe that in the end a solution can only be found in the efforts of the farmers themselves. A great deal has been done by our colleges and our experimental farms to show us how to produce more, but very little has been contributed from those sources to show how to market profitably what we produce and how to conduct our farming operations at a profit to ourselves. Much of the money that is being expended along this line in these institutions might, in my judgment, be even better expended if some attention was devoted to methods of bringing about a better system of marketing and to demonstrating how the various operations of the farm can be conducted at a profit.

Some reference has been made to the Liberal party, now on the government benches. I do not propose to discuss at great length the Liberal platform of 1919; it does not seem to be an agreeable subject to some hon. members. However, the government has been two sessions in office and it is only fair to look over its record thus far and see how well it is living up to expectations. I will give them credit for some things at least. Last session, through a slight reduction in the tariff on farm implements, which was more than offset by an increase in the sales tax, they succeeded in putting an if in the tariff. But this session they have more than counterbalanced that by putting a raise into raisins. There is one thing, however, that in the two sessions they have failed to do, and that is to put form in their platform. In direct opposition the Finance Minister now makes a stab at tariff stability concerning which the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Raymond) made the most eloquent and probably the best explanation that has been given; he said that tariff stability did not mean that the government were not moving at all—I infer also it did not mean that they were making progress in the right direction—but it did mean that they were not easily upset. Well, it seems to me that the people have a right to demand a little bit more than what is involved in that explanation. It is not sufficient to say that they are making progress in a circle and that they are not easily upset; the people who put faith in the tariff platform of the party now in power have a right to ask when the ship is going to make port. I would like to follow this illustration a little further, because it seems to be very apt. When is the ship going to deliver the cargo entrusted to it? There was also chartered by another party in this country a ship to carry a cargo of political professions very similar to the former. Some of us did not have the faith that others did in the quality of those two ships, which were so nearly alike that it was difficult to distinguish between them. Through certain circumstances the one chartered by the Liberal party obtained the right to make the first voyage. Some of the things that were to form part of the cargo of that ship were the following: Tariff reductions, free foodstuffs, free agricultural implements and instruments of production, and so on; relief from taxation, reduction of debt, relief from government by orders in council, a producers' and consumers' tariff, and a number of other things, all of which were promised if the charterers of the ship were given control of the people's affairs. As to tariff reductions, some have been made, but they have been offset by increases and bounties on other articles. The free list has been entirely abandoned. Relief from taxation, especially the sales tax, has been given by an increase in taxation, and reduction of debt has been dealt with by an increase of debt. Freedom from orders in council has been provided to the extent of increasing the number of orders in council, and the producers' and consumers' tariff—none of us seemed to be quite clear what it meant—has been entirely abandoned. The whole thing was styled as responsible government. Now, this ship was equipped with a chart and

compass, and provisions were necessary for a voyage of that kind. The provisions have been described as "the letter and the spirit." The provision of the letter was made in Ottawa in 1919 while the spirit had its source in another province. If there has been criticism of this phase of the voyage it is that while the ship was well furnished with the spirit there was not quite enough of the more material thing, the letter. A majority of the Canadian people put faith in that ship and in her ability to deliver the goods.

Many of our friends to the left, having a similar ship, were watching with interest the voyage of the one to which I have been referring and anxiously awaiting the delivery of the cargo. Let us try to imagine the feelings of these gentlemen who have been waiting for delivery of the goods. Well, when a wireless was sent asking for an explanation of the delay—the voyage having been continued for seventeen months but still with no port in sight—the hon. member for Brantford explained what tariff stability was. He told all the anxious ones to take comfort, that "we are still right side up,"—he might have added the two accompanying words, "with care." But in my judgment those who put faith in that ship, those who have been anxiously waiting, are entitled to more than that; they are entitled to know how long it will be before this cargo, including substantial reductions in the tariff, is to be delivered. There are some reports—I do not know how true—that some members of the crew became discouraged. We know that one at least has jumped overboard and is attempting to swim to port. It is not expected that he will be able to bring much of the cargo with him. It is also reported that others are about to follow. One of the officers is reported to be suffering from wounds and is now in the south recuperating. The Solicitor-General, so apt in quoting scripture, has gone to his reward. The Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock) from whom much was expected in the way of providing solutions for all the difficulties of the labouring men and the common people, seems to be somewhat shackled. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell), the bold Lochinvar from out the West, is apparently otherwise employed. The cargo has proven of no value, and the ship is on the rocks. The captain is indisposed and the mate labors to "Budget." These, it seems to me, are some of the conclusions that must be entertained by those who put faith in that particular party.

In closing let me say that in times past there was another ship chartered by the Conservative party, known as the National Policy. No doubt that party made some mistakes; no doubt they have not kept a perfectly accurate course throughout the whole voyage, but in the main they have tried to steer a safe course in the national interest, avoiding the rocks of high protection on the one hand, and the shoals of free trade on the other—because under present international conditions I believe that free trade can only be adopted as a theory; it cannot be put in practice—therefore, we must avoid the rocks of high protection on the one hand, and the shoals of free trade on the other. In an endeavour to do so we are not advertising stability in the sense that we believe we have reached the point where no further reductions can be made. We are still ready to subscribe to our platform even though the measure of protection to-day may not be the same measure required five years hence, but we are ready to subscribe to the policy that we only want such a measure of protection as will keep our money and our men employed in Canada—no more and no less. We do not think that anyone should ask for less.

I realize some of the problems affecting our people in the East and some of the problems affecting also our friends in the West. I believe the majority of right-thinking people and especially, may I add, of the Conservative party, will be willing to meet in a compromise and try to do something towards providing a solution for the difficulties that present themselves to the Canadian people to-day in an effort to avoid the rocks and shoals and to carry the ship of state, though not as at present manned, but as we hope it soon will be, safely on to national progress and prosperity.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. JOHN EVANS (Saskatoon): The discussion on the budget has turned mostly on the trade of the country, and I wish to discuss it to-night from that standpoint. Tidings are reaching us from different parts of the country of a movement unparalleled in our history, composed of men and women who have spent years of hard work founding a home and raising a family, and indeed from one end of the Dominion comes news of a section of people, although very small, talking of secession. We may well ask ourselves at this time what there is in the government of the country that is out of touch with the problems of humanity as represented by the

workers of the country, and is there any way to remedy the condition? Now, bad as times have been this last year on the farms of Canada, the government has seen fit to increase the expenses in the coming year, and to continue the process, begun many years ago, of closing up the last gap of liberty that the consumers of the country ever possessed. Notwithstanding all that the Prime Minister said this afternoon, the fact remains that the country did look to the Liberal party as the party of free trade.

Another fact is established conclusively by this budget; that is that the Liberal party is not a free trade party, that it has abandoned the principle that established it as a free trade party, that it is now in line directly with the party whose forebears established the national policy of trade penalties and that nothing is to be henceforth expected from the Liberal party in the line of free trade more than from the original party of protection. The Prime Minister says that this is not a protectionist budget. I wonder if it can be called a free trade budget. I think he means it is a budget of stability. But is there anything in it that would lead the public to expect some relief from the burden of taxation imposed by the tariff? He said that economists must take their stand in the practical world as they find it. Who are the economists? Since 1897 I have not known of an economist. I have not known of a professor of economy in any of our colleges or universities who has come out with treatises on this subject in a way to guide the public. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that since that time the mouths of the economists have been closed, and for a certain reason. A theory, he said, is different from practice. We must be careful of capital.

What is capital? Is capital only that which is liquid, looking for investment? Is capital only that which is in the hands of the manufacturer invested in a manufacturing industry? Is there no capital invested in the farms of the country by the million men engaged in that industry? What is capital? Referring to the men who have spent twenty years of their life building homes in the new parts of this country, and who now see everything slipping from them by the unjust conditions placed on their backs, I ask this House, in all fairness, is that twenty years of hard work not a very substantial form of capital?

The Prime Minister says he does not object to our theory, but to the methods we adopt to achieve our ends. He speaks of the great men of the past generation in England who have had their names emblazoned on the pages of history, and he asks, did they take the same methods and leave their party? I am not acquainted with the lives of all those men, but I do know of one in particular, John Bright, who did leave his party. He left his party, formed the Anti-Corn League and was willing to co-operate with any one for the purpose of taking duties off the necessities of life at that time.

The Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) says that if the world needs anything to-day it needs stability in industry, but, in speaking of industry, he forgot to mention agriculture even once. Does the agricultural industry of this country need no stability? If there is one industry in this country more than another that needs stability at this time, it is that one basic industry on which the prosperity of every other industry depends. The Prime Minister says we must take note of what the United States is doing. That is an old protectionist argument. It is venerable only in its age. There is nothing in it. He says we must let the United States know that if they sell they have got to buy. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that when we can buy our goods from the cheapest market in the world we are bringing the cost of production on our farms in line with the world's prices. Production will then be made easier and our goods for export will be produced somewhat in line with the world's prices. He blames the untoward conditions of agriculture and the country at this time on the Great War, which has now been over for five years He says that through that, the demand for grain is gone. I want to inform the House to-night that we have about a 75 per cent better price for our grain than we were getting in pre-war days. Grain is the thing we have demand for, and we can sell it at all times. The wheat of western Canada is the chief producer of the income of this country, and it is the only thing on the farms that we are sure of finding a market for at the present time. We are not grumbling at the prices of that product; our grievance is as regards the price of everything we have to buy in order to raise that product.

The lowering of the tariff against Great Britain is more than offset by the restriction placed upon goods coming in, of having them all unloaded at Canadian ports. This will entail a haul of some 540 miles more by rail. It will certainly deprive our Canadian National Railway of a good part of its income, as it cannot be expected that the goods will come in any volume, at least in nothing like the same volume as at present. But evidently in this case the ear of the government has been

open to the demands of the privileged monopolies rather than to the needs of the people.

The increase also in the duty on raisins is bound to raise the price of a very necessary commodity. "Oh", but you say, "we will get them from Australia." The raisin and current industry in Australia is still simply in the experimental stage, and in any case the Australian people do not have to sell those commodities any cheaper than the Californian price on which we shall have to pay three cents per pound.

The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart) declared that the trade of Canada is passing through a very serious, a very critical time, made critical by the fact of that trade having been established by a tariff. He blames the tariff for that. Yet the government of which he is a member is giving the same privilege to an industry about to be set up in Canada for the first time for the manufacture of artificial silk. After operating for one year, this industry will be entitled to the same consideration as, he says, applies now to all other industries established under the tariff. In other words, this new calf raised on the tariff cow, in forty years time will still have to be fed from the same source. I have never yet heard an advocate of protection put up a logical reason why a trade penalty should be imposed on any article of commerce, particularly the necessities of life. But even from a protectionist standpoint, is there any logic in encouraging the copper industry by a bounty and, at the same time, placing foreign copper on the free list? I am a free trader, but I am trying to look at this from a protectionist standpoint. I confess the ways of the protectionist mind have been a closed mystery to me for a long time. Evidently there is in this an attempt to please the home producer as well as the manufacturer.

This afternoon a change was made in the duty on sugar. To my mind the sugar combine needs no protection. The same gentle men who to-day control the price of sugar in this country, very largely control the credit to the Cuban producers, and they are able to raise or lower the price of the raw product just as they see fit. As I state, they need no protection.

Some of my hon. friends to my right would like to see, in the words of the hon. member for Fort William and Rainy River (Mr. Manion) a tariff commission, so that we could have a scientifically constructed tariff. There can be no such thing as a scientific tariff. No man who has given any thought to that subject will ever try to reconcile the two words "scientific" and "tariff." He might as well try to say that the Atlantic ocean was dry as to apply the word "science" to the tariff. Science aims at the vindication of natural laws, while tariff taxes are devised for the express purpose of circumventing natural laws as regards trade. A tariff for revenue is just as contradictory, except where it is levied on goods that are not made at home. Great Britain raises revenue by a tariff, and the Conservatives do not forget to tell us about that; but their tariff is placed on articles of luxury and those which are not produced in Great Britain. The British people, after about seventy-five years of the freest kind of trade in the modern world, will not allow the skinning process to go on that our taxpayers are subjected to.

The hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Raymond), speaking the other evening, declared that the tariff is not understood by some of us who undertake to discuss it. He informs us that it is a study in natural psychology whatever that means. I want to inform my hon. friend that one thing we on this side of the House know quite well, is that the tariff is a privilege given to one class. Somebody has to pay for that privilege and we know very well who pays for it. If it is simply the hallucination of a disordered mind, as he suggests, I submit that that state belongs rather to those who fancy a tariff confers a right by law to get something for nothing, than to those who are plundered. It may be said that all citizens, all city dwellers, doctors, lawyers, mechanics and others, are taxed alike to bear the burden of the tariff placed upon other classes; but the doctor, or the lawyer, or the mechanic sets the remuneration for his services according to the cost of living. Even the working man, the labourer, through organization, is able to maintain the same high rate for his services, and still to pass the tariff tax on to someone else. That someone else, more particularly than any other in this country, is the farmer, and since his price is set for him by the open markets of the world, he is not able to pass on to others the unjust burden that the manufacturer of the commodities he needs places upon all other classes. The farm products of this country must be sold in competition with the product of all the cheapest labour throughout the whole world, including Europe and Asia alike. The United States farmers have been disillusioned since the Fordney tariff has been placed against us in that country. I want to read an extract from an editorial I received the other day because nothing better exposes the fallacy of the protective tariff. Look at it

from any angle you like, it is a fallacy, whether it is to increase prices in favour of the farmers or is intended to raise revenue. This editorial says:

> A committee of experts employed by the Fair Tariff League of the United States have estimated that on the agricultural schedule farmers in the state of Kansas gain $260,000 as producers and lose $2,500,000 as consumers, while on manufactured goods the farmers of the State gain $257,000 and lose $30,000,000.

This committee has started a similar investigation in Nebraska and the farmers are beginning to see the nigger in the tariff woodpile. The time has about arrived when the Canadian farmer will no longer be the beast of burden of this nation as he has been in the past and will not suffer the taunts and insults that have been thrown at him by all other classes, including indeed some of the members of this House, simply because he seeks to make known the truth in regard to the conditions that surround him. Even the Minister of Agriculture—

Mr. MOTHERWELL: What is the trouble with the hon. gentleman?

Mr. EVANS: I was going to say that the Minister of Agriculture himself describes the statements of a patriotic minority who seek to make known the truth in this House as so much bluff; he regards it as a game, at which he was playing, some time ago himself. The hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Stevens) also says that the Progressive party has been wholly misled by false literature, and has been making reckless insinuations regardless of the facts. In other words, I suppose he means that they are too ignorant to know better. But the strange thing about agriculture these days is that no one knows anything about it except those who have never been at it, or those who have been at it and failed and have recently taken refuge, perhaps in the Civil Service, or in other branches of business, perhaps on some experimental farm or on some commission, or even, perhaps, in politics.

There is even unfairness to-day in the difference of attitude on the part of the government as between city and rural dwellers. Since confederation everything has been sacrificed in this country to the building up of the cities, and I believe that even in the Civil Service there is great unfairness and partiality as between the country and the city employees. I was asked to mention in this particular the plight of one class of men to-day who are not receiving a fair remuneration for their work, or anything that bears any comparison to the wages paid to a similar class of men in the Civil Service. I refer to the rural mail carriers. They are entitled to something more than they are getting. They are men who have to brave all kinds of weather and furnish their own outfit, and they are bound down by a contract to deliver their mail on time. I was asked to make a plea for them, and seeing the justice of their demand I do not hesitate to do so, nor do I apologize.

The hon. member for North Waterloo (Mr. Euler) declared that last year certain manufacturers realized the necessity for the restoration of the Crowsnest pass agreement and although this was against their own interests, the hon. member said, they were not complaining. As a matter of fact, all manufacturers have been depicted in this House as the most docile class of men, bearing with fortitude the hard conditions that are imposed upon them at the present time and never squealing. Well, why should they squeal? What have the manufacturers to complain of? Their will is dominant in this House. They have been served since 1879 submissively by the government of this country irrespective of party, and the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) declaring that they have been served better by the present government than under his régime, quoted a list of farm implements which have been increased in price in proof of that assertion.

From the Progressive standpoint, the whole controversy that has taken place in this debate,—all the speeches delivered yesterday, able and eloquent speeches, by the member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) and others—has been as to which party has been serving the big interests the best, which has been most faithful to the principle of protection. Sir Richard Cartwright declared at the Ottawa Convention in 1893, as reported at page 42 of the official report of that convention, that up to that time, after only thirteen years of the National Policy, hardly less than $1,000,000,000 had been filched from the pockets of the people for the purpose of entrenching the oppressors of this nation in power and enabling them to defeat the wishes of the people. What have they to complain of? By a law they were made the wards of this nation in 1879, and by 1897 they had become its masters; and since then the government of this country has been, irrespective of party, obedient to all their wishes. That $1,000,000,000 represents more than the whole of the indemnity that Germany dared to impose upon France after the war of 1871; the total sum which the victors dared exact from a vanquished nation of forty millions was taken from the pockets of the Canadian people during the first thirteen years of the Na-

tional Policy, in a country with a population at that time of less than five millions. Now, Sir Richard was accepted at that time all over the Dominion as the greatest authority on trade statistics.

But let us take the next fourteen years, up to 1907, the date of the second Fielding tariff revision. Assuming that Sir Richard was right in his computation as to the first thirteen years, the years between 1893 and 1907 must have robbed this nation of one and a half billion of dollars, because during that time we increased in population by one and a half millions, and the dutiable items had increased from three hundred and forty to four hundred and eighty; besides it was during this period that certain provinces gave substantial aid to the steel industry and many municipalities aided the establishment of certain industries within their own borders.

But I come to another phase of the question. Is the money cost all that is to be considered? What was the moral cost in all those years? The right hon. leader of the Opposition pointed out yesterday the seriousness of a government scrapping its pre-election pledges. Now, in the same speech of Sir Richard Cartwright I gleaned the following:

> It must be obvious to everyone who will give the slightest consideration to the working of the protective system in this country or elsewhere that the moment you introduce that system you make legal provision for corruption on a most extensive scale. The moment you introduce the protective system you create a class whose interests are essentially different from those of the people at large, and who become ready contributors to corruption funds, sharing with their masters the plunder they have been enabled to filch from the pockets of the people.

In the House of Commons debates of April 11, 1890, Sir Richard, in answer to a question from the Honourable Mackenzie Bowell, declared:

> The whole business of protection is robbery, legalized robbery, You subsidize the manufacturers, and in return the manufacturers subsidize you. The thing is openly done by both parties to the transaction.

In 1891 when he published Canada and the Canadian people, Goldwin Smith made exactly the same charge. Who will say to-day that a similar debauchery is not practised when politicians will still defend a system of revenue that places one dollar in the treasury and five in the pockets of the protected interests? Previous to 1896 a system of education in opposition to the National Policy with all that it entailed, was carried on by the Liberal party. They educated the people to the evils of the protective system and the benefits of free trade; but after 1897 this educational effort ceased, and since that time a generation of young Canadians has grown up which sees nothing better in the public life of this country than was described by Sir Richard Cartwright. I think we need go no further to find what is the matter with this Dominion to-day. This is the state of affairs at the present time, and those on both sides of this House who advocate the maintenance of the present system are doing so in face of the fact that people have been driven out of their very homes from the great basic industry of agriculture, and that our workers are seeking employment in another country.

Now, the member for Victoria City (Mr. Tolmie) put the blame on the farmers themselves for their present unsatisfactory condition and said it was due to their lack of method and industry. He even went so far as to declare that the pioneers of to-day were of the ginger pop kind—all gas and no kick. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that there are thirty-five of those pioneers in this little group to which I belong, and they are not any of the gassy kind either. Some of us furnished our quota to the brave army that fought for the liberties of this Dominion. Many of us who had begun to take life a little easier resumed active work on the farm in order that our sons might fight the battle of freedom. No, we are not of the gassy kind. We did not try to hide our boys in the woods or in theological seminaries either. And we are not mentally or commercially helpless, as the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Raymond) describes those he is pleading for and on whose behalf he exclaims, "Oh, if you don't leave us alone we shall die."

In this debate the advocates of trade penalties have expatiated on the wealth of our natural resources, and at the same time they whine at their helplessness to make use of those resources. And yet they charge us with seeking paternalism from this government. I say, Mr. Speaker, it would be better for this nation if these people depended on their own industrial ability and ceased whining about the stability of the tariff. I am not a prophet nor the son of a prophet, but it does not require much prophetic skill to foresee that there will be no stability in this country until all our people shall enjoy their citizenship in the fullest degree. The phrase has frequently been used in this House, "Canada for the Canadians." Who are the Canadians? Have the agriculturists and workers no part in this Dominion? At last Friday's sitting of this House there was brought forth a plea for the workers at Powell river, British Columbia, and it was found there was no way in which parliament could protect those people from the unjust and unreasonable action of their employers. It is true the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mur-

dock) made a very fine speech about the decisions of the Versailles Conference; but the workers of this country to-day are like hungry lads outside a confectioner's shop window When these workers are driven to desperation the Minister of National Defence will not hesitate to send the militia there as he sent them to Sydney last year. In the past we have seen empires rise, reach their zenith, wane and pass away. The verdict of history points to the cause as being the lack of interest on the part of the common people in their civilization and their government. Russia is the last case in point where the wedge of privilege was driven in to cause a cleavage and separate the toilers from any interest they might have in their common wealth.

If the protectionist dominions of the British Empire, and especially this Dominion, fell in line with the Mother Country in a free trade policy they would place themselves in a position to share with her the material benefits which the economic blunders of other nations are forcing upon her in the hope of bringing about her ruin. England to-day is the centre, the trading mart, of the world, just as she used to be. Month by month she is increasing her trade and shipbuilding, while we are making the same mistake as the United States did some years ago when she taxed foreign goods and shipping in the hope of making that country the great trading and carrying country of the world. Our short-sighted policy of placing a penalty on the trade of the country has involved this Dominion in a huge deficit in respect of our merchant marine fleet, and the day is close at hand when we shall see the end of that venture unless we reverse our national policy. England is still the greatest carrier of the world. She cares nought for the tariffs of other countries; the mistaken policies of other countries are keeping the cost of production so low in Great Britain that tariff policies of other lands make little difference to her. Canada, under the mistaken policy of protection, has impoverished the industries natural to this country in order to maintain an export trade for industries that admittedly cannot stand on their own feet. I say admittedly, and this, I want to inform my hon. friends, is where the hallucination may be again applied. Our statesmen to-day, ignorant of economies, are refusing, even if they are able, to see the consequences of their own action in the depletion of the farms in every province of this Dominion and the exodus of mechanics to seek work in other lands. The fact is that they have killed their own home market by the shortsighted policy of protection.

[Mr. Evans.]

Britain will be the first country in the world to free herself from the abnormal load of debt occasioned by the war, in which she placed all her allies in a position to resist the kaiserism and bondage that threatened the world at that time. Britain has now arrested the decline in shipbuilding. Last month an increase was reported in the tonnage built of 24,000 tons over the output for the previous three months, while we in Canada have a modern merchant marine fleet which under present policy we would be well rid of. Britain's exports expanded by $15,000,000 in the same period, and the fiscal year which has just terminated yielded a surplus revenue of $500,000,000, which is being applied to the redemption of the public debt, thus simplifying the problem of national finance for the present year. And most important of all, there is a reduction of 6 pence in the pound in the income tax, as well as a cutting of the corporation tax in half and a lowering of the excise on certain articles. During the year gone by we, on the other hand, have had to increase our national debt and the Minister of Finance is hard put to it to find sufficient revenue for the current year.

Protectionist countries contribute to the cheapness of production in Britain by taxing themselves to bonus importations into that country, and this generosity on our part is so costly that we have in the past been keeping the financiers of Britain and other countries busy furnishing loans to make good the difference. At the same time, our natural resources are not developed as they should be, and we are stifling to death the one basic industry that may be able under other conditions to pay its way—agriculture.

I did hope to see in this budget some consistency regarding the tariff. If we need tariff for revenue, why do we maintain tariff laws and regulations that can absolutely, at the will of the minister, prohibit imports on which revenue may be collected? I am speaking now of the anti-dumping clause with its latest amendments and regulations, all interpreted in favour of those whose interest it is to eliminate competition and not to collect revenue. When we go back to our constituencies what shall we advise our people to do? Shall we tell them to buy foreign-made goods so that we may furnish revenue for the carrying on of government? Or shall we advise them to buy the home-made product enhanced in price by import penalties and help to swell the coffers of the protected industries, the distributing combines, and so on, and give them the increase of power that goes with money to dictate the policy of this country?

Surely there are plenty of ways to collect revenue besides the stupid, vicious, insatiable method of placing a penalty on all our exchange of goods with other countries.

We have been accused of not coming forward with any policy of taxation. I think our amendment is pretty plain in that respect, but I would recommend, since both Liberal and Conservative protectionists are anxious about a tariff for revenue, the abolishing the anti-dumping act with all its regulations and thus enable our co-operative concerns throughout the land to flourish. To do this will increase the revenue by the importation of foreign goods on which duty may be collected. Since the distributing combines will not allow goods to be co-operatively distributed, it is a vicious, a feudalistic act on the part of the government to tie the hands of the people by any such unreasonable legislation. Its removal will tend to lower the cost of living and consequently the cost of production, which will be an incentive to agriculture and manufacture alike. If there is one form of protection that our Canadian Manufacturers Association should be careful to cultivate and preserve, it is a national spirit of co-operation on the part of the home consumer. This, however, they have destroyed by refusing to sell except through "legitimate channels of trade," as they term it—through combinations, jobbers, wholesalers, and so on. These bodies have become so tyrannical that I believe even some of the manufacturers themselves are beginning to squirm.

The cost of living to-day in Canada is higher than in the United States or Britain, and it cannot come down until the people have freedom as to where they shall purchase what they need. The distributing combine has gained in strength since they found that the anti-combine bill of 1910 was a still-born babe. I have grave doubts that the present enactment is going to show much more life.

But to return to sources of revenue, I would recommend an even sharper graduation on big incomes than we at present impose. A graduated inheritance tax should be a lucrative source of continuous revenue. The provinces to some extent make use of it. But through the granting of franchises many of our citizens have inherited great wealth that has been created by the community at large. It is only right that the people should share a part of the wealth they themselves have created. It is certainly in the interests of a real commonwealth to diffuse great fortunes; it helps to smooth out class distinctions and to afford equal opportunity to all. Colossal fortunes are often made these days in, say, oil grants, which belong to the community. We are not making as much of this resource as we should. When great fortunes are attained simply by luck, and sometimes perhaps by manipulation, it is unfair to curb the opportunities of others by a concentration of wealth in a few hands.

I would suggest, as is done in the amendment, an extension of excise. Heavier taxes on luxuries might be imposed to produce revenue. But to say that revenue can only be collected by giving a monopoly to certain privileged ones, why, I do not think you could deceive a school boy with such a tale.

Withal I would recommend that greater attention be paid to economy. At a time like this when the trade of the country is contracting rather than expanding, it surely does not call for such lavish expenditure on public works, geodetic surveys and the like. Besides taking the estimates for this year, members from Quebec and the Maritime provinces seem to make a business of playing Santa Claus to all their little fishing towns and villages, and the government seem willing that such should be the case, making a business of patronage.

No definite policy seems to be followed in any of our national developments. Too much is done according to political party expediency. The Welland canal was begun at a time when the nation could not afford it and when it was not particularly needed.

Mr. GRAHAM: Is the hon. member not aware that the Welland canal was started largely at the request of western people?

Mr. EVANS: I want to inform the hon. minister that I have been in touch very largely with western thought, and I have never known from any of the organized interests in western Canada, either from the United Farmers of Manitoba or Alberta, from the Grain Growers' Association of Saskatchewan, or from any united boards of trade a demand for the Welland canal. I say that that work was begun at a time when the nation could not afford it, and when it was not particularly needed, while on another project $12,000,000 worth of work and material was left to go for naught and will now have to be redone. I think that altogether history will record the policy of Canadian statesmen from confederation down to the present time as a policy of blind selfishness in conducting the trade of the country along certain channels through certain hands without any thought of the country's need.

The hon. member for Halifax condemned the Hudson Bay railway project, but defended the commencement of the Welland canal after the Hudson Bay railway project had been abandoned because

9 p.m.

the nation could not go on with it for want of money. Whatever doubt there is regarding the Hudson Bay railway and the navigation of the straits, the time to raise any objection was surely before some $23,000,000 was spent on that work, nearly half of which has been left to go for naught because some people thought their interests would be hurt by its completion.

The statement is often made in this country, it has often been made in this House, that Canada is a hard country to govern. I say, Mr. Speaker, it is only hard to govern to the extent that in our national life the wedge of privilege has been driven in between the interests of different classes and areas of this Dominion. If those responsible for the administration of this country would consider the needs of the Dominion instead of the exigencies of party things would be different. To-day independent thought is stifled in our colleges and universities. Newspapers are controlled, credit is withheld, enterprise killed and confidence destroyed. Our natural resources go undeveloped while agriculturists and workers are leaving the country. Canada is a country of great potential wealth, but we cannot hope to create a nation by class privilege. We must view these things with a broad outlook upon the fields of the future, and leave to our posterity the foundation of a true democracy.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, if for no other reason I feel that I should rise now to express my warmest thanks to the hon. members in all quarters of the House who during this debate have said so many kind words concerning myself. I appreciate very much these manifestations of their goodwill, and I give them in all quarters my warmest and grateful thanks.

Now, with regard to the budget debate, so much has been said from this side of the House in review of objections that have been raised and the ground has been so well covered in the magnificent address delivered to-day by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), that there really would be no excuse for my occupying the attention of the House in a lengthy address. I have no intention of doing so. I desire to be brief, but there are a few points, chiefly in the speech of my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton), and the ex-Prime Minister, the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen), to which I should like to allude, but I promise the House that I shall not detain them at any considerable length.

[Mr. Evans.]

The criticisms offered by my hon. friend from West York (Sir Henry Drayton) were in the main kindly and not calculated to make me or anybody else angry. On the whole I have not much fault to find with him. One criticism that he offered was that I was too conservative in my estimates of the revenue for the year. Well, perhaps I was, but will my hon. friend not agree with me that on the whole it is better in forming estimates of the revenue to be conservative than be extravagant in the other direction? I think it is wiser.

My hon. friend again and again in the course of his address argued that we should have armed ourselves—I think that is the word he used—in our French relations, in relation to the United States, in relation to all our trade business with foreign countries, by first increasing our tariff to a high point in order that, as they say, we should have something to trade with. I am not sure that that is a wise policy; but this I am justified in saying, that if it was a wise policy in the minds of my hon. friends opposite, the strangest thing in the world is that they did not utilize that policy when they were in power themselves. My hon. friend the ex-Minister of Finance did not occupy that post for many years, but he had a couple of sessions during which he might have, to use the expression, jacked up the tariff to a high point if he so desired; but he did not do it. He kept on under the old tariff. My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition fell into the same line of argument. Why did we not arm ourselves, why did we not jack up the tariff before we went to France and before we go to the United States? I think myself I have a right to point out the fact that hon. gentlemen opposite when they had an opportunity did not do it.

How is it if that is a sound policy it has only been discovered since they have been out of office? I had in my mind the story of two country merchants in the flour trade. A customer went into Jones' store and said to him, "What are you asking for flour to-day?" Jones said "Ten dollars." "Oh," said the customer, "that is pretty high; I cannot pay it." Jones said to him "No; that is all right; it is a fair price." The customer said to him "Why, Mr. Smith's price for flour is $9.50." "Well," said Jones, "in that case I am afraid you will have to buy it from Smith." The customer said "Yes, but Mr. Smith is out of flour just now." When Smith was out of flour, he could quote a low price, and when my hon. friends are out of office they can tell us in pious words what they

would have done if they had been in power. But it seems to me that the action of hon. members when they had the opportunity to do something is the best answer to the policy they are advocating to-day. My hon. friend from West York (Sir Henry Drayton) emphasizes that line of policy, not only with regard to France, but with regard to the United States. Again and again he tells us that if we want to trade with the United States we must have something to trade with. He emphasizes that policy and he takes up the old line "No truck or trade with the Yankees." That is the substance of it. But not long after he made a speech along those lines the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Anderson) suddenly asked this question: "Why is this government not reducing the duty? Why do they not reduce the duties on American automobiles?" Which of these two policies represents the attitude of the Conservative party to-day? Is it my hon. friend from West York, who wants to jack up the tariff against the Americans, or is it my hon. friend from Halton, who wants to cut down the duty on Yankee automobiles? I think I have a right to ask my hon. friend to define which of these two policies is the correct one. My hon. friend from West York gave us quite a lecture on potatoes. I think there is no other item in his review which occupied so much of his time as potatoes. I want to refer to it, first because he regarded it as important, and secondly because it is an amusing incident. The item reads as follows:

Potatoes when imported from a country which imposes a customs duty on potatoes grown ln Canada per 100 pounds, British preference 20 cents; intermediate, 35 cents; general tariff, 35 cents.

My hon. friend went on to speak at considerable length on this potato question; he referred to the hon. member for Victoria and Carleton (Mr. Caldwell) as having something to do with it, and he said:

The hon. member for Victoria and Carleton (Mr. Caldwell), I think has been helping them a little along the line of instructions. I do not know how he managed this; he certainly managed to get them to pick out the one item that would constitute the smallest reason in the world to move an American business man in the right direction. But, perhaps, the process of education will go on. He has got them to put a protective duty on potatoes when other countries maintain a duty against potatoes grown in Canada. I do not know why we should not eat Canadian potatoes. I always thought we should. I think Canadian potatoes are very good.

And then, in consequence of his reference to the hon. member for Carleton and Victoria, that hon. member (Mr. Caldwell) said:

Since the hon. member has coupled my name with this, I should like to dissociate myself with it entirely. We want free entry of our potatoes into other markets.

Then the hon. member (Sir Henry Drayton) continues:

Wonderful! Is the attitude of this hon. gentleman not extraordinary? I am not going to debate the matter; but I am going to tell him one thing, that his attitude is just as helpful to the potato producers of New Brunswick as was his vote on the Crowsnest pass case. If he wants to make it impossible to do business, all right; but hon. gentlemen across the aisle—

I believe that he meant the members on this side of the House. Then he continues:

—were learning something, and they put this duty on potatoes. Let us suppose that this duty on potatoes was imposed for some good cause. If there be any good cause, the reason why potatoes should be picked out as a specific instance, must have regard to the American tariff. The one potato scale I know of that is worrying Canada to-day is the American potato scale.

He went on to speak at some length in that direction and said:

Certainly it is a fine point to start with if they are serious in the desire to tackle the question like men of business. Undoubtedly it is a fine trading point as compared with the millions, the hundreds of milllions, of values that come from the United States into Canada; it is small, for example as compared with the millions which we get from them in silks, textiles, iron and steel products, etc. It is simply small and contemptible.

That was my hon. friend's criticism. He referred to it as a small and contemptible item. I have pleasure in telling him that, if that item is small and contemptible, it is no baby of mine, it is not an item of mine, but it is taken from the tariff as he left it when he went out of office. This item he has dwelt upon, which he thinks we have selected as a small, contemptible item, is simply taken from his own tariff in its very words, and we have carried it into the new tariff. While the tariff previously, as my hon. friend left it, had a rate of so many cents per bushel, the law of Canada requires that potatoes shall be sold by weight and not by measures, and we simply convert it from the number of cents per bushel into the number of cents per hundred pounds; and that is the whole question. Nevertheless, my hon. friend characterizes it as a small and contemptible thing, and says that it is a specimen of the way this Liberal government is doing things.

Reference was made to the duty on artificial silk as something which creates a departure from our own line of policy. Let us examine that for a moment. That is a new article which is not yet classified in the tariff. As it is likely to be widely used, it ought to have a classification, and we have placed it in the tariff and so we have to say what rate it would bear in the tariff. Artificial silk is after all silk, practically. It serves all the purposes of silk. It will displace silk as far as

it is used. If it be not specially mentioned, it may fall into the unenumerated list which would bear the rate of 17½ per cent. My hon. friend opposite emphasizes the opinion that silk is a luxury. We think that artificial silk might properly be treated as silk, and put in the tariff accordingly, and if the rate is a high one, it is simply because of the general principles that luxuries are taxed more highly than cheaper commodities. That is the whole story. From a purely revenue point of view, it is a serious thing, because if we displace silk by artificial silk we will be losing the revenue. In this case, I hope we shall get the revenue, and if incidentally it helps to encourage the industry, so much the better. It is a fair illustration of a revenue tariff which carries with it incidental protection.

I have a number of notes to which I intended to refer, but I am frank enough to say, Mr. Speaker, that my right hon. friend the Prime Minister covered the ground so well to-day that I am going to make my speech briefer than it would otherwise have been. In connection, however, with the general criticism, we have heard very much about economy. They all talk about economy. It is the easiest thing to advocate and the hardest thing to accomplish. My hon. friends opposite generally talk about economy. I think possibly my hon. friends of the Progressive group talk of it still more. But if we examine the records of parliament we find that in three cases out of four the suggestions of hon. members opposite do not call for economy, but for larger expenditures of public money. We propose some appropriations for the Militia service, but hon. members opposite say our estimates are too low, and we ought to spend more. I think they find fault and say that we did not grant enough money for the militia. I do not want to debate the merits of it. I simply state it as a fact. We had a similar experience in the matter of naval service. My hon. friend the Minister of Militia brought down some appropriation for the naval service and again we were told we should have provided more money. We are proposing to add one or two industries to the bounty list, and hon. members opposite say the bounties are not large enough, and that we should make them higher Everybody talks of economy. We all become advocates of economy for the other fellow, not for our own district, not for our own province. My hon. friends from Toronto talk about economy; but they are not anxious to cut down the appropriation for Toronto harbour. The hon. members residing in Toronto, the hon. member for East York (Mr. Harris) emphasized the fact that we were not spending money as we ought for the deepening of the St. Lawrence canals. This I suppose, would probably take only a couple of hundred million dollars! What about that? They talk economy, and yet they tell us that we should expend money on deepening the St. Lawrence canals. The last speech delivered to-night, namely that by the hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. Evans), advocated economy; but the only economy he proposed was that we should increase our expenditures by paying more money to the rural mail carriers.

Mr. EVANS: I should like to put the hon. gentleman right. I contrasted their remuneration with that of other members of the Civil Service.

Mr. FIELDING: The hon. gentleman, I understood, said that they were not getting enough, and he thought they ought to get more. If I am wrong in my understanding, I take it back. He thought these men were not well enough paid and perhaps they are not. I am not debating that question, but it is costing the country six and a quarter million dollars to provide for that service, and if you vote only a moderate increase, you add a couple of million dollars to the expenditure. I am not discussing the merits of the case; I am simply pointing out that this cry for economy contrasts very strangely with the attitude of hon. gentlemen when they come to deal with matters in which they have a keen interest.

My Progressive friends are not free from criticism in that connection. They are advocates of economy; but they want more branch railways, and they want the Hudson Bay railway. It is not as easy as it looks to economize. Even in the matter of the Civil Service, although hon. gentlemen talk glibly of economy in that direction, one of the hardest things in the world, as any hon. member who has been in office knows, is to cut down the Civil Service. Those who have no responsibility can treat that matter very lightly; but I can tell hon. gentlemen—I do not need to assure those who have held office—that even in that matter, a policy of economy may very easily cause trouble. I would be as glad as any other hon. gentleman in this House if we could have a larger measure of economy. But Canada is a comparatively undeveloped country; we have great needs; we have in every part of the country many works which call for attention. Some of them possibly can wait; many of them are urgent, and if the wheels of progress are to keep moving, we have to respond to

many demands made upon us for public expenditures. I frankly say that it is a good deal more difficult to economize than my hon. friends think.

Perhaps one of the strangest things in this discussion is that which was so forcibly referred to to-day by the Prime Minister, when he spoke of the criticism being offered that this was a protectionist budget. That is the strangest thing in the world, and if hon. gentlemen opposite will persist in that attitude, they must not be surprised that the country refuses to take them seriously. Why, in nineteen out of twenty cases in which the tariff is touched by these resolutions, it is touched by way of reduction, and in the budget of last year, with very rare exceptions every change that was made was by way of a reduction. Why then do hon. gentlemen persist in talking about this as a protectionist budget?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Was that not equally true of the budget of 1919 and the budget of 1920, both of which my hon. friend denounced as protectionist budgets?

Mr. FIELDING: My right hon. friend is not the best witness as to what I have said and things of times past; but I am more concerned in the things of to-day and of the future, than I am in what occurred in 1919. My taste for study does not lead me back to the kings of Egypt as quickly as it does in the case of my right hon. friend.

I would say, as regards the hon. member for West York, whose kindly criticism I accepted in the best of good nature, that he set himself right in the end. He did, perhaps, say some harsh things, but in the end he turned to the Speaker—I am not using quotation marks; I do not say that these were his words, but they are the substance of them—and he said: Mr. Speaker, I have been talking along these lines for some time; but I want to tell you that you do not want to take me seriously; I want you to understand that all this is said merely in a Pickwickian sense, and as evidence of that I want to tell you that these farmer chaps may, if they want to, go after the budget; let them; but as for me and my house, I am satisfied with the budget, and I do not propose to move any amendment. So, if I cannot agree with all that my hon. friend from West York has said at all events I can congratulate him upon the soundness of the conclusion which he has reached.

The Prime Minister dealt with the question of this being a protectionist budget, but I think what he said is capable of being emphasized. He said and very truly—indeed he gave illustrations of the extent to which reductions had been made—that this could not be considered a protectionist budget. He dealt with the matter so ably that I will not dwell further upon it.

I turn now to make a brief reference to the speech of the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen). I am sorry that he did not find himself in a more amiable frame of mind. He does not seem to be able to forgive the people of Canada for a little event which occurred more than a year and a half ago. He should cultivate a little more amiability in that direction and leave his grouch at home next time. The first criticism was that this was not much of a budget anyway; that it did not give us as many statistics as it ought to; that there ought to have been this statement and that statement, and this comparison and that comparison. That is a fair matter of debate. Possibly he is right, but at all events he is not universally supposed to be right. A budget which would please everybody would be a marvellous thing. I have no thought that I have achieved that purpose, nor that I am ever likely to do so; but I am glad to be able to say this that, while in the press of the country I have found many criticisms, legitimate enough from the point of view of opponents of the government, I have been rather fortunate to have this compliment paid to me: "Whatever may be said, Fielding did not give us a long speech anyhow." That is something. You know the story in the case of the good old German people where the custom is to say something nice at the grave of the departed. This was the case of a man who had died and who did not have many friends. At his grave everybody was trying to say something nice and they found it a pretty hard job; but one old man said: "Well, friends, he was a good smoker." It is nice to have somebody say a kind word even in the matter of the brevity of the speech. I want to quote, particularly for the benefit of my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, what the leading Conservative organ of Canada said on the occasion of the delivery of the budget. I am quoting from the Montreal Gazette on the morning after the budget:

> It (Mr. Fielding's speech) was the shortest budget speech on record and took less than an hour to deliver. The effort lost nothing on account of its brevity—

They differ from my right hon. friend there. He thinks it should have been a longer speech.

> —and Mr. Fielding did not weary his listeners with a recital of endless figures on Canada's financial position. He gave a short, crisp statement in that regard and quickly got to the kernel of his subject, namely, changes in the tariff, sales tax and stamp tax.

I have to make my choice between the compliment that is paid by the leading Conservative organ of Canada, and the severe criticism offered by the leader of the Opposition, who complained that I did not weary my listeners with these long tables.

The leader of the Opposition also emphasized this notion of the hon. member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton) about jacking up the tariff, and the general cry for economy. What now is the financial difficulty in the way of Canada? What are the causes of our embarrassment so far as we have any, because I do not admit that the embarrassment is very serious? What prevents our having a satisfactory budget? Two things. The war, as hon. gentlemen will surely admit, and the railway question. I do not want to debate the question of who is responsible for either of these things. Least of all do I want to blame the hon. gentleman for expenditures on account of the war. But this I have a right to complain of, that while I willingly share with him any responsibility for those expenditures, he discusses the causes of the present difficulties we are in and attributes them to us. He is not fair in so doing. He is constantly talking of the difficulties with which we are faced, and assumes that they have resulted from some conduct of our own. He tells us again and again that we have increased the sales tax and in that way have added to the burdens of the people. He asks, why do you not balance the budget? And many an hon. member on the other side reiterates the same question. Well, in the budget speech I pointed out what I thought were good reasons for our inability to do this; I stated that it was much better to bear patiently for a year or two the condition we now have, and to have faith and hope and a firm belief that the betterment which we all long for will come in a short while, than to impose new taxation. But if my hon. friend insists so emphatically on the necessity for balancing the budget, why did he not do it in his own day? Only now he discovers that we cannot balance the budget. He says, "You are increasing the sales tax." He did not increase the sales tax in 1921, but he was content to add $92,000,000 to the debt of the country—a much simpler process in a way, but not quite so satisfactory, I think. He did not increase the sales tax in 1922; no, Sir, he preferred rather to add $81,000,000 to the public debt. And if things had gone on in that way and the right hon. gentleman had remained in power, heaven only knows what would have been the condition of affairs last year Heaven only knows what the public debt would have been. We thought it was wise to face the music, to recognise the facts, and to meet the obligations that were before us.

I do not stop for one moment to consider who is or who is not blameable for the fact that we have these large obligations; I simply declare that the right thing to do, in the face of them was to increase taxation in some form or other to meet them. We increased the sales tax. If we had been willing to follow my hon. friend's example and to allow the whole burden to be added to the public debt, we need not have increased the sales tax. But we did increase it, and we did so for good reasons; and having done so we think there is nothing for us to apologise for. We did not balance the budget: we hope we shall be able next year to do so but whether we do balance it or not, we are facing our obligations; our path is in the right direction and we are endeavouring to make ends meet. So that if we have to add something to the public debt it will be because conditions oblige us to do so. In the meantime, we say to the country that the policy which offers them exemption from other new taxes is a wiser policy than that which the right hon. gentleman would recommend.

Now, with regard to the question of reciprocity, when we undertake to consider all that is involved in this question we assume a very great responsibility; and I confess I have some reason to rejoice in the attitude of my right hon. friend, not that I approve of it, but because it is some satisfaction to have a clear issue before one. My right hon. friend says that these resolutions which we have embodied in the budget do not amount to anything; he tells us that they will not accomplish anything. Well, I do not know whether they will or not. I do think, however, that it is desirable nevertheless that the resolutions should be there; I think it is desirable to have a clear-cut statement in the most official form of the desire and the willingness of the people of Canada to enter into a friendly arrangement with the government of the United States whenever that government is prepared to consider any proposals in the direction of reciprocity; and just as it was deemed wise in 1879 to introduce this proposal into the Tariff Act of that day, which proposal was commonly referred to as the standing offer, so I think it is wise to-day to re-introduce that standing offer, not because there is anything new in it, or because we expect that we shall gain anything by it,

but simply because we think it is well that there should be a clear statement of the desire of the government of Canada to enter into an arrangement with the people of the United States. The American people, in view of the events of 1911, might be justified in emphatically declaring that they do not want reciprocity; and I would not blame any American who, if he met me, might say: "What is the use of your talking about reciprocity now? You had a chance to have reciprocity in 1911 and you rejected it, so that there is not much use in your talking about the matter at this time." I think there is much to justify that view if any American were inclined to advance it. At all events, we are persuaded that it is a wise policy that there should be at least no room for misunderstanding, but that we should have it clearly and distinctly made known, in the most precise and formal way possible, that this is our desire now.

The right hon. gentleman has taken a new line on the question of reciprocity. He discusses the events of 1911 and takes the extraordinary view that the reason why he would not support the Reciprocity agreement of 1891 is because it lacked permanency. Why, he says, if only we had the assurance of permanency it would be all right.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not say that; I said that there would be something to be said for it and much to be said against it, but that it would be a great deal better for us to have some assurance in the matter.

Mr. FIELDING: I happen to have before me just what my right hon. friend said, and I will quote him to justify my statement of his position.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Very well, read what I said.

Mr. FIELDING: I have the exact words of the right hon. gentleman, and in order that there may be no misunderstanding on the point I shall quote precisely what he said:

> If we enter into a commercial arrangement with them, there would be something at least to say for it, if conditions were such that we knew there would be permanency to such arrangement.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, that is part of what I said.

Mr. FIELDING: And further, the right hon. gentleman goes on to say:

> But I said before there would be something to say for such a treaty if there was any guarantee or hope of permanency.

In other words, he wanted the assurance of permanency. He says:

> In that case we would know what to do; investors would know what to do; agriculturists would know what to do; ranchers would know what to do; men thinking of going into any line of trade or production would know just what to expect.

Can you not see the great demand there for permanency, for a guarantee, an assurance of permanency?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister, of course, left out a part of the quotation.

Mr. FIELDING: If my right hon. friend thinks it important I can, of course, read the whole extract. I did not omit any part that was vital.

Mr MEIGHEN: Oh yes, you did.

Mr. FIELDING: The right hon. gentleman has his remarks at his hand, and if he thinks fit to do so he may read what I have omitted; I simply wanted to avoid wearying the House with a long extract. He said further:

> But is there any guarantee of permanency or can there be any guarantee of permanency under any conceivable circumstances? I ask that question, and I ask it seriously, because in my judgment it is the root and the heart of the whole situation. There was no permanency inherent in the 1911 treaty. Each country reserved the right to depart from it at its will. That the United States insisted on; that the United States will always insist on.

Will my right hon. friend tell me what is his warrant, his authority, for the statement that the United States insisted upon anything of that kind? That is the material part of the quotation. He states that the United States insisted upon that qualification; I want to know where he got his authority for that assertion?

Mr. MEIGHEN: For the reason—

Mr. FIELDING: Oh no; not the reason. the authority. I want the right hon. gentleman's authority for that statement of his.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I know it is there.

Mr. FIELDING: It is not there.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not in the treaty that the hon. gentleman made? Was it not provided that it was not to be permanent but was to be cancellable at the will of either country? It undoubtedly was, and in every treaty that was ever made in the history of the country that provision has been embodied.

Mr. FIELDING: In the first place, my right hon. friend is referring to the treaty; and in the second place he is not answering my question. I am not disputing his statement as to what is in the agreement itself; that speaks for itself. But the right hon. gentleman says that the United States insisted upon

that qualification, and I want to know what authority he has for making that statement. We do not want him to tell us what is in the document; we know what it provides. But he says that the United States insisted upon a certain qualification and I say that he cannot give me any authority for that statement.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I should think that something which the United States obtained would be obtained on their own insistence and not on the insistence of this country. Anyone would presume that. Would the hon. gentleman permit me to read what he omitted?

Mr. FIELDING: Yes, if it will do any good

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is what I said:

> Now, mark you, I said there would be something to say for it. There would at the same time be much to say against it.

And I went on to say what would result.

Mr. FIELDING: Quite so. But the right hon gentleman went on to say that an assurance of permanency was "the root and heart of the whole situation." He not only says that this condition was in the agreement, but he tells us that the American people insisted upon it. That is the vital point; and he has not given any authority for that statement. Nor can he give any such authority; I tell him there is absolutely no foundation for it. The Americans were prepared to discuss a reciprocity treaty for a term of years if we so desired.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That would not be permanent.

Mr. FIELDING: There is no permanent treaty in God's world.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is what I say.

Mr. FIELDING: When the hon. gentleman used the term "permanency" he meant forever, did he? That is not my idea of what in diplomatic affairs the word "permanence" means. However, I again say in reply to my hon. friend that his assertion, that the United States government insisted upon the temporary condition and we had to submit to it, is unwarranted; of my own personal knowledge I say it is not in accordance with the facts. The United States government were prepared to discuss a reciprocity agreement of a broader type if we wanted to do so.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In return for what?

Mr. FIELDING: I will read the essential part of the agreement that we did bring back. But my hon. friend emphasizes the fact that the Americans insisted upon this and that it was something we had to agree to. I say emphatically there is no warrant for the statement. What happened to the agreement when we came back? Was it not attacked because it was considered to be practically permanent? Was not the burden of every complaint from the Conservative party "You have bound Canada hand and foot?" Was not that the story? It is a new story now. To-day they say they wanted a permanent agreement, but at that time we were charged with binding Canada hand and foot to these horrid Americans. "No truck or trade with the Yankees" was the cry of those days, and now the right hon. gentleman says, "Oh, it would have been all right if we had only had some guarantee of permanency."

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Minister of Agriculture is very much amused to-night.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I am.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think it is perhaps the hundredth time the hon. gentleman has stated that hon. members of the opposition at that time declared for "No truck or trade with the Yankees." I ask him now for his authority for that declaration. That was entirely an invention of the hon. gentleman's leader of that time.

Mr. FIELDING: I saw it at that time in the press. I never attributed the phrase to the right hon. gentleman himself, but I have been informed and believe that that was the cry of the Conservative party.

Mr. DUFF: I heard Sir Robert Borden say it.

Mr. FIELDING: I heard it was stated in Ontario by the chairman of a meeting with Sir Robert Borden sitting on the platform. However, "No truck or trade with the Yankees" was the slogan throughout the country, no matter by whom it was originated.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the hon. gentleman think that the statement of some chairman of some meeting is authority for attributing it to the Conservative party?

Mr. BUREAU: It was in the literature of the Conservative party.

Mr. FIELDING: If used at a public meeting by the chairman of that meeting with Sir Robert Borden sitting on the platform it is pretty good evidence that it was the slogan of the Conservative party at that time. However, I want now to show what was in this agreement that my hon. friend has referred

to. Here is a quotation from the letter written by the late Mr. Paterson and myself to the American Secretary of State:

> It is agreed that the desired tariff changes shall not take the formal shape of a treaty, but that the governments of the two countries will use their utmost efforts to bring about such changes by concurrent legislation at Washington and Ottawa.
>
> The governments of the two countries having made this agreement from the conviction that, if confirmed by the necessary legislative authorities, it will benefit the people on both sides of the border line, we may reasonably hope and expect that the arrangement, if so confirmed, will remain in operation for a considerable period. Only this expectation on the part of both governments would justify the time and labour that have been employed in the maturing of the proposed measures. Nevertheless, it is distinctly understood that we do not attempt to bind for the future the action of the United States Congress or the Parliament of Canada, but that each of these authorities shall be absolutely free to make any change of tariff policy or of any other matter covered by the present arrangement that may be deemed expedient. We look for the continuance of the arrangement, not because either party is bound to it, but because of our conviction that the more liberal trade policy thus to be established will be viewed by the people of the United States and Canada as one which will strengthen the friendly relations now happily prevailing and promote the commercial interests of both countries.

That is incorporated in the agreement, written by Mr. Paterson and myself, placed there at our request, not because the American government insisted upon it, but because we thought it was not wise at that time to bind Canada for a longer term. We were content to bring the arrangement back for submission to the Canadian people, to let them try it, and in the light of actual experience to determine whether or not they wanted to make a permanent treaty.

There is one satisfaction in dealing with my hon. friend's position in this matter; we have at all events a clear-cut issue. He is opposed to reciprocity with the United States—he does not want it anyhow. His idea is—I do not quote his words now—no truck or trade with the Yankees. That is only another clear-cut way of expressing his position.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not at all; that is very unfair.

Mr. FIELDING: Well, I understand that in his speech yesterday my right honourable friend (Mr. Meighen) distinctly declared his opposition to reciprocity with the United States.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Hear, hear.

Mr. FIELDING: Very good. Then there is a clear-cut issue. Hon. gentlemen of the Conservative party—so far as they permit themselves to be represented by my right hon. friend—are against any trade treaty with the United States. In the name of the Liberal party of Canada I declare to-day that we stand for reciprocity with the United States. I say that when the opportunity comes to make a fair treaty or agreement—and I say the agreement of 1911 was a fair and reasonable agreement, and I am glad that our Progressive friends call for a repetition of that agreement in their motion to-day; to that extent I agree with it—but I say that when the opportunity comes we are proud to declare in the face of the parliament of Canada, whatever the fate of it may be, that this Liberal party stands for reciprocity with the United States when we can get a fair and reasonable agreement. That is our position. We are content to let the people judge between the hon. gentleman and ourselves on that point

Now, I want to conclude. I have spoken longer than I expected to do.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go on.

Mr. FIELDING: The budget speech—may I modestly say?—was not partisan, it was not boastful, though I think there was something in it that might justify boastfulness. There was not a line nor a note in it that gave cause of offence to anybody. It stated simple facts in a way beyond dispute. That has not been denied. It was a fair statement of the situation, and it offered a fair proposal to the people. Now, what is it that is offered in the reciprocity agreement? My right hon. friend, by the way, says there has been a change in public opinion since 1911 with regard to reciprocity.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No.

Mr. FIELDING: No, I reverse the statement. My right hon. friend is right. He says there was no change, that is, that the adverse opinion of the people of Canada in 1911 remains to-day. That is more correct. I want to tell my right hon. friend that he is absolutely unwarranted in making that statement. In 1911 blind partisanship led men away from the consideration of an economic question and for party reasons, not for economic reasons, they voted against reciprocity.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the minister not consider that what he is saying now is "a grouch?"

Mr. FIELDING: No.

Mr. BUREAU: It is an answer to a grouch.

Mr. FIELDING: No, it is just a proclamation again of the old faith, and I am proud to proclaim it; that is all. But my right hon.

friend has said there has been no change of public opinion. I want for a moment to draw his attention to this. I am told there are members sitting in this House to-day who voted against reciprocity in 1911 and who are to-day subscribing to the resolution of the Progressives which is in favour of reciprocity. I do not say that of my own knowledge, but I am so informed. Last week in the town of Yarmouth a large meeting was held of the fishing interests of the south shore of Nova Scotia and was attended by leading gentlemen from three or four counties. Among these gentlemen were many from my own constituency, including a number of prominent citizens who opposed and helped to defeat me in 1911. Those gentlemen at that meeting declared that what the interests of Nova Scotia most need to-day is the admission of its products into the United States market. Yet my hon. friend says there is no change in public opinion. There is a change in this way, that the time is come when the people will no longer view this question through the spectacle of partisanship; they are looking at it, as it ought to have been loked at from the beginning, as an economic question. The cattle raisers of the West and the fishermen of the East alike feel that admission of their products to the United States market would be one of the greatest things for the commercial success of Canada. That is the feeling in Canada to-day. It is said of the Bourbons that they learned nothing and forgot nothing. I doubt whether the Conservative party of Canada are going to endorse the position taken by my right hon. friend against reciprocity. An economic question will override a purely political question, and although my right hon. friend may still desire to take the Bourbonic view of the matter, I believe there are thousands of Conservatives in Canada who will readily follow us if we go to the polls on that issue and who will stand for reciprocity now, though they did not stand for it in 1911.

Now, about the budget. I have said that it is a very modest budget, an unassuming budget. There are no fireworks about it. It does not offer a great deal; it offers just a simple statement of what seems to be most needed to meet the conditions of the day. First, it offers exemption from those new taxes that my right hon. friend would impose to balance the budget. We do not want to balance the budget with new taxes to-day; we will wait and see, if I may quote that expression again, and hope that we shall be able to balance it next year without new taxes. Then, we offer a wide, comprehensive measure of tariff reduction. We offer a substantial increase in the British preference. We offer a reduction aggregating $2,500,000 on one household article, sugar—and if you want to do something to relieve the masses of the people in respect to the commodities that they use, what article could be better chosen than sugar? And we make a proposal —I am glad to find that it was honoured by some hon. gentlemen on the other side—to encourage the business of the Canadian ports. Reduced taxation, then; reduced duty on sugar; increased British preference; tariff improvements; simplification of the sales tax—in all these things, simple, unpretentious as they are, you have the elements of a sound, sensible budget, one which, I am bound to say, will receive and has already received approval from the people of Canada.

I know you can have no budget that will please everybody. I know you cannot make omelettes without breaking eggs. I know that any time you touch the tariff somebody will for the moment think he is hurt. But in all my experience in making budgets I never knew a budget that was characterized by so many evidences of the public favour as have been indicated in the communications which have come to me, as well as by what has appeared in the press. I present this budget to-day as a simple, businesslike transaction, a project of common sense to meet the present situation, and I am sure that it will receive the favourable judgment of the Canadian people.

The House divided on the proposed amendment of Mr. Forke, which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs.

Bancroft,	Hopkins,
Beaubien,	Hudson,
Bird,	Irvine,
Black (Huron),	Jelliff,
Brethen,	Johnston,
Brown,	Kellner,
Caldwell,	Kennedy (Edmonton),
Campbell,	Kennedy (Glengarry & Stormont),
Carmichael,	
Coote,	Kennedy (Port Arthur & Kenora),
Davies,	
Drummond,	King (Huron),
Elliott (Dundas),	Knox,
Elliott (Waterloo),	Leader,
Evans,	Lewis,
Fansher,	Lovie,
Findlay,	Lucas,
Forke,	Macphail,
Gardiner,	McConica,
Garland (Bow River),	McDonald (Timiskaming),
Good,	McMaster,
Gould,	McTaggart,
Halbert,	Millar,
Hoey,	Milne,

Morrison,
Pritchard,
Reed,
Sales,
Shaw,
Speakman,
Spencer,
Steedsman,
Stewart (Humboldt),
Thurston,
Wallace,
Ward,
Warner,
Woods,
Woodsworth—61.

NAYS

Messrs.

Anderson,
Archambault,
Arthurs,
Baldwin,
Baxter,
Béland,
Benoit,
Binette,
Black (Yukon),
Boivin,
Bouchard,
Boucher,
Bourassa,
Bowen,
Boys,
Bristol,
Bureau,
Cahill,
Cannon,
Cardin,
Carroll,
Carruthers,
Casgrain,
Chaplin,
Charters,
Chevrier,
Chew,
Chisholm,
Church,
Clark,
Clifford,
Copp,
d'Anjou,
Déchène,
Delisle,
Denis (Joliette),
Denis (St. Denis),
Desaulniers,
Descoteaux,
Deslauriers,
Desrochers,
Dickie,
Drayton (Sir Henry),
Duff,
Duncan,
Ethier,
Euler,
Fafard,
Fielding,
Finn,
Fontaine,
Forrester,
Fortier,
Fournier,
Garland (Carleton),
Gauvreau,
Gendron,
German,
Gervais,
Gordon,
Gouin (Sir Lomer),
Graham,
Grimmer,
Guthrie,
Hammell,
Hanson,
Harris,
Hatfield,
Healy,
Hocken,
Hubbs,
Hughes,
Humphrey,
Jacobs,
Jones,
Kay,
King (Kootenay),
King, Mackenzie (York),
Kyte,
Ladner,
Laflamme,
Lanctôt,
Lapierre,
Lapointe,
Lavigueur,
Leger,
LeSueur,
Logan,
Lovett,
Low,
Macdonald (Pictou),
MacKelvie,
Mackinnon,
MacLaren,
Maclean (Halifax),
MacLean (Prince, P.E.I.),
Maclean (York),
McBride,
McCrea,
McGiverin,
McIsaac,
McKay,
McKillop,
McMurray,
McQuarrie,
Malcolm,
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Marcile (Bagot),
Marler,
Martell,
Maybee,
Meighen,
Mercier,
Michaud,
Mitchell,
Morin,
Morrissy,
Motherwell,
Munro,
Murdock,
Neill,
Ouimet,
Papineau,
Parent,
Pelletier,
Power,
Preston,
Prevost,
Putnam,
Rankin,
Raymond,
Rhéaume,
Rinfret,
Robb,
Roberge,
Robichaud,
Robinson,
Robitaille,
Ross (Kingston),
Ryckman,
St. Père,
Savard,
Séguin,
Senn,
Sheard,
Simpson,
Sinclair (Oxford),
Sinclair (Queens, P.E.I.),
Spence,
Stansell,
Stewart (Argenteuil),
Stewart (Hamilton),
Stewart (Leeds),
Stork,
Sutherland,
Thompson,
Tobin,
Tolmie,
Vien,
Walsh,
White,
Wilson—162.

PAIRS

(The list of pairs is furnished by the Chief Whips)

Ministerial.	Opposition.
	Messrs.
Hunt,	Ross (Simcoe),

The House divided on the main motion (Mr. Fielding), which was agreed to on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs.

Archambault,
Baldwin,
Béland,
Benoit,
Binette,
Boivin,
Bouchard,
Boucher,
Bourassa,
Bureau,
Cahill,
Cannon,
Cardin,
Carroll,
Carruthers,
Casgrain,
Chevrier,
Chew,
Chisholm,
Clifford,
Copp,
d'Anjou,
Déchène,
Delisle,
Denis (Joliette),
Denis (St. Denis),
Desaulniers,
Descoteaux,
Deslauriers,
Desrochers,
Duff,
Elliott (Waterloo),
Ethier,
Euler,
Fafard,
Fielding,
Finn,
Fontaine,
Forrester,
Fortier,
Fournier,
Gauvreau,
Gendron,
German,
Gervais,
Gordon,
Gouin (Sir Lomer),
Graham,
Hammell,
Hatfield,
Healy,
Hughes,
Humphrey,
Jacobs,
Kay,
King (Kootenay),
King, Mackenzie (York)
Kyte,
Laflamme,
Lanctôt,
Lapierre,
Lapointe,
Lavigueur,
Leger,
Logan,
Lovett,
Low,
Macdonald (Pictou),
MacKinnon,
Maclean (Halifax),
MacLean (Prince, P.E.I.),
McBride,
McGiverin,
McIsaac,
McKay,
McMurray,
Malcolm,
Marcil (Bonaventure)
Marcile (Bagot),
Marler,
Martell,
Mercier,
Michaud,
Morin,
Morrissy,
Motherwell,
Munro,
Murdock,
Neill,
Ouimet,
Papineau,
Parent,

Pelletier,
Prevost,
Putnam,
Rankin,
Raymond,
Rhéaume,
Rinfret,
Robb,
Roberge,
Robichaud,
Robinson,
Robitaille,
St. Père,
Savard,
Séguin,
Sinclair (Oxford),
Sinclair (Queens, P.E.I.),
Stewart (Argenteuil),
Stork,
Tobin,
Vien,
Walsh—114.

NAYS

Messrs.

Anderson,
Arthurs,
Bancroft,
Baxter,
Beaubien,
Bird,
Black (Huron),
Black (Yukon),
Bowen,
Boys,
Brethen,
Bristol,
Brown,
Caldwell,
Campbell,
Carmichael,
Chaplin,
Charters,
Church,
Clark,
Coote,
Davies,
Dickie,
Drayton (Sir Henry),
Drummond,
Duncan,
Elliott (Dundas),
Evans,
Fansher,
Findlay,
Forke,
Gardiner,
Garland (Bow River),
Garland (Carleton),
Good,
Gould,
Grimmer,
Guthrie,
Halbert,
Hanson,
Harris,
Hocken,
Hoey,
Hopkins,
Hubbs,
Hudson,
Irvine,
Jelliff,
Johnston,
Jones,
Kellner,
Kennedy (Edmonton),
Kennedy (Glengarry & Stormont),
Kennedy (Port Arthur & Kenora),
King (Huron),
Knox,
Ladner,
Leader,
LeSueur,
Lewis,
Lovie,
Lucas,
MacKelvie,
MacLaren,
Maclean (York),
Macphail,
McConica,
McDonald (Timiskaming),
McKillop,
McMaster,
McQuarrie,
McTaggart,
Maybee,
Meighen,
Millar,
Milne,
Morrison,
Preston,
Pritchard,
Reed,
Ross (Kingston),
Ryckman,
Sales,
Senn,
Shaw,
Sheard,
Simpson,
Speakman,
Spence,
Spencer,
Stansell,
Steedsman,
Stewart (Hamilton),
Stewart (Humboldt),
Stewart (Leeds),
Sutherland,
Thompson,
Thurston,
Tolmie,
Wallace,
Ward,
Warner,
White,
Wilson,
Woods,
Woodsworth—106.

PAIRS

(The list of pairs is furnished by the Chief Whips)

Ministerial.

Murphy,
Power,
McCrea,
Hunt,
Mitchell,

Opposition.

Messrs.

Porter,
Mewburn,
Stevens,
Ross (Simcoe),
Manion.

[Mr. Fielding.]

Mr. McCREA: Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr POWER: I was paired with the hon. member for East Hamilton (Mr. Mewburn). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

Mr. MITCHELL: I was paired with the hon. member for Fort William and Rainy River (Mr. Manion). Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

The House went into Committee of Ways and Means, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

Mr. FIELDING: There are a number of resolutions in the hands of the committee, but I am quite sure it will not be the desire of the committee to proceed with them to-night I beg to move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the House adjourned at 10.50 p.m., until Friday, May 25.

Friday, May 25, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

FISHERIES—ATLANTIC PROVINCES

MARINE AND FISHERIES COMMITTEE RECOMMEND INVESTIGATION

Mr. WILLIAM DUFF (Lunenburg): I beg to move that the third report of the select standing committee on Marine and Fisheries be concurred in.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): If I recall correctly, the chief subject of this report is a recommendation for another roving commission. If the report is to be concurred in, I ask that it be concurred in on division.

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries): May I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to postpone this motion until next sitting?

Mr. SPEAKER: Of course, this motion was only by unanimous consent, because notice had not been given. Therefore, the matter will stand.

Motion stands.

CANADIAN REPRESENTATIVE AT WASHINGTON

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. S. W. JACOBS (George Etienne Cartier): I should like to direct the attention of the government to a despatch which appeared in the daily press this week to the effect that the delay in naming Canada's envoy at Washington is due to pressure from the Imperial authorities at London. It is stated that this question will be taken up at the forthcoming Imperial Conference at London, and that an interchange of correspondence has taken place between this government and London with respect to the matter. Is the government in a position to give us any information.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): The report is wholly without foundation as respects any one of the features mentioned by my hon. friend.

SOLDIERS' CIVIL RE-ESTABLISHMENT

VANCOUVER EMPLOYEES

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. MURRAY MacLAREN (St John City): I wish to draw the attention of the Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment (Mr. Beland) to an answer that was given in reply to certain questions of mine. I refer the minister to Hansard at page 2297. The first question I asked was:

> Were the services of any men in the employ of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment at Vancouver, British Columbia, dispensed with on or about March 1st, 1923?

The answer to that question was: "No." I have in my hand a communication stating that the following: Captain R. C. Cruit, Captain W. R. Flewin, M.C., Mr. H. Irvine and Mr. W. A. Beattie were given notice and left the service on February 28. They were all married men with dependents; they were of good overseas' service, and, as I state, they were given notice and left the service on February 28. Would the minister be good enough to look into the matter and ascertain if there has not been some inaccuracy in the answer?

Hon. H. S. BELAND (Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment): The answer was prepared by officials of the department. I shall be glad to make an inquiry as to the apparent inaccuracy in the answer given.

BANKRUPTCY ACT AMENDMENT

Sir LOMER GOUIN (Minister of Justice) moved the second reading of Bill No. 139, to amend the Bankruptcy Act.

He said: When introducing the bill I explained the purposes of the amendments. The main amendment is to change the system as to the trustees. Under the present law we have authorized trustees who are appointed by the Governor in Council. We propose to have the trustees chosen by the creditors. Under the present law the debtor assigns to the trustees. We change this system; we propose that a debtor should assign to the creditors. He will assign willingly through an official receiver who will be a judicial officer in one or another of the different provinces, or he will be forced to assign on a petition granted by the court. In either case a custodian will be appointed—by the receiver when the assignment is made willingly, and by the judge on petition. The duties of the custodian are to take charge of the assets of the estate and to call the creditors to appoint the trustee. We propose to amend the law for various reasons, among others for the purpose of authorizing the sale of real estate properties that are subject to hypothec in the province of Quebec in the same mode as we now proceed in that province in connection with sales by the sheriff. Another amendment is to restore to the landlords the privileges which they enjoyed, before the law of 1919, under the legislation of the different provinces. We propose also to provide that the debtor shall not be authorized to propose a composition between his creditors and himself until after the assignment; while another authorizes the official receiver to compel the appearance of the debtor before him for examination in regard to the causes of his assignment, the disposal of his property, and so forth. There are minor amendments, consequent upon the main ones which I have just outlined.

Mr. W. A. BOYS (South Simcoe): In committee I shall probably have more to say than on the present occasion, but I desire to take the opportunity now of making an observation or two upon the proposed amendments. It seems to me that if what the minister suggests is carried out we might just as well go back to the provincial law as it previously obtained in the various provinces. We were getting along fairly well in Ontario, and the only thing we required was a law providing for discharge, which has been the feature of the bankruptcy law, so far as I know. I hold in my hand the act as originally introduced, together with a mass of amendments; now we have a further bill, with another extensive collection of amendments. If the law is to be changed so frequently and extensively it seems to me

we had better revert to the old state of things and let each province deal with the situation as it thinks proper. There is, I think, in every province of Canada a law dealing with assignments and preferences, and if we would in this parliament extend the right to grant discharge—say after publication of notice of application to be made to a county judge, the debtor satisfying the judge that he has dealt honestly with his property—then I do not see why the debtor should not be given an opportunity to start life afresh. But these constant changes, and the mutilation of the act in this manner, are to my mind most undesirable. I do not know whence comes the request for the change; I have heard of none in my own province. We are getting on very well indeed with the act as we had it, with the authorized trustees. I know that a number of them have put up $80 to obtain the security required; in my own county one has recently done so. If this proposed bill goes through they lose that, and while this may appear only a trifling feature it is one worth mentioning. Why should we have the change now suggested? I hope later to ask the minister to explain from what source comes the demand for this startling change in connection with this law. I understand that the act is modelled after the English act, and naturally it would take a little time to get a new law working smoothly. That, however, was being accomplished, and now that we understand the act and the people of the provinces have become acquainted with its provisions and, are applying them with little inconvenience, it is proposed to make these changes. I think if the minister feels that he must do away with the existing system of authorized trustees, it would be just as well to repeal the provisions of the act entirely and pass one giving authority for the discharge of a bankrupt in the manner and upon the grounds I have indicated, leaving the matter in other respects to the various provinces. After all, apart from that feature, is it not a question of property and civil rights? It is a much easier matter to make an amendment to meet the situation in the legislatures, it can be done more quickly and the operation of the act would be less expensive. The stand I feel disposed to take is that if we are going to disturb the law as we have it now and go back to what is practically the old system, we should have recourse to the provincial laws as they obtained in the various provinces. But I certainly do urge that there should be some law giving the right to discharge anyone making an assignment, upon his satisfying, say a county judge. I do not see why a bankrupt should have to go to large cities in a matter of this kind. A county judge is in a position to pass upon the question whether or not a debtor has dealt honestly with his property and should be given his discharge and be allowed once more to do business in his own name. I will reserve any further remarks I have to offer on this matter until the House is in committee on the bill.

Mr. S. W. JACOBS (George Etienne Cartier): I do not understand that these proposed amendments are intended to interfere with the discharge of the bankrupt. As I understand the matter, the provisions proposed relate more to procedure than to anything else, and I gather from a cursory reading of the bill that the amendments now introduced rather strengthen the act in many respects. The substance of the bill appeals to me as being an improvement, with the possible exception of one of the clauses, which restores to the landlord all the rights that he had prior to July 1920, when the act was put into force. I am against the provision in that clause, because I fear that as a result of it the landlord will walk away with the entire assets of the estate.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: They often do.

Mr. JACOBS: In one province, which I know most, the province of Quebec, the privilege of the landlord in some cases extends to twenty-eight months' rent. In a large city like Montreal, where rents are pretty high, we can conceive of cases where a landlord not only will rank as a privileged creditor and walk away with everything, but will be a creditor to a considerable extent even after the entire estate is wound up. Let me read section 2,005 of the Civil Code:

> The privilege of the lessor extends to all rent that is due or to become due under a lease in authentic form.
>
> But in the case of the liquidation of property abandoned by an insolvent trader who has made an abandonment in favour of his creditors, the lessor's privilege is restricted to twelve months' rent due and the rent to become due during the current year if there remain more than four months to complete the year; if there remain less than four months to complete the year, to the twelve months' rent due and to the rent of the current year and the whole of the following year.

That is to say, the landlord would be entitled to sixteen months' accelerated rent and twelve months' past due rent. Where the trader has been paying $1,500 or $2,000 a month rent, this privilege claim will run up to some $40,000 or $50,000 in some cases, whereas the whole estate might not be worth more than $15,000 or $20,000. I think the

minister ought to consider this amendment carefully before finally putting it through, because there is no reason so far as I can see why the landlord should be placed in this exceptional position. The creditors are all more or less in the same boat. A merchant who has sold goods to a trader expects to get paid, otherwise he would not have given him credit, and when the trader makes an assignment this class of creditor ought reasonably to get something out of the wreck, instead of the landlord being given the preference and perhaps gobbling up the entire estate. To my mind it is a relic of feudalism that the property-owner should have everything and the ordinary creditor nothing. In that respect I am opposed to the bill.

I am in favour of the other amendments. I am glad that the rights which a married woman had before the passing of this act are to be restored. Under the act of 1920 a married woman who has advanced money to her husband has no claim whatever against his estate until all the creditors are paid in full, which means that her claim is wiped out. We can easily conceive of a husband in trade who upon becoming financially embarrassed would naturally look to his wife to lend him whatever means she possessed. She would be the very first to whom he would apply for assistance. Simply because she is a married woman she gets absolutely nothing, whereas if she happened to be unmarried or living in concubinage with the debtor she would be entitled to her full rights as an ordinary creditor. I think it was a mistake on the part of this parliament to enact such legislation, and I am glad to see that under the proposed amendments this injustice is removed.

Mr. HANSON: What is the effect of the laws of the province of Quebec with relation to marriage settlements?

Mr. JACOBS: The act wiped out marriage settlements so far as husband and wife are concerned, and these amendments do not propose to restore them. It is only where a wife has advanced money to her husband that she is entitled to rank as an ordinary creditor. This seems to me to be only just and right, and I heartily support the amendment. Another amendment to which I give my entire approval is in regard to fees paid to attorneys and trustees of estates. It was provided that attorneys and trustees should be entitled to not more than five per cent of all the proceeds of the estate; they might get less but not more. A trustee and an attorney might carry a case to the judicial committee of the Privy Council, they might be engaged for five or ten years on work in connection with the estate, but would not be entitled to more than the specified percentage. Under these amendments the inspectors may in writing, with the consent of the judge, fix such fees as they may deem advisable. That seems to be logical. I may say that this particular section of the act was introduced after the bill left this House. The Senate seemed to be so obdurate on the point that it was not thought worth while to insist on the withdrawal of their amendment, and by so doing imperil the passing of the act. I think it is high time that this section was repealed, and I am glad the Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin) has yielded to the requests of those who have studied the act. The measure by its other provisions makes easy of comprehension the more or less complicated verbiage of the act as it was prepared in 1920, and naturally we are all in favour of this simplification. So far as the province of Quebec is concerned I think I can say that in a general way the bill meets with the approval of the entire province, but I am sure the section with regard to the priority of landlords' claims will not meet with the approval of the trading interests throughout Quebec.

Hon. J. B. M. BAXTER (St. John City and Counties of St. John and Albert): Mr. Speaker, the only feature of the act in reference to which I would like to make a few remarks is the change in regard to official receivers. Experience no doubt has convinced the Minister of Justice that the system is not quite satisfactory in some of the provinces. While in the province of New Brunswick recently for about a week, I made inquiry of a number of members of the legal profession and of some business men who come very closely in contact with the working of the act. I do not pretend that I interviewed everybody, but those I canvassed were unanimous in supporting the present system.

Mr. VIEN: Which province did the hon. member refer to?

Mr. BAXTER: New Brunswick. My inquiry was confined really to the people in the city of St. John; I do not pretend to have got information outside. But I am quite convinced that the business men and lawyers there are better satisfied with the law as in force at present than with the system under the Assignments and Preferences Act—provincial legislation—which used to be administered. Under

the proposed amendments there is practically a direction to appoint the chief creditor as trustee. Under certain circumstances this system might work out very badly, for the chief creditor might arrange to realize the estate in such a way that perhaps the general creditors would not fully benefit.

Mr. JACOBS: The chief creditor only acts as official guardian until the trustee is named.

Mr. BAXTER: There is rather an indication that his appointment is to be permanent. Under the old Assignments and Preferences Act the chief creditor was very often a big wholesale house which practically dominated the whole administration of the estate. All I want to say is that the Canadian Credit Men's Association, which has organized itself as a trustee, has the confidence of the business world of New Brunswick, and the few others who have been appointed there as official receivers also have the confidence of the public. In the case of any new law the people require to become adapted to it. In the province of New Brunswick we have virtually a body of officials who have become, to a reasonable extent, expert in the administration of insolvent estates. Under the system now proposed there is no necessary filling of the official position by the same person. In other words, if A becomes insolvent X may be the official receiver, while if C becomes insolvent Y may administer his estate, and so on. We think it is better to have a few corporations or individuals designated for this purpose who have acquired a knowledge of, and consequently are much more expert in dealing with, the ordinary problems that arise in respect to insolvency, and we prefer these experts to a procession of untutored men. I do not want to oppose the change if the Minister of Justice is convinced that it is advisable, as I am sure he must be convinced of its necessity in certain provinces; but I would ask him to confine its operation to those provinces where he has found the need for it, and to let the other provinces alone where the present system is working well to-day. Surely that can be arranged. While the plan seems to be that more responsibility is to be placed on the clerks of the Circuit Courts, I do not know that the Minister of Justice or anyone advising him has made any sort of inspection of those clerks in my province. They are all very admirable gentlemen, but I trust, in regard to some of them, that no very onerous burdens will be imposed upon them. Some of them would fail in performing the simplest official act—and to say that is not to reflect at all upon their honour or their credit; it is simply a question of ability. I am not favourably impressed with the idea of the attaching of federal bankruptcy provisions to the existing assignments and Preferences Acts in the provinces, because I do not see how you would be able efficiently to deal with an estate which was in more than one province. That is the value of the bankruptcy law, and I do not think we ought to detract from that value. I would ask the Minister of Justice to consider carefully the advisability of leaving as it is the present machinery in the provinces where it is working efficiently, and where the suggested change would not be as good. The changes should be confined to the districts from which complaint may have come.

Mr. W. F. CARROLL (Cape Breton South and Richmond): Mr. Speaker, the intention of the Bankruptcy Act as passed by this parliament was, I believe, that there should be a uniform law throughout Canada. If the proposals of the hon. member for St. John City (Mr. Baxter), who is a good lawyer of considerable experience, were put into effect the bankruptcy law would be anything but uniform.

Mr. BAXTER: The principle would not be altered.

Mr. CARROLL: No, but the procedure under which the bankruptcy act was enforced would not be uniform. In regard to the point raised by the hon. member for George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs), I would point out that the law respecting rentals under bankruptcy or assignments in the province of Quebec is different from the law in the other provinces. Speaking for my own province, I would say offhand that the very best a landlord may get when an assignment is made is three months' rent, which is equivalent, I think, to a notice that when assignment is made the occupant of the premises must get out in three months.

Mr. BOYS: One year in Ontario.

Mr. CARROLL: Yes,—unless indeed, the premises are used by the assignee or the trustee for the purpose of selling the goods, and so on. In view of the circumstances that might arise, and that in fact do arise every day in connection with bankruptcy or assignment cases, where the creditors are from different provinces and people from different provinces are interested in the estate, I think the minister should make the law as regards the rights of landlords in bankruptcy cases uniform over all Canada.

With reference to the matter of trustees in bankruptcy, there have been numerous complaints from Nova Scotia. I do not know

how well founded these complaints are; while I do some little practice of law there when I am not in parliament, I have had no considerable experience under the new Bankruptcy Act aside from giving an opinion occasionally—that is, I have never followed a bankrupt through the bankruptcy courts. But the situation was this. Trustees from all over Canada had jurisdiction in all parts of the country under the act, and the complaint was that gentlemen from other cities —I am not going to mention the particular cities—would come down to Nova Scotia and actually induce persons who were in more or less shaky circumstances financially to make an assignment or to take proceedings under the Bankruptcy Act.

Mr. VIEN: May I ask my hon. friend whether there are any trustees in his own province doing this same thing?

Mr. CARROLL: Oh, I am not talking about that. If they are doing the same thing they are certainly doing something that is unquestionably wrong.

Mr. VIEN: My hon. friend did not catch the purpose of my question. In the province of Quebec we have just such a condition, and we protest against it. I made the inquiry of my hon. friend in order that I might learn from him whether such a grievance existed in his own province.

Mr. CARROLL: That is, whether or not trustees from Nova Scotia went into other provinces?

Mr. VIEN: Not only that, but that they indulged in the practice of inducing debtors to go into bankruptcy.

Mr. CARROLL: That is, in our province?

Mr. VIEN: Yes.

Mr. CARROLL: Well, I did not make the statement, but I think I can fairly say now that such has been done. If my hon. friend wants to find out what is the concern to which I have reference, I will tell him; it is the Credit Men's Association of the city of Montreal. Now, they are not here to defend themselves, and I am simply saying that the charge has been levelled against them that they have come into Nova Scotia and induced people there who are a little shaky financially to make an assignment under the Bankruptcy Act. I have no doubt in the world that the people of my province are not one iota better in that regard than this particular association to which I have referred. In Nova Scotia the official receiver under the act would be the prothonotary of the Supreme Court, or perhaps in some instances, as in New Brunswick, the clerk of the county court. But it does not take one very long to become acquainted with the general principles of the Bankruptcy Act. The assignees or trustees who were appointed after 1919 were, of necessity, novices in that kind of work, but they benefited by their experience and, if they had any brains, became, as a rule, expert. I would point out to the hon. member for St. John City that the receiver in the first instance, namely, the prothonotary of the Supreme Court or the clerk of the county court, will have, as I understand the act—and I have not studied it very thoroughly—very little to do. A meeting of the creditors is called; they appoint some person, one of themselves or someone else who is competent, to become the guardian of the estate.

Mr. BAXTER: They are only formal custodians.

Mr. CARROLL: So that no very onerous task would be imposed on the prothonotary of the Supreme Court or the clerk of the county court. I have no further suggestions to offer; in fact, I would not have arisen had not the hon. member for George Etienne Cartier brought up the question of rentals. I would ask the minister to take into his serious consideration the advisability of making this phase of bankruptcy—the matter of rentals, uniform all over the country.

Mr. R. B. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I have given this proposed amendment of the Bankruptcy Act some consideration; during the interim between last session and this I had occasion to act in a number of bankruptcy cases in my own province. I should like to say first of all that except for one thing, to which I shall advert later, the act has given very general satisfaction in New Brunswick. I believe in the principle involved in the act, that of giving a debtor his discharge so that he may start over again. It would be a great pity indeed if that outstanding feature of the act were wiped out, and I am glad there is no suggestion of that kind in this bill.

With regard to the outstanding substantive feature of the bill as introduced by the Minister of Justice, namely, the change in the claim of the landlord to the estate, I think that ought to be opposed very, very strenuously. Under the old Assignment Act in the province of New Brunswick, and I think it is true of nearly all the provinces, only three months' rent could be taken by the landlord,

and if the law is changed as proposed by this bill and this provision would be in suspense while this act is in force, in my humble opinion in the province of New Brunswick there would be no limitation on the rights of the landlord. It would depend entirely on what might be contained in this bill and the terms of the lease. The lease might have ten years to run, and I know of no reason why the landlord in that event should not collect the full rent out of the estate. Of course, I know I am putting an extreme case, but anyone can see at a glance that that would be a very wrong state of affairs. If three months is too short make it six months, or a year, but do not leave it as long as is suggested by the civil code of Quebec, which is apparently what has actuated the hon. minister in regard to this matter. That would put the ordinary, unsecured creditors at a very great disadvantage. After all, they are the people whom we should look after, they have given credit. The landlord is always in a secured position, and I suppose he always will be. I suppose it will be necessary that he should have some priority and preference over the ordinary creditor; otherwise rents would have to be guaranteed and premises would not be secured easily, but at the same time there is danger of going to the other extreme, and I would suggest that the minister devise some happy medium and make it applicable to the whole Dominion.

Mr. CANNON: Does my hon. friend contend that section 27 of the present bill would make the laws of the province of Quebec concerning lessor and lessee applicable in New Brunswick?

Mr. HANSON: No, I do not say it would. I did not argue that for a moment, but I would say this to my learned friend. From what I gather from the reading of the article in the civil code by the hon. member for George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs), I think it gives the landlord a very great preference, and one that I personally do not wish him to have. In the province of New Brunswick it would revert, of course, under this section to the old act where the provision was three months, and in the province of Ontario a year, and in some other places eighteen months, all of which is undesirable to say the least. I think there should be uniformity.

The chief objection to the Bankruptcy Act in the province of New Brunswick is not with reference to the principle involved at all. It is not with respect to the personnel of the authorized trustees. We are a small province down there, and business is comparatively small having reference to, say, Toronto and Montreal. The estates of bankrupts are small, and the complaint I have found among creditors and others in the province of New Brunswick is in relation to the costs and expenses. I think it has been little better than a scandal the expenses that have been incurred and the fees that have been paid to solicitors out of some of the estates. I happen to know of a few cases in my own office, and there was one where I felt constrained to admonish my junior with respect to the size of the bills he got taxed by the registrar. They have been altogether too large having regard to the character of the business; I will be perfectly frank about it. I could give you a case in point, where there was a contest with respect to an alleged preferred claim. An ex parte order was made by the judge of the bankruptcy court to set the case down for trial, and when the bill of costs came out, the solicitor got a fee of $80 for going to St. John and back and getting the ex parte order setting the case down for trial. The judge ruled that he was entitled to $30 as solicitor, and a counsel fee of $50, which was absolutely absurd. It tends to bring the act into disrepute and gobble up the whole estate. There was a contest over this case, ending in a drawn battle, each side winning one of two points. The costs involved were over $800, and the amount in dispute was less than $500. The creditor class do object to the size of the costs, and I wish the minister to give some heed to what I am saying in that regard with relation to small estates. The cases I have in mind will never get to the Privy Council, and I think the act would be received with a great deal better grace if there was a real limitation on the amount payable to authorized trustees or the trustees as proposed here, and to the solicitor.

Mr. JACOBS: Might I point out that these amendments make provision for a case of that kind?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I think I should point out to hon. members that on the second reading of the bill only the principle is discussed. I see that the hon. Minister of Justice is by this bill introducing several amendments to the Bankruptcy Act. When the motion for the second reading was made it was carried, but as the Minister of Justice thought proper to give a brief explanation the debate continued, and now on both sides hon. members are discussing various features of the bill. Would it not be better to go into committee of the whole and there take up these amendments one by one?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. SPEAKER: Then the motion is carried.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON (West York): Before the motion is formally carried I would ask my hon. friend the minister to give us the usual assurance we get on second readings in a case of this kind. I quite realize that we would make much better progress in committee, but we do not wish to be told in committee that any objection we might raise is a matter of principle that should have been raised in the House; so I would ask that if the second reading now carries, it be on the understanding that we have the right to raise in committee any matter of principle that we desire.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time, and the House went into committee on the bill, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

On section 1—Short title.

Mr. DENIS (Joliette): Before this clause carries I wish to make some remarks which I was just in the way of making when the second reading was called "Carried" by Mr. Speaker, as he did not happen to see me rise. A few weeks ago we had a debate in this House on the motion of the hon, member for Charlevoix-Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) asking that this act be repealed altogether. The debate was carried on to a very large extent by members from the province of Quebec from which I come, and I feel safe in saying that it was the opinion of a very large majority of those members, in fact the almost unanimous opinion, that the Bankruptcy Act should be repealed. Moreover objection to the act was expressed by various hon. members opposite. As a result of those opinions the Minister of Justice said he would give his very best attention to what had been said, and that some measure would be introduced in the course of the present session, which would give better effect to the wish of the House as expressed at that time.

To-day I was particularly pleased to hear the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Boys) suggest to the government that the Bankruptcy Act should be repealed in toto, provided some provision was made in the law to allow the debtor his discharge such as now exists, under the Bankruptcy Act. In other words, if I understood the hon. member for South Simcoe rightly, in the event of there being a provision enacted by which a debtor could be discharged, just as he can now be discharged under the Bankruptcy Act, he would favour the repeal of the whole act. I emphatically endorse that proposition. When the debate took place on the motion of the hon. member for Charlevoix-Montmorency, I was one of those who protested very strongly against the Bankruptcy Act and asked for its repeal I do not intend at this moment repeating what I said on that occasion, much less repeating the arguments of hon. members who took the same stand as I did. Be it sufficient for me to say that the provincial legislature, no later than December last passed a resolution declaring that the Bankruptcy Act was not in the interest of the province of Quebec, and expressing the opinion that it should be repealed. That is a declaration from the highest tribunal in the province of Quebec, and I may add that 95 per cent of the citizens of our province would favour the repeal of the act. As to having a provision in the law under which the debtor could be discharged under the same conditions as the present, I have not the least objection; I very strongly support the hon. member for South Simcoe when he asks that the Bankruptcy Act should be repealed subject to the retention of a clause such as referred to.

Mr. MERCIER: There is no proposition of that kind before the House just now.

Mr. DENIS (Joliette): It is true, the hon. member did not make a formal motion to that effect, but I gathered that to be the effect of his argument. I repeat, there is a good deal in what the hon. member for South Simcoe said and I think the Minister of Justice should give heed to it, especially when it represents the opinion of ninety-five per cent of the citizens of my province.

Mr. BOYS: I think I had better make a little explanation. I do not know that I went quite as far as has been suggested. What I said was that if the present idea of having authorized trustees was abandoned and we were to revert to the system of candidates, so to speak, on the part of large creditors—for that is what it would amount to—we might as well get back to the former provincial practice as set out in the various provincial acts. My experience has been this. An assignment in the past was made to some individual; it could be made to anyone, it could be made to an office boy for that matter. A meeting of creditors was held. The creditors organized themselves, and in the large cities we know perfectly well that there are cliques each with their pet trustee. They came there supporting their pet trustee, and finally one side won out. Instead of having what should be, in my opinion, more or less of a judicial officer in the position of trustee,

you had the successful candidate of certain interests in the larger cities. There might be forty or fifty local creditors but their claims were small. One or two large creditors in the cities controlled the situation, changed the trustee, or assignee as he was called
4 p.m. before, and appointed their choice. He might be a perfectly honest man, but it goes without saying that his tendencies would be to do what he could for those who secured the office for him. What I said was, that if we are going to depart from the system we have at the present time of having an authorized trustee—who is a man appointed by the department and who has to give substantial security—we might as well go further and return to the provincial idea. For the whole county of Simcoe, so far as I know—and it is a very large county, large in territory and very large in population, the people numbering over 90,000—I think there are only two trustees. They are both men of excellent standing in the county, they have given security, and they are doing their work well. If you are going to destroy that system entirely it seems to me—the Minister of Justice shakes his head but I certainly thought—

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I say that in fact they will not be abolished, because if they have such experience they will be elected by the creditors.

Mr. BOYS: With the greatest possible respect to the views of the minister—and I would like to say that I do have very high respect for his opinion so far as I have heard it expressed in this House—I do not think the matter will work out that way at all; it has not during my thirty years' experience at the bar in my own province. I repeat, I believe you will find you will get back to the system of "candidates," just as I have mentioned, and that the creditors controlling the meeting—which means the largest creditors—will change the assignee as appointed by the debtor and elect one of their own choice. Now, you do not, in my opinion, get a man who could for a moment fill the position of an independent judicial officer under those conditions. I want the committee to understand that I do not oppose the present system at all, but I say if you are going back to the system suggested in the bill now before us you are practically returning to the provincial system. If you are going back to the provincial system you may just as well go the whole distance and let the laws of the various provinces govern. I think the hon. member for George Etienne Cartier misunderstood me in that connection. I would much sooner see the law as it exists at present maintained—

Mr. JACOBS: I think it was the hon. member for Joliette (Mr. Denis) who misunderstood my hon. friend.

Mr. BOYS: I gathered from your remarks that you thought I had made some reference to the trustees, and advocated the repeal of the act, but perhaps I was mistaken.

Mr. JACOBS: It was the hon. member for Joliette.

Mr. BOYS: Perhaps I am mistaken. My position is this: If we can retain the authorized trustees, let us do so. If we have too many, they are not appointed for life and good conduct, and the services of some of them may be dispensed with. That might be unpleasant; but it can be done, and we should get capable men.

As regards the landlord and his preference, this is not an appropriate time to discuss that subject, and when we come to it I may have something to say, as there seems to be a difference of opinion as regards landlords and preferential claims. In Ontario, I understand a landlord has a preference for one year's rent as regards the past. I was not speaking of the future at all.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: My hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Boys) seems to be surprised at the fact that the law of 1919 is amended, and that we have these amendments this year. I must tell him that this is not new. The United States had been working for a century and a half before they arrived at their present bankruptcy law. We have been doing the same thing for nearly one hundred years. It is not because we now propose to make a change in the system of appointing trustees, that we should say that this is so radical an amendment that we would be justified in repealing the whole act. I may be in error, but it seems to me that the majority of the people of Canada are in favour of a bankruptcy act. I know the province of Quebec is opposed to it.

Mr. BOYS: So am I in favour of a bankruptcy act.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: But the majority seem to be in favour of it. My hon. friend says that we should not change the system of appointing trustees; that we have authorized trustees, and if we proceed in the way in which we now propose, many of the best men who have acquired experience under the present law will be deprived of the op-

portunity of continuing to practise their profession. He says that the system by which the trustee is chosen by the debtor is preferable. It seems to me that the creditors should have more to say than the debtor in the choice of the trustee who is to liquidate the estate. If my hon. friend looks over the situation in the various English-speaking countries, I do not think he will find anywhere else in the world a country which has such a system as we have to-day of authorized trustees, where the debtor is the judge as to the choice of the trustee. We now propose to adopt the English system, we propose to adopt the American system, and to say that the creditors who are most interested are those who should have the first and last say in the election or choice of the trustee.

Mr. CLARK: Is it not a fact that the creditors have it in their power to remove the authorized trustee at any time after appointment? Does that not give the creditors the control to which they are entitled, and which is all that is necessary?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: They can do that for cause; but if it is good to give them such a right, why not give it to them at the start? That would not dispose of the objection raised by the hon. member for South Simcoe.

Mr. HANSON: The difficulty with the present modus operandi is this. You appoint in a locality an official called the custodian. He is only a locum tenens after all. While a meeting of the creditors is being arranged for, I think it will be found that the estate will be gradually disappearing; that these officials will not act as the authorized trustees act to-day. The minute a petition is filed with the authorized trustee, he takes control of the estate and he takes all steps necessary to protect the assets, pending the first meeting of the creditors. When the meeting of the creditors is held, it not infrequently happens that the creditors exercise their right under the act and change the authorized trustee. But the estate has been preserved in the meantime by a man who is responsible.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: It has been so well preserved that, in many cases, if not in most cases, there has been nothing left for the creditors. We want to put a stop to that.

Mr. BOYS: Does the minister, in making that statement, refer to Canada as a whole or only to certain parts of Canada?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: To many of the interests.

Mr. BOYS: I wish to say that, in my experience, that is absolutely not the case at all. The work of the trustees with whom I have had something to do, has been very satisfactory and the charges have not been excessive.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I congratulate my hon. friend who is most fortunate, and I am sure, as I have said before, that his trustees will continue to exercise their profession in the future, because the creditors will confide to them all the different estates which may have to be entrusted to trustees.

The hon. member for St. John City (Mr. Baxter) raised an objection to the amendment that we propose regarding the custodian. He said that he objects to the choice of one of the largest creditors, because in most cases that creditor would be appointed trustee. It is very seldom that creditors are appointed trustees. I remember that in Quebec, under the law we had, we had regular professionals as trustees. We had not a very large number of them. They got to be known by the merchants, by the manufacturers, and in the large centres they were, in most cases, the same. Creditors were never appointed trustees,and I have reason to believe that under this law, what has happened in the past will happen in the future.

I understood some hon. members to say that the Credit Men's Associations disapproved of these amendments. From what I have heard and read of them, I find that they all approve the amendments. We have received resolutions of approval from the Manufacturers' Association of Canada, and from many boards of trades and different associations in Canada. This bill, which has been on the order paper for two or three weeks, has been considered by the whole population of Canada, and I gather from opinions that I have received that the amendments are generally approved.

As to the question of the rights of landlords, all we wish to do in suggesting amendments to the present law, is, first of all, to make it constitutional. It is all very well to say that in such and such a province the preference is too large in favour of the landlords; it is all very well to say that the laws of the provinces are different; but in amending our statutes, we must take into consideration our constitution. If we were to make a special section or clause which would make the law uniform for the whole Dominion, and if we were to find afterwards that such a section or clause was not in accordance with the British North America Act, we would have to amend our

statute once more. I am told that at this moment an action is pending before a court in one of the provinces of the Dominion, and the parties have been told that the judge will decide that our section 52 is unconstitutional. Is it not preferable to leave it to the provinces to decide as to the privileges they wish to extend to the landlords? The adoption of our amendment, which provides that the privileges of the landlord shall be controlled by the provincial laws in force in 1920 in the various provinces, would not deprive any province of the right to amend its own laws to meet its own views. If it is found that the province of Quebec, for example, gives too much to the landlords, the business men or any of the electors of that province might very well wait upon the provincial government and request that the law, which my hon. friend (Mr. Jacobs) seems to think is so bad, be amended to provide that in future the privilege accorded the landlords should not extend to more than 26 or 28 months, or 16 months, or whatever might be deemed best. It would be quite simple for the people of Quebec to have their law amended if they considered it unjust; and if the privilege of the landlord is not considered enough in any of the other provinces, it is equally competent for them to amend their statutes. What I wish to insist upon is that in regard to the question of the privileges of the landlord, the important consideration is that whatever legislation we pass shall be constitutional, and unless we are perfectly certain that we can legislate without infringing upon any rights of the provinces in this particular we ought to be exceedingly careful. If we cannot pass a provision, in regard to this question of the privileges of landlords, that shall be uniform, and equally satisfactory and acceptable to every province, I think it is preferable for us to take the course that is now proposed, so that the provincial laws which are now in existence or which may be enacted in the future shall govern the rights of the landlords.

Mr. CARROLL: That would necessitate an amendment to section 51A of the act?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Yes. On this point I am prepared to receive the suggestions of the committee, and if there is offered anything that is better than what we propose I am ready to consider it.

Mr. CANNON: My hon. friend from Joliette (Mr. Denis) mentioned anterior debates in this matter. I do not wish to reopen the discussion, but before entering upon a consideration of the details of the various amendments I would offer some general observations to the committee on the law itself. I fully agree with the majority of hon. members from my own province who have suggested in this House the entire repeal of the Bankruptcy Act. I do not desire to criticize the operation of the law outside the province of Quebec. Evidently, in view of the expressions of opinion of other hon. members in the House, the Bankruptcy Act operates rather favourably and satisfactorily in the other provinces. In the province of Quebec it has not given satisfaction.

Mr. JACOBS: Why?

Mr. CANNON: Before the bankruptcy law of 1919 was passed we had a very simple, economical law under our code of civil procedure, which was known as the voluntary abandonment of property. The people were satisfied with the operation of that law, and whatever changes were brought about by the Bankruptcy Act certainly did not meet with the approval of the majority of the people in our province. My hon. friend (Mr. Jacobs) has just inquired why the people of Quebec were not satisfied with the act of 1919. I can answer that question briefly. The reasons for this dissatisfaction were principally these three: First, the authorized trustees were appointed by the government in too large a number. We had in our province, in the large centres like Montreal and Quebec, accountants who had given entire satisfaction to the people, and who had been handling estates under our own abandonment of property law; and when the 1919 act was passed and put into force a greater number of trustees than necessary were appointed. The result was that while on the one hand we had large, prosperous and trusted firms who could handle estates in a satisfactory manner, there were on the other hand a whole lot of trustees who had for the most part been appointed through political pull, who had no experience, and who began to make a living by inducing people to go into bankruptcy. This evil has been considerable in the cities, but it has been widespread in the country. Farmers who had always met their liabilities with the merchants and with the banks, who never had any serious financial troubles, were told by these trustees that if they went into bankruptcy their debts would be wiped out, their financial liabilities would disappear, and they could start all over again. The farmers were deceived and a large number of them went into voluntary assignment. The trustees made a whole lot of money, the farmers lost the little they had, and their credit has naturally diminished in consequence. The re-

sult of the appointment of these unnecessary trustees under the 1919 law was most disastrous in our rural centres. The second reason is that the officials under the law, that is to say, the court officials who were supposed to conduct the proceedings under the Bankruptcy Act, were under the control of nobody. They were not provincial officials; they were not federal officials; they were not under the authority of any judge. Although exercising functions of the widest importance, they were subject to the supervision of no one.

Mr. HANSON: Were the registrars not under the supervision of the judges?

Mr. CANNON: If my hon. and learned friend will examine the law he will see that while the judge has certain functions the official registrar also has distinct functions altogether beyond the judge's control. Let me give an example. In one of our judicial districts a minor official whose duties were solely to affix stamps to judicial proceedings became the registrar. Now this minor official has for years exercised functions of the highest character and is drawing tremendous fees without being controlled by anybody, and whoever attempts to control him is told very politely that "it is none of his business."

Mr. JACOBS: May I be permitted to point out that under the law passed last year he becomes an official of the provincial department?

Mr. CANNON: We had another example in the city of Montreal. The registrar under the Bankruptcy Act, when he received instructions from the attorney general of the province to follow a certain line of conduct, told the attorney general that "he had nothing to do with it." This is a notorious fact.

Mr. JACOBS: But he ended up by following the instructions of the attorney general.

Mr. CANNON: He may have changed his attitude. But that is the condition of things in the province of Quebec: first, too many trustees; second, officials under nobody's control; and third, the Civil Code put aside and mortgagees treated as ordinary unsecured creditors. Therefore there is throughout the province a general feeling of dissatisfaction with the act.

Mr. CARROLL: Does my hon. friend mean to say that under the Bankruptcy Act a mortgage would not be a preferred claim in the province of Quebec?

Mr. CANNON: Not unless it fell within the provisions of, I think, Section 32.

Mr. CARROLL: The three months?

Mr. CANNON: Yes. I do not wish to repeat the arguments which were brought forward this afternoon, but there is also the question of the married woman's rights being put aside. One of the hon. gentlemen opposite mentioned the desirability of having a uniform law throughout Canada, especially as concerns federal matters. We all agree on this point. But this uniformity, if it is to meet with the approval of the people, must be of such a nature that it does not take away privileges which have been guaranteed to any province by the British North America Act or by existing treaties. We have in the province of Quebec privileges concerning our civil laws which are considered, and rightly so, as the most sacred heritage received from our forefathers. We are justly proud of our French laws. These laws have their source, as everybody knows, in the greatest work of the highest legal minds—Pothier and others. We have in the province of Quebec laws handed down to us from la coutume de Paris, and we have our civil laws which are a reproduction of the Code Napoleon. We wish to follow in federal matters the same laws as the other provinces, but we ask the federal government, when it deals with matters of this sort, to be always careful not to lay a hand on the sacred heritage which we treasure and which we want to retain as complete and as intact as it was left to us.

I observe with pleasure that the amendments brought forward by the Minister of Justice meet to a large extent the three inconveniences which I have indicated. Trustees are now to be chosen by the creditors. Those who are good will continue in business; those who are simply trying to live by deceiving people and leading them into bankruptcy will have no more business, and so this evil will disappear. As to officials under the Bankruptcy Act, if there was no control before, I see with pleasure that, should these amendments be adopted, these officials in our provinces will be under the immediate control of our prothonotaries.

As to our civil rights, I see by the amendments that they are restored in great measure. There is, I think, misapprehension in this House as to the right of the federal government to encroach on the civil rights of the provinces. Bankruptcy is within the scope of federal legislation according to the British North America Act. If we have a right to

legislate on bankruptcy we should exercise the right, but only encroach on provincial rights whenever we have to enact something which is an essential incident to our own law. What are the essentials of a bankruptcy act? First, to take over the property of a debtor; secondly, to realize the assets of that debtor; and, thirdly, to distribute the proceeds. These are the essentials.

Mr. JACOBS: What about the discharge of the bankrupt?

Mr. CANNON: I do not think it is essential. But even if it were, supposing we have, then, four essentials, cannot this parliament enact a complete bankruptcy law to meet these four essentials without laying a hand on the civil laws of the province of Quebec?

Mr. CARROLL: Does my hon. friend think that uniformity should attach to all federal laws?

Mr. CANNON: Certainly, provided the rights of the provinces are safeguarded. Let us legislate in bankruptcy matters in order to meet four, or three, requisites of a bankruptcy act. But I say we can do so without in any shape or form encroaching on the civil rights of any province. I am pleased that the Minister of Justice who is in charge of this legislation belongs to the school of those who believe that the provinces are not merely adjuncts of this federal parliament, but that they are just as powerful and sovereign within their own jurisdiction as the federal parliament is.

Mr. HANSON: You did not say so the other night.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Yes, I did.

Mr. CANNON: We have had in Canada a long fight between successive Ministers of Justice and the attorneys general of the different provinces, and I hope, notwithstanding what my hon. friend opposite may say, that the Minister of Justice will continue the tradition of Sir Oliver Mowat and others and will never, after having been Premier of Quebec, endorse as Minister of Justice the policy that would make the federal power superior to the provincial.

I have read the amendments and am sorry to see that the Minister of Justice has brought forward nothing to cover the punishment of offences under the Bankruptcy Act. Under sections 92 and 93 all such offences are indictable offences; but the Criminal Code has not been amended to meet the provisions of the Bankruptcy Act, and therefore it is impossible for a man accused of an offence under the act to have either a summary or speedy trial. Very often these offences are of such a nature that they could be tried summarily or speedily, especially in rural centres where criminal terms are held only once a year, sometimes only one every two years. Before this bill passes I hope the Minister of Justice will see to it that amendments are prepared by his officials to meet this condition.

Mr. JACOBS: I would point out to my hon. friend that cases under section 417 of the Criminal Code—offences against bankruptcy—are now handled speedily in the district of Montreal under the Speedy Trials Act.

Mr. CANNON: When was the amendment introduced?

Mr. JACOBS: It has been the law for the last thirty years.

Mr. CANNON: My hon. friend may think it is the law, but I doubt whether a provision enacted thirty years ago would have effect in the legislation of 1919, which repealed the old law.

Mr. JACOBS: The section of the code to which I refer—I think it is 417—says that the court may handle offences under the Bankruptcy Act. Under that act we have sent to prison quite a large number of traders in Montreal. I trust they will not take this hint from my hon. friend to apply for habeas corpus.

Mr. CANNON: I know I have had occasion as Crown prosecutor to discuss the matter before our judges of the Sessions of the Peace, and they have come to the conclusion that they had no jurisdiction. The Criminal Code was passed when there was no Bankruptcy Act.

Mr. CARROLL: My hon. friend will remember that the Criminal Code gives jurisdiction in all criminal cases except certain matters, and if it does not except bankruptcy, the courts have the power to try cases under the Bankruptcy Act.

Mr. CANNON: I attach great value to the opinion of my two learned friends, and I hope they are right. But I direct the matter to the minister's attention in view of the fact that it was decided altogether differently by our judges in Quebec, and that very recently.

I support most heartily the amendments which are offered, and I hope this is only the first step in the right direction. If we cannot obtain a complete repeal of the law, I trust that it will be amended in such a way as

to cause most of the present inconveniences and disadvantages to disappear.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: In the first place, I want to commend the member for Dorchester (Mr. Cannon) upon the study he has given to this question and also to congratulate him upon his sudden, violent, and, I hope, permanent, conversion to the recognition of provincial rights. During this same session we witnessed an absolute disallowance, a flouting, a complete disregard of provincial rights in the case of a Nova Scotia statute, and it is both refreshing and interesting to see the good that discussion has done and the converts it has already made.

Mr. JACOBS: May I point out that desperate diseases require desperate remedies?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Apparently the disease looked so bad that the remedy, which is best illustrated by that frame of mind which grants to the provinces their rights and acknowledges their jurisdiction, has already happily been established just where it was most needed. I agree that there are difficulties in Quebec. I do not personally know anything about them, but so many hon. gentlemen have said they exist that I am sure they do. I have no doubt that too many trustees were appointed in the very first instance, as my hon. friend says. The former government appointed 182 trustees for Quebec—a larger number than had been appointed for any other province. In that list were included all the accountants and all the gentlemen the hon. member referred to as having done business before, and it included also a lot of others. But even at that, apparently it was not large enough, because the new government promptly appointed 66 more, so that we had a total of 248 in that province. Revocations in the case of people not putting up their security reduced the number by 39. I am frank to say that 209 trustees for Quebec are altogether too many. I suggest that the minister consider the advisability of recognizing that fact and of putting Quebec upon a more reasonable basis in that respect. He will have no difficulty in finding out where the troubles are or in getting the act on a working basis in that province, because so far as I am aware it is on a working basis everywhere else. Would it not be better to make an honest attempt to improve matters in the province of Quebec by cutting down the number of trustees, getting it back to what the situation was before the legislation was introduced? Would it not be better to do that than to upset every other province with the idea of helping a comparatively small matter of regulation or administration in Quebec? I recall very well the old days when assignments were plentiful when there were many commercial and law firms specializing in assignments, firms which had their representatives here, there and everywhere. We remember that certain gentlemen who could be named by the practitioners in almost every town and who specialized in that kind of work always had a little valise packed in their office in order that they might take the first train out where there was a chance of getting an assignment. We all recollect the fights that used to be worked up, the money that was spent, and the indirect preferences that resulted. Is it wise to go back to that condition? For that is what we are doing. Again, is this thing not costing enough money as it is? Why should any unnecessary interest be brought into the matter? I am very much in sympathy with my hon. friend from the province of Quebec when he speaks about junior officials having large powers—and we propose to increase those powers; we are aggravating the evil he complains of. It is the first step that is important in matters of bankruptcy and assignment; the great thing is to get in quickly and see that the right thing is done at the right time. Well, we are now saying that the person who is to take the first steps is the class of official that my hon. friend from Quebec has spoken about.

Mr. CANNON: My hon. friend is under a misapprehension as to the word "custodian." In our province, under these amendments, the prothonotary, the chief official of the Superior Court, will be the one who will control the operation of the act. We are satisfied with that. Before, he had no authority.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not know how it is in Quebec, and I will take my hon. friend's statement for that at once, but in Ontario we have the local registrar everywhere. The vast majority of these gentlemen have never had the slightest amount of commercial experience, absolutely none. Very many of them have very little experience of the ways of the world or anything else outside of the town where they may have had a practice and subsequently received the appointment, and many of them have never practised at all. Yet it is to gentlemen of that experience that estates are now to be given, just at a time when decisive action is the most necessary. Is that a good thing?

Again, in order to protect—I do not know why we have this other feature brought in—but in order to protect the estate—I do not

know whether it is to protect it from these registrars or what the real idea is—we are to have a custodian. There is another place of possible conflict and possible loss. But why, if the registrar is good enough to take hold of this thing in the first instance, cannot you trust him with the problems? Or is it really necessary to have a second set of costs besides the registrar's set of costs? You have the custodian's set of costs, and you have not finished then, because you must go further and have your election and finally find out who the trustee is to be. Mr. Chairman, as we are running it in Ontario—I do not know how it will be in other provinces—the result is simply this: You are going to have three sets of law costs in any event, and we do not know how serious they will be or how far this thing will go. The opportunity is there. You have the opportunity in the first instance with the registrar. He will have somebody to look after him, to steer him. Then you have the debtor, and the debtor usually has a substantial interest in the estate. You have him there with his lawyer. Then you have the curator, and finally you have the receiver. We have all these additional costs thrown on estates in Ontario simply because too many trustees are appointed in Quebec; there is no trouble anywhere else. I do not want to overstate this matter in the slightest, and so that I do not overstate it I am just going to read a short memorandum as to how people who trade, people in business, think this will work out. They point out what the present law is; I do not touch that. They point out as to the amendments that are now being made: I do not touch that. Then they go on to say that the court officer to do this work in the province of Ontario will be the registrar or the local registrar. Then they say:

> The debtor, when filing this voluntary assignment with the court, is required by the amendment to, at the same time, file with the official receiver a sworn statement of his affairs including a list of his creditors. Then the official receiver, or, in the case of a receiving order then the court, is to appoint a custodian who shall, as far as possible, be selected from the most interested creditors. The official receiver is required to preside at the first meeting of creditors, which is to be called by the custodian at his office or some other convenient place. This meeting of creditors is to appoint a trustee for the estate, who may be any person the meeting may name, and the trustee thereupon takes charge of the administration of the estate.

I think these business men have fairly stated it.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: My hon. friend says they are business men?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Yes.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Who are these gentlemen?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Auditors accustomed to business. I want to make it sure that I am not overstating the case, and I am giving their opinion to my hon. friend. I do not want to overstate in any one particular, and if these gentlemen are wrong on any point I hope the minister will point out where. They go on to say:

> This method of appointing a trustee contains many objectionable features. It is undoubtedly designed in an attempt to correct an unfortunate state of affairs in the province of Quebec, where authorized trustees have been appointed under the Bankruptcy Act who are inexperienced: It is stated that the government has appointed—

They go on to give the number of trustees appointed in Montreal, and then say:

> The result is that the administration of bankrupt estates throughout the entire Dominion is being complicated very materially in an effort to cure a condition in Quebec which should never have been permitted to arise. The present Bankruptcy Act, section 15, provides adequate machinery for the change by the creditors at any meeting of the authorized trustee to whom the assignment was originally made, or who was appointed receiver by the court, and it is submitted that the creditors have therefore a complete remedy in their own hands.

I think my hon. friend is wrong when he stated in his speech that section 15 was only operative for cause, that the creditors for cause might make a change. And if I may draw his attention to the section I think he will find that the creditors at their discretion, without any cause, at their will, may make any change they like. It is the court that asks for cause. If I am wrong in that, I hope my hon. friend will correct me. The memorandum goes on:

> The objectionable features of these changes may be summarized as follows:
>
> As to the matter of expense: The proposed amendments add to the cost of an estate, the costs of the court and the costs of the custodian, which will bear heavily upon small estates. Three sets of solicitors' costs will have to be paid out of many estates, that is, the costs of the solicitor for the debtor, then the solicitor of the custodian, and finally of the trustee.
>
> As to meetings of creditors, assignment papers would frequently be filed with local registrars through the province in which the debtor lives. The appointment of a creditor at a distant centre as custodian will be inconvenient. If a local creditor should be named as such custodian the first meeting of creditors will be called locally, resulting in creditors, who are usually located in large centres, having to make long journeys to attend meetings for the appointment of a trustee. On the other hand, the meetings of creditors of a debtor residing, for instance, at Sault Ste. Marie, if called in Toronto, where the majority of creditors of most estates in Ontario are usually located, and which would be the most convenient place for the meeting, then the local registrar at Sault Ste. Marie would be obliged to personally attend the meeting of creditors, at the expense of probably a small estate.

I pause there and ask my hon. friend what he thinks ought to be done in a case like that. There you have a merchant at Sault Ste. Marie. The local registrar there is the appropriate person to handle that estate. You have all the creditors in, say, Toronto. These amendments provide for a meeting of the creditors. What is to be done? Are all the creditors to go up to Sault Ste. Marie, or is the local registrar to come down to the creditors at Toronto? Usually debtors arrange these meetings so as to meet the convenience of creditors, and so that there shall be only one railway trip instead of the expense of bringing thirty or forty creditors to the meeting. What does the minister think ought to be done in a case of that kind? Is the local registrar, because he has to be there, going to call the meeting where the creditors are or where the debtor lives?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: That is a matter of detail, when we come to it we can deal with it. I may remark that the creditors have the right to vote by proxy; it is not necessary for them to travel from any place in any province to the centre of that province, they may very well send their proxies. Even where the meetings are held in the great centres very few creditors attend but they are always represented by someone. What is complained of is a matter of detail but I am prepared to discuss it. In reference to the memorandum from which my hon. friend is quoting I should explain that I have met quite a number of trustees. There was only one that I saw who was unalterably opposed to this amendment. He is a gentleman from Toronto and very well experienced in these matters. I tried to convince him that he would not lose anything from this amendment but I find he has not been converted yet.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: In a city like Toronto you have your one registrar. How would it be possible for him to look after the meeting of creditors from time to time in a city of that size, with the amount of insolvency matters which are pending there? How could he do it?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Very easily, and he could have a sub-officer to replace him, as we propose by an amendment which my hon. friend will see later on.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: So there will be relief given in that direction?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Here is another point that I draw to the minister's attention:

> In the administration of a complicated or important estate a great deal of preliminary work must be done by a trustee prior to the first meeting of creditors apart from the mere preparation of the statement of affairs.

I do not suppose any one of us will deny that that work ought to be done, unless you are going to have a whole lot of time and money thrown away.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: What kind of work?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The work of getting together all the figures, the work necessary in order to make a proper and complete statement of the affairs of the debtor. That ought to be available. Further than that, if the trustee be a good trustee he should be prepared with some suggestions as to the best way of working the matter out.

Mr. MARTELL: As I understand it the proposed amendment provides that the assignment shall first be made to the clerk of the court or prothonotary of the court, who is usually the same official, and this prothonotary first secures a list of the creditors and notifies them. He calls a meeting of these people and they elect a curator or trustee to carry on the work. Now, prior to this amendment there was a lot of official trustees in bankruptcy and the majority of them, though perfectly honest men, were concerned primarly with getting their fees for the work they did.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is the question?

Mr. MARTELL: In this case it is proposed, I believe, that the person to whom the assignment is primarly made—

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend is not asking a question he is making a speech. Surely we would all agree that in the administration of a complicated or important estate a great deal of preliminary work must be done by the trustee prior to the first meeting of the creditors, apart from the mere preparation of the statement as to the condition of affairs.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: My hon. friend's informant wants the trustees to be chosen by the debtors. We say the trustee should be chosen by the creditors, and that work could be done by the official receiver or custodian. And what is the work to be performed? Purely and simply the calling of the creditors.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: If that is all my hon. friend thinks ought to be done I can

tell him he is not familiar with the work which is done by the better class of trustees when the work is properly looked after, and it is usually properly looked after by the better class of men. If this meeting is merely in order to see how many people there are on the list of creditors, and the time and money consumed is to be thrown away well and good. But if you have a man who understands this work there will be a lot more than that done.

Mr. MARTELL: Does the hon. member not think well of the proposition of the Minister of Justice which is to try and provide that everybody concerned shall get a fair return from a bankrupt estate?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: If that is what the Minister of Justice has in mind he is not doing it.

Mr. MARTELL: I think he is doing it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: No, he is going to prevent that. Now, is there any dispute about this?—

> This work calls for expert accountancy knowledge and its proper preparation does materially assist the meeting in its decision. This preparatory work could not be accomplished by a creditor-custodian, thus making necessary further needless meetings.

Is there any dispute about that?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Yes, there is dispute. When an assignment is made by the receiver a custodian is appointed and if it is necessary to take any proceedings to preserve the property the custodian does it under the direction of the receiver. If there is an inventory to be made the custodian makes it and he calls the creditors. In the work of liquidation he is supported by the trustee.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then, Mr. Chairman, we have this position: No work of liquidation goes on, nothing is done, except a mere collection of names, until the receiver is appointed.

Mr. MARTELL: Is not that right?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Nothing is done at all, there is no preliminary work of any kind done?

Mr. MARTELL: Nobody is prejudiced.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The estate is not got into shape at all, and nothing is done to clarify the issue. We have that, at any rate, that nothing of any kind is done until after the meeting of the creditors. I take it that the minister would not suggest that the local registrars have any expert knowledge in accountancy that would enable them to do the work, no matter how pressing the necessity?

5 p.m.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: That work has to be done by the custodian, who will be a man of experience and interested by reason of the fact that he will be one of the largest creditors.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Ah, but how can the minister tell he will be experienced because he is a creditor?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I said "interested."

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: But the one thing here is experience—experience in accountancy, experience in the work. The fact that the man is a creditor does not say that he is at all experienced one way or the other. The custodian is to be one of the creditors.

Mr. MARTELL: Not necessarily.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Should he be one of the creditors?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: If possible, yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Why should he not be the man who ought to be appointed the permanent receiver?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: If it is satisfactory to the creditors they will appoint him trustee.

Mr. JACOBS: Some little time must pass before the appointment of the permanent trustee?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That is what I am pointing out, and I am pointing out further that under this amendment there will be a complete waste of time. On the other hand, if you appoint a man who is experienced in accountancy a lot of preliminary work will be done and, very often, a complete scheme worked out. Now, what does my hon. friend say to this?—

> The appointment of a creditor as Custodian opens wide the door for serious collusion between the creditor-custodian and the debtor and would lead to irregularities of many kinds which would be extremely difficult to trace.

In other words your custodian is a man who may have a private interest in the estate apart from the rest of the creditors As a creditor he has his own axe to grind, but it may not be one that is common to the rest of the creditors.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: But the custodian acts under the direction of the receiver.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The custodian is getting control and I do not know how

long that matters could be delayed until the permanent receiver is ultimately appointed, or whether you may not have to deal with the fact that the custodian being on the ground would like to stay there. I suppose it will also be admitted:

> In large estates a creditor would be totally incapable of taking charge or administering its affairs for even the short period between his appointment and the calling of the meeting.

Would that be permitted?

> Experience is essential to such temporary administration and often it is necessary and expedient that advances should be made to the estate in order to conserve assets and manage the business so that the estate can be subsequently dealt with to the best advantage.

I suppose my hon. friend will provide in his bill that this custodian may be recouped for advances he makes in order to keep the estate going. That is a risk that good trustees are taking to-day.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: There is no doubt that if he disburses any money, he should be recouped.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: And if he advances money for the purpose of keeping the business going?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am pointing out again to my hon. friend that that incidental work is sometimes very important, and that it ought to be in the hands of people who have been accustomed to doing that sort of thing. The rest of this memorandum—and it is a long one—merely emphasizes the points that I am indicating. It shows the manner in which log-rolling and wire-pulling goes on when you have an election carried out in the way that my hon. friend suggests. At least that is what has happened in the past, and there is no question that it will happen again in the future. I am not, however, going to trouble my hon. friend with further details, because that is all covered in the larger points that I have mentioned. Again I ask my hon. friend: Why not make the Quebec situation right and have things functioning in Quebec as they ought to function and as they are functioning in Ontario?

Mr. MARTELL: What is the difference?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am afraid it would take me too long to tell my hon. friend. We have had a long statement on that, and we all have to agree that there is a difference. I am taking what hon. members from the province of Quebec say.

Mr. MARTELL: Everybody in Canada knows that the system of laws in Quebec is different from that in any of the other provinces. If my hon. friend and I were to argue in regard to the Nova Scotia laws and the Ontario laws, we would understand each other; but if we undertake to argue about the laws of Quebec, we are both in the dark.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am not going to argue with my hon. friend as to the Nova Scotia or the Ontario laws.

Mr. MARTELL: They are very much the same.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: We were not talking about the laws in either province. My hon. friend was out of the room at the time, but our discussion had to do with the character and number of trustees in Quebec. Would it not be better, as I said before, to try to get this Quebec difficulty overcome as I have suggested? I am not going to discuss the other clauses at all. I have discussed the question of appointment only, and only because my hon. friend discussed it. I am not going into any details as to his rent clauses and the like, except to say this. I want to find out, in the first instance, whether my hon. friend thinks this House has jurisdiction to pass a bankruptcy law.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Can my hon. friend tell me how in the name of common sense, a bankruptcy law can be passed which does not affect property and civil rights?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: It depends.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: A bankruptcy law means the creation of a method of determining civil rights. It takes civil rights here and civil rights there.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I wish I had the assurance of my hon. friend to decide that point of law. It is not so clear as that.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am not talking about a point of law; I am talking about the necessary implication of a Bankruptcy Act. Under a Bankruptcy Act you are immediately taking away the rights of creditors. Are they not civil rights?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The right of distress is taken away. Is that not a civil right?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Unquestionably. Therefore, we must all agree that you cannot

have a bankruptcy law, power to pass which is given to the Dominion under the British North America Act, and you cannot exercise it unless you interfere with property and civil rights. The whole thing deals with property and nothing else. Does my hon. friend find in the British North America Act any distinction drawn between property and civil rights having regard to personal property on the one hand and property and civil rights having regard to real property on the other? Because I cannot find such a distinction.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Perhaps I might show some to my hon. friend, but I do not suppose we intend to discuss that point here. As I say, the question has already been submitted to some of our best judges, and some have said that we have no right to interfere to the exent of depriving landlords of their preference; some say that we may have that right. As I said before, we have now a case pending in which, I understand, judgment is to be rendered against our act. I shall not be prepared to say that the judgment is not sound.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: If we stand in that parlous position, we ought to stop doing anything with this act.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Not at all.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Yes, because my hon. friend himself has admitted that it is absolutely necessary and essential, under a bankruptcy law, to deal with property and civil rights. Every day, under a bankruptcy law, we are interfering with rights of action which are founded on provincial law, just as much as is the right of a lessor founded on provincial law. I would have thought that if we had the right to introduce and pass a bankruptcy law, we would have the right to deal with matters of necessity incidental to that field of legislation. The Privy Council has so held in other cases. If we have not that right, I point out to my hon. friend that this measure ought to be withdrawn.

Mr. MARTELL: Though we have already passed a Bankruptcy Act, does my hon. friend not think that before we put an amendment to the Bankruptcy Act upon the statute books, it would be well to repeal the Bankruptcy Act as it stands at present, and to get a reference to the Supreme Court of Canada and, if necessary, to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, in order that we may know exactly what we can do in regard to bankruptcy—though we have the power, under the British North America Act, to pass a bankruptcy law—in order to see how far, in the opinion of the learned judges or of the law lords, we can go as regards an infringement on property and civil rights? Would that not be better than allowing the ordinary people to bear the expense?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The trouble in that case would be that the people would have to pay a great deal more. There are many insolvencies at the present time; if we cancel this law, that would cost the public, the creditors and the debtors, a great deal of money, and more money would be thrown away.

Mr. MARTELL: Does my hon. friend not think, before we had this bankruptcy law, we were getting along very well under our various provincial laws with regard to debtors and so on?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It is a good thing to have a law which will enable a man who has failed honestly to be able to get a clean sheet and to start afresh. We could not do that before, and for that reason I am in favour of the bankruptcy provision. But surely my hon. friend will agree with me in this, that if we have jurisdiction to pass this bankruptcy law, we have jurisdiction to interfere with the right of a lessor just as much as we have the right to interfere with the rights of any other creditor.

Mr. MARTELL: I agree with that.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I understand my hon. friend desires, as we do, to frame a bankruptcy law that will be as perfect as possible—he is in favour of a bankruptcy law?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Yes.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: We are discussing the point whether we have the right, legislating as we do in regard to bankruptcy, to affect property and civil rights?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Yes.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: As I said before, there is room for discussion on that point. The only point, though, that we have to consider in connection with these amendments is the preference of the landlord. When there is doubt on such a question why not make it sure that there shall be no cause for attack by anyone on our amendment, on the ground of its being unconstitutional, by leaving to the provinces all their rights intact in this matter? If, simply in order that we may have a uniform law for all provinces, our legislation changes the status of the landlords in any province and thereby gives occasion for the contesting of our act and the decision later on by the courts that it is un-

constitutional, we should only have to start all over again; while if we leave, as we propose to do, the privileges of landlords within the jurisdiction of every province, there is no possibility of any doubt being raised in connection with our amendment.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I would willingly give in to my hon. friend if it were possible in my opinion logically to do so on the one hand, and on the other hand to maintain our bankruptcy law. Logically, I cannot see the difference between saying to a preferred creditor, who has risked his capital, that his preference shall be absolutely void under our bankruptcy law, while we say to the landlord, who has risked nothing except the occupancy of his property, "We will not interfere with you."

Sir LOMER GOUIN: That is the merit of the provision.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The merit of the provision? I should think the merit is all with the man who has risked his capital. But on the question of property and civil rights, is there any distinction between a preferred creditor and a preferred landlord? You interfere with local law in each case.

Mr. MARTELL: Is it not a fact that in all failures, even under provincial laws—and this is certainly the case in Nova Scotia—the landlord has priority over all other creditors?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I know that there is such a preference. In Ontario it has been one of twelve months down to the time of the failure, and three months afterwards. But we changed that in Ontario by our legislation; it is only three months now, if I remember rightly, to the time of the failure. But there is no trouble in Ontario.

Mr. MARTELL: There is no trouble in Nova Scotia.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It was a just change to make, and I believe Nova Scotia had the same provision as Ontario.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Suppose we postpone further discussion of this point until we get to that amendment.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Very well.

Mr. BOYS: If the minister is afraid of the question of landlords' rights, if he fears that we are treading upon provincial jurisdiction in interfering with the landlords in their claim for rent, what has he to say regarding the Statute of Limitations? Under the law of Ontario, which I imagine is the same as in many other provinces, the creditor has a right of action for six years. But if you give the bankrupt his discharge, and if you want seriously to face this question of provincial rights, what about the application of the Statute of Limitations in this case? When you give the debtor his discharge you say to the creditor that while the law of his province gives him for six years the right to sue, yet under federal legislation in this particular respect he shall not sue at all? I am not seeking to raise these provincial questions, but now that we are discussing them I am surprised to hear the minister state that there is a grave doubt concerning our right with respect to the landlords.

Mr. MARTELL: I understand the minister to propose that as regards the landlord's preference the provincial law as it previously stood shall be invoked again. Is not that fair to those people who have been brought up under that law, and to the lawyers who are fully acquainted with it?

Mr. BOYS: The hon. gentleman is quite right; that is exactly what the minister says. and that is acceding to the suggestion that we are interfering with provincial rights. But I am asking the minister's attention to another feature which is more far-reaching than that. The Statute of Limitations in Ontario gives the creditor the right to sue within a period of six years.

Mr. MARTELL: It is the same with us.

Mr. BOYS: Well, are you not taking that right away by this legislation when you give authority for the discharge of the bankrupt? I am absolutely in favour of the discharge, but if we are to worry about provincial questions, I should think it would be better to take time to consider all these matters, because there is no earthly doubt that you are interfering with the right of the creditor under the Statute of Limitations when you provide for the discharge of the debtor. It may be well for us to go cautiously until the Privy Council has passed upon the question. If you venture into the realm of provincial rights there are a number of other questions, besides that of landlords, which might be urged along the same line.

There is another feature with regard to the authorized trustee on which I might speak for a moment. I have listened carefully to what the minister has said on this point, and while I have an absolutely open mind on the subject I must confess that he has not convinced me. I am in favour of the authorized trustee, because, as I think, you will get in

the main good men. They are appointed by the department and give a substantial security. What right has the creditor to find fault if the estate of the debtor is dealt with by a man appointed in this way? Surely the creditors are just as safe in the hands of such trustees as they would be with one of their own choice, when he is only himself a successful candidate against others. There is absolutely no doubt that in all these meetings of creditors an effort is made by one clique to have one man appointed who will act for a number of wholesale houses in the large cities, while another clique will endeavour to have an assignee of their own choice nominated; and generally one group come to the meeting sufficiently strong to control affairs and they secure the appointment by outwitting the others. Surely creditors—and this is what we must consider—are as safe in the hands of an authorized trustee, appointed with proper security, as they would be under a trustee appointed in the way I have described. If the minister has anything further to urge upon the subject I shall be glad to hear it, because if I could see any reason for a different view I would gladly take it. I do believe that the present system has worked well in Ontario, and because it has worked well I think we should stick to it. It it has not proved satisfactory in Quebec, and the minister thinks that something different is advisable for that province, it is not my desire to say or do anything that would interfere with the satisfactory operation of the act there. But I realize that if we are to have uniformity at all it would hardly be right to have one law for one province and a different law for another province. For that reason I think it is better to stick to the idea of authorized trustees. I agree with the suggestion of the member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton) that if there are grievances in Quebec, if too many trustees have been appointed, if they are not of the right type, or if they have been guilty of improper conduct, such as persuading solvent farmers to make assignments in order that they themselves might be personally advantaged, then it is high time that some provision be embodied in the act to make any such conduct a criminal offence in order that these men might be punished. There are proper ways of dealing with men of this type. But the mere fact that a few trustees, such as have been described, have been appointed in this way is no valid reason for turning this act completely upside down. If you are going to do that let us get back to provincial legislation.

[Mr. Boys.]

Mr. MARTELL: Would it not be well to assign the work to local registrars? Many of these men holding official positions are not dependent on the fees derived under the Bankruptcy Act, whereas the trustee in bankruptcy is very apt to be particularly concerned regarding his fees.

Mr. BOYS: Unless the position of registrar is looked upon as a sinecure, and therefore those occupying them do not earn the fees they are now receiving, I do not approve of the suggestion. It may be that there are local registrars who have not work enough to do, but as a rule I think they are fairly busily engaged, and you would be simply giving them a lot more work. I do not hesitate to say that in Ontario we have as capable a registrar as anywhere in Canada. He is a very efficient man. But he already had plenty of work to do, and there is no question that when these duties were heaped upon him he had too much to attend to. From what I have been told by members of the profession in Toronto—my own experience is limited—he did not have time enough to perform these additional duties.

Mr. MARTELL: You take as your instance, a large centre of population.

Mr. BOYS: I am taking the act as it stands.

Mr. MARTELL: Take the case of a small centre.

Mr. BOYS: We must deal with the act as it is. There was only one registrar for Ontario; if there was one for every county I would not be arguing as I am. I admit at once that the suggestion contained in the amendment before the committee is a great improvement, because of course the work is being divided up, and it may be that in that respect it will turn out all right. If we have to submit to these other changes, as far as I am concerned I am in favour of this feature, but I take the stand that we should not depart from the system which is working well everywhere except in Quebec. Again I say, if these abuses exist let us insert a section which will deal with the guilty and punish them. Regarding the controversy between two hon. gentlemen opposite, I am of opinion that where an offence is made indictable, as it is in many cases in this act, that is sufficient in itself, as the Criminal Code deals with indictable offences. This act says that the doing of a certain thing shall be an indictable offence, and thereupon I should imagine information could be laid and the provisions of the code invoked. However, if

there is any doubt on the point a very definite provision should be inserted in the act.

Mr. CARROLL: The hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Cannon) raised the point that the judge handling a bankruptcy case might commit the accused to the Supreme Court for trial, and thereupon no other criminal proceedings could be taken against him. There may be something in this contention. On the other hand, section 523 or 533—I forget which—of the Criminal Code provides that a county court judge shall have absolute jurisdiction except in cases of murder, treason and so forth. I take the ground that as bankruptcy is not included in the exceptions the bankruptcy court would have jurisdiction under the code. But there is something to be said in favour of my hon. friend's contention.

Mr. BOYS: I do not know of any provision which gives the bankruptcy court any jurisdiction regarding indictment. Certain things are made indictable offences.

Mr. CANNON: If my hon. friend will allow me, according to section 93 of the Bankruptcy Act a judge of the Superior Court who acts as judge in bankruptcy has a right to commit, and the section indicates the procedure to be followed. It says that after the judge has committed the accused an indictment has to be preferred. Then subsection 4 says that should proceedings be taken under the Bankruptcy Act no other proceedings can be instituted under any other act. I argue that if the commitment is by a judge in bankruptcy, as the law stands to-day the trial can only be held before the Court of King's Bench.

Mr. CARROLL: That is, by jury?

Mr. CANNON: By jury. If, on the other hand, the complaint is made under section 417 of the Criminal Code, which is altogether different, then there can be a summary or speedy trial.

Mr. MARTELL: Do I understand my hon. friend to say that the judge in bankruptcy has power to order the commitment of a person without any preliminary investigation?

Mr. CANNON: No. According to the Bankruptcy Act the judge acts as the magistrate hearing the preliminary investigation. After the trustee, or whoever lays the complaint, has put before the judge sufficient evidence, there is a commitment. When the commitment has been made by the judge, at the following term of the Court of King's Bench an indictment is put before the grand jury. Then the question arises: if a prisoner when arraigned is called upon to plead, has he a right to ask for a speedy trial?

Mr. JACOBS: Yes, he has.

Mr. CANNON: I do not think he has.

Mr. MICHAUD: I think we had better submit the question to the Minister of Justice, and find out.

Mr. CANNON: To sum up my argument, I say if the proceedings are taken under the Bankruptcy Act there cannot be a summary or speedy trial; if proceedings are taken under the Criminal Code there can be either trial by jury or summarily.

Mr. MARTELL: In other words, as I understand my hon. friend, an accused committed under the Bankruptcy Act has no power to elect for a speedy trial, he must go before the grand jury, be indicted and be tried by the petit jury?

Mr. CANNON: As the law reads now.

Mr. CLARK: I can shorten my remarks considerably by saying that I endorse the suggestions made by the hon. member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton). The object that the Minister of Justice appears to be anxious to attain is that the creditors shall control or have the power of appointment of the trustee or custodian of the estate. If that is so I have no objection, but I think the same object can be attained in a simple and much more effective manner than by the proposed amendment. In the first place, I think it objectionable that the registrar should become the official receiver. In the second place, I think it is objectionable also that one of the creditors should be a custodian of the property even though it is only for a short period of time. I can think of instances where creditors with business reputations that are Dominion-wide have been only too anxious to secure advantage over their co-creditors. I think it objectionable that one creditor should be the custodian of the property, even for a short time, particularly where the estate may be owned by foreigners. There you will have creditors who, probably, are also foreigners; you will have a bad element; the custodian is almost sure to be not too scrupulous with regard to the rights of his co-creditors, and I am afraid that before the general meeting of creditors takes place the assets of the estate in many cases will have been dissipated. Or advantage may be gained by means of lobbying which will result in a trustee being appointed who

has not had experience, who is not trustworthy, and who should not be given control of the estate pending its winding up. It strikes me that there are some weaknesses in the present act. Probably the most serious trouble has occurred in the province of Quebec. Undoubtedly too many trustees have been appointed, and apparently the trustees have not been of such a calibre that they should be entrusted with the administering of estates.

There is a provision in the act which permits debtors going into bankruptcy when they should not do so at all, debtors who are involved, perhaps, yet solvent, and who would eventually pull through. I refer to section 3, subsection (j) of chapter 8 of the statutes of 1922. This section uses the expression, "If he ceases to meet his liabilities as they become due." In other words, if one of these unscrupulous trustees, who appear to be so plentiful in the province of Quebec, comes across a man who may not be able to meet one particular debt, he can persuade that man to go into bankruptcy, and it is pretty difficult to combat the right of the debtor to do so. There is one debt he cannot meet; perhaps he cannot meet a good many; but he is not a man who should be permitted to go into bankruptcy. This section should be so amended as to provide that only those who are unable to meet their general liabilities may go into bankruptcy.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: We intend to amend that section along those lines.

Mr. CLARK: Then that point is met. But I am very serious when I say that throughout Canada, these estates should be administered by authorized trustees. I do not believe that in Ontario or in the western provinces any serious difficulties have been encountered in connection with the authorized trustees. It all comes back to the man who is appointed. Perhaps the number of authorized trustees should be limited, and the appointees should be men experienced in the winding up of estates. I am prepared to agree that the creditors should have the power at the outset that the minister thinks they should have, provided that it is an authorized trustee who is appointed, a responsible man. That will bring about a condition of security and will make it certain that the estate will be administered in an honest manner. But in the present act there is a provision under which the creditors appoint a committee of inspectors representing all the creditors—not any particular creditor—and this committee of inspectors control the administration of the estate; the trustee cannot make a move without their authority. Therefore I think we have in the act now a provision which gives the creditors the control from the outset that the minister has laid down as essential.

There is another feature that has not been touched upon, and a very important one, with which I had to deal last summer. A responsible firm in Vancouver was in serious financial difficulty. They did not want to go into bankruptcy, and under the provisions of section 13 they made a proposal for a composition, which meant that eventually they would pay their debts in full. That composition was accepted by the creditors. As the act is proposed to be amended, that company could not make a composition with its creditors without going into bankruptcy; the good will of the business would have been gone and its credit lost; in fact, the business would have been destroyed. On the other hand, by being able to submit that composition to its creditors, the business of the company was continued, its credit in England and throughout this country was preserved, and to-day it is carrying on successfully. The minister might well consider leaving the act as it is so that a firm can make a composition without the necessity of going into bankruptcy. If the amendment as proposed goes through it will be a very serious matter for the business of the country. I say again that I hope the minister will give serious consideration, before these amendments are passed to the suggestions made by the hon. member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton), which, I think, are essentially sound. I do not mind the creditors having control so long as we are assured that we are not to have further complications. The minister will find within a year, I think, if this proposal regarding custodians is adopted, that great protest will be made by the business interests of the country. I do not see how anything can be gained by having these custodians. If it is necessary to have a custodian, by all means let him be one of the authorized trustees. Do not let an interested person have control of the estate, even for ever so short a time because the best business men will look after their own interests.

Section agreed to.

On section 2—"Authorized assignment."

The CHAIRMAN: It is suggested by the minister that (yy) should read as follows:

"Official Receiver" means the person having authority—

The words "having authority" are now inserted by motion to amend.

—in the locality of the debtor to exercise the functions of the official receiver for the time being.

The word "authorized" is struck out.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Does this section really carry out the expressed intentions of the minister, Mr. Chairman? For example, when we were discussing the question of custodian and I was pointing out the disadvantage of having creditors placed in that position, he said that it was not necessarily a creditor that the custodian had to be but I think as the clause now reads it makes the custodian a creditor. It says:

"Custodian" means the creditor duly authorized to exercise the functions of custodian for the time being.

That clause stands, and I think it is entirely out of line with the remarks of the hon. minister.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Subsection 4 of section 10 provides:

Immediately after the acceptance of the authorized assignment, the official receiver shall appoint a custodian whom he shall, as far as possible, select from the most interested creditors.

So it is not necessarily a creditor, but only as far as possible.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am pointing out to my hon. friend his own section here defining the word "custodian," and it says he shall be a creditor.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: We might substitute the word "person" for the word "creditor" in line 12, subsection 2 of the bill. I move accordingly, Mr. Chairman.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That would remove that difficulty.

Amendment agreed to.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I would like to ask my hon. friend what is meant by section (yy) reading:

"Official Receiver" means the person in the locality of the debtor authorized to exercise the functions of the official receiver for the time being.

What does that mean? It says the official receiver is the person authorized to exercise the functions of the official receiver.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: My hon. friend will find that by clause 31 we are providing for the appointment of an official receiver, and here in (yy) of section 2 we are defining what the official receiver is. We say that the official receiver means the person having authority, that is to say, the person appointed in virtue of that section 31 which I have just mentioned.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: This refers not to the real receiver, but to the stop-gap?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: To the real receiver, the judicial officer.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: To the man who only acts temporarily?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: No. He will be there for all time, even after the discharge has been granted. He will keep the records, the archives. He is a very important officer, and is permanent.

Mr. BOYS: Why does the minister use the word "locality?" That is very indefinite.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: That means a district. Each province is a district, and we intend to divide them into sub-districts. It means the locality where the assignment is to take place.

Mr. BOYS: Do these sub-districts come down to country or judicial districts?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: When we arrive at that section we can discuss whether in Ontario we shall have, say ten or forty districts.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Does my hon. friend really think there is any sense in having that clause there at all? It says: The receiver is the receiver.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: It is necessary to define who the receiver is.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The definition is that the receiver is the receiver. I do not know that we are getting any further by that. If you wanted to define it I would have thought you would have had some reference to the other section and say that it was the person to be appointed under the authority of that subsequent section. To say that a cow is a cow does not advance one very far in a definition.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: This is not the definition of a cow. It is for the purpose of showing where the assignment shall take place. It must take place in the hands of the receiver in the province.

Mr. CARROLL: He can only go to one receiver.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I see.

The CHAIRMAN: There is an amendment submitted to be known as 2A to be inserted between clauses 2 and 3. It is moved to amend section 3 of the act by inserting the word "generally" after the word "liabilities" in paragraph (j) thereof.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: That is to say, the debtor cannot be adjudicated bankrupt because he has failed to pay one of his debts. He must cease generally to meet his obligations.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: We have not that in front of us. It is rather hard to follow.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: It is subsection (j) of section 3a, which now reads as follows:

If he ceases to meet his liabilities as they become due.

We propose to include the word "generally" after the word "liabilities." The subsection will then read:

If he ceases to meet his liabilities generally as they become due.

That is to say we cannot adjudicate a man bankrupt because he fails to pay one of his debts; he must cease generally to meet his obligations.

Mr. JACOBS: Does not the word "liabilities" carry the implication of "generally."

Sir LOMER GOUIN: No. There was a judgment rendered by Mr. Justice Fisher in the case of Stevenson vs. Taylor, reported in volume 70, Dominion Law Reports, page 853, where it was decided that failure to pay one debt that was an act of bankruptcy within this paragraph.

Mr. BOYS: It seems to me that the minister will cause litigation by using the phrase that a man shall only be adjudicated bankrupt when he "generally" fails to pay his debts. Who knows what that means? It is quite evident it does not mean the failure to pay one debt; does not mean two or three, or twenty? Why not have a provision that if on written demand he fails to pay his debts for a week, or two weeks, or some such period, then he may be adjudicated bankrupt? The word "generally" is very indefinite, and is certain to give rise to litigation.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I do not see what litigation it could give rise to. It is for the judge to reach a decision. A petition is presented to the judge and if there is any objection from the debtor, if he says, "I have not ceased meeting my obligations" the petitioner will give proof that in three, or four, or five instances, he has failed to do so. Then the petition will be granted.

Mr. BOYS: There may be an answer to that suggestion or some explanation given. Surely it is better to have the section definite in its wording. The provisions of The Companies Act are somewhat along the line I have referred to. If you do not want to prolong the situation make the period one or two weeks, but let there be a written demand for the payment of the debt. On failure to pay the debt within a specified time he may be adjudged bankrupt. In that case there will be no doubt about it. Otherwise, I think, you will have doubt, possibly difference in judicial decision, as to what the wording means, and there will certainly be answers and unfounded excuses given for failure to pay the claims which might delay the declaration of bankruptcy.

[Mr. Chairman.]

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I thought this was the best amendment we could draft. There certainly were abuses in declaring a man bankrupt because he ceased or refused to pay one of his debts. By saying that it should be "generally" and leaving the matter to the judge to decide we thought there was protection for the creditors and for the debtor.

Mr. JACOBS: I want to say that the section we are now discussing was inserted in the Bankruptcy Act as an amendment, I think, last year and it is taken word for word from the old Bankruptcy Act which was reproduced in our Code of Civil Procedure.

At six o'clock the Speaker resumed the chair and the House took recess.

After Recess

The committee resumed at eight o'clock, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN: It is moved that the bill be amended by adding section 2A as follows:

Section 3 of this act is amended by inserting the word "generally" after the word "liabilities" in paragraph (j) thereof.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 3—If petitioning creditor is a secured creditor.

Mr. CLARK: Sub-clause (2)—

Sir LOMER GOUIN: We should add the words "as far as possible" after the word "custodian" in the third line of sub-clause (2).

Mr. CLARK: What I was going to suggest was that the words in the third line "one of the most interested creditors" should be struck out, and the words "a person qualified to act as trustee" inserted. That would be in keeping with the spirit of paragraph (mm) of clause 2, subclause (2), which was amended by striking out the word "creditor", and inserting the word "person".

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Yes.

Mr. CLARK: The substitution of those words would get over the difficulty with which most of us have been faced, namely that of having competition, lobbying, amongst creditors for the appointment of a trustee. I think it would also tend to reduce the cost of winding up these estates. As was pointed out this afternoon, we are likely, under the amended legislation, to have at least three sets of costs.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Will my hon. friend be satisfied to accept the substitution of the words "a qualified person" instead of "one of the most interested creditors", but keeping the last part of the clause, that the judge should be governed as far as possible by the wishes of the creditors?

Mr. CLARK: That is agreeable. It would then read:

A qualified person, having regard, as far as the court deems just, to the wishes of the creditors.

I would rather have the words "qualified to act as trustee", because it would then be quite clear to the official receiver that it is the desire of this parliament that, so far as possible, the person who is appointed is a person capable of winding up an estate, because if that official receiver appoints a man who is qualified to act as a trustee and he receives the approval of the creditors in making that appointment, the probability is that when the creditors meet for the first time for the purpose of appointing or approving a trustee, that person who has been appointed as custodian during the interim, will be the person chosen. The chances are also that the costs will be reduced, the efficiency in winding up the estate increased, and at the same time the object which the minister has in view, namely, the consulting of the creditors and giving them ultimate authority, will be accomplished.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I have no doubt that the amendment as we offer it will fully protect the interests of the creditors. I have no wish to oppose any suggestion offered and I am prepared to accept the change. I therefore move that the words "one of the most interested creditors" be struck out of line 3 in subsection 2 and that there be substituted therefor the words "a qualified person."

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 55—Regarding vestment of property in trustee.

Mr. CLARK: What is the effect of this section?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: It repeals section 6, which constitutes the authorized trustee or receiver, since there is no longer an authorized trustee, and provides for the substitution of the official receiver and the creditors' trustee. This section also contains provision for stay of proceedings. In the act as it stands now there are three sections relating to stay of proceedings, sections 6, 7 and 13A. These three sections are repealed by the present bill and the whole subject is embraced in section 9.

Mr. CLARK: In line 6 of subsection 3 it is provided that upon the appointment of a trustee:

—as hereinafter provided, such property shall, subject to the rights of secured creditors, forthwith pass to and vest in such trustee, and in any case of change of trustee, the property shall pass from trustee to trustee without any conveyance, assignment or transfer whatever.

If a company holds property in trust for another, will that property vest in the trustee under the provisions of this section?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: The trustee will have the same right as the company had before.

Mr. CLARK: Under the act as amended, I assume from the minister's answer that in future all property which the assignor held in trust for any other person will vest in the trustee?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Yes.

Section agreed to.

On section 6—Stay of proceedings:

Sir LOMER GOUIN: This is covered by the new section 9.

Section agreed to.

On section 9—Limitation regarding remedy of creditor against property or person of debtor:

Sir LOMER GOUIN: This section contains the provisions with regard to stay of proceedings. In the case of a secured creditor who takes action against his debtor the court is authorized to stay proceedings when this is considered to be in the interests of the creditors generally.

Mr. BAXTER: The last phrase in this section, "unless the court otherwise orders," applies, I take it, only to the clause beginning with the words "provided that, subject to the provisions of section forty-six," etc.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Yes, it applies only to the last clause; it is not necessary in relation to the first.

Section agreed to.

On section 10—Regarding assignment for general benefit of creditor.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: We amend this clause so as to make the statement which is to be offered by the debtor less complicated. It would be an impossibility for a debtor to prepare the statement which was provided for in the amendment as first suggested. If the details offered to the receiver by the debtor are not sufficient the statement will be refused. A full statement will be prepared by the trustee when elected.

The CHAIRMAN: This is the amendment submitted:

That subsection 5 be struck out and the following be substituted therefor:

The official receiver or his nominee shall preside at the first meeting of creditors and shall decide any question arising in connection with the appointment of the trustee by the creditors, and any creditor may appeal from his decision to the court. Upon the appointing of the trustee by the creditors he shall complete the authorized assignment by certifying thereon the name of such trustee, and such assignment shall thereupon, subject to the rights of the secured creditors, vest, as of the date and the acceptance of filing of the said assignment, in the trustee all the property of the debtor.

Shall section 10 as amended carry?

Mr. BAXTER: I see it is dependent in part on another section, but here is something that seems to be very important. We are in the hands of the official receiver; he has the power to accept or reject an assignment. Now I have to refer to section 65A as enacted by section 31 of this bill, and there I find that in my province the official receiver is the Circuit Court clerk until the Chief Justice assigns another officer to perform those duties. If the Chief Justice does not assign the duties to any other officer I would have great fear of the consequences sometimes.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I agreed with my hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Boys) that we would not consider this section before Monday evening. Then we might discuss the point now raised by my hon. friend.

Mr. BAXTER: I think it would be well to reconsider it.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall section 10 as amended carry?

Section agreed to.

[Mr. Baxter.]

On section 11—Form of assignment.

The CHAIRMAN: The following amendment is submitted to section 11 (A):

That section 10 (A) of the said act as enacted by chapter 17 of the statutes of 1921 be repealed.

Shall section 11 (A) carry?

Section agreed to.

On section 12—Publication of notice, etc.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: This is only a change in the procedure. Notice has to be given by the custodian instead of by the authorized trustee.

Section agreed to.

On section 13—Composition, extension or scheme of arrangement.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: In this amendment, Mr. Chairman, we provide that a composition will be allowed only after assignment.

Mr. CLARK: I should like to repeat what I said this afternoon, that I think it is a great mistake, as far as my experience goes at any rate, to force a business concern into bankruptcy before it is allowed to make a composition with its creditors. I had a concrete instance of this last year in Vancouver. A large business firm was in financial difficulties, as many other firms are to-day owing to the general deflation. It had large creditors in Great Britain and throughout this country: It wanted to continue its business operations. It made a proposal to its creditors, which after due consideration was accepted by all of them, and to-day that firm is carrying on successfully. Now, had it been necessary for that firm to go into bankruptcy before making a composition its credit would have been destroyed and it would not have been able to carry on business. I am sure many other similar instances might be given. I feel confident that the object which the minister has in view will not be accomplished without grave injustice being caused to business in general.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: We have complaints from nearly every province that this clause has been much abused. We are told that debtors will go before a judge, make an offer of composition, have it approved, and then go to their creditors, who are forced to accept the composition. The clause may have been advantageous in the case mentioned by my hon. friend, but generally we understand from traders and manufacturers that a composition should only be allowed to take place after an assignment. Then the creditors are in a position to examine the debtor as to his

assets and can judge whether a composition is worth acceptance. I really think we should not refuse the amendment.

Mr. CLARK: I have one other observation to make. My understanding of the act as it now stands is that a debtor must go to his creditors first, not to the court. The court merely approves what the creditors have already approved. The creditors now have all the facilities that have been suggested by the minister. In the instance I have cited the creditors appointed their inspectors and auditors, who made inventories and audits just as they would have done if the estate had gone into bankruptcy. But there was this further advantage, that the public was not informed that the business was bankrupt, and consequently its good will was not destroyed. It was an instance of an unfortunate debtor successfully coming through a trying period. The provision for examination might be made applicable to debtors who seek a composition with creditors, without the necessity of actually making an assignment. If we make the provisions regarding examination applicable, then they appoint their inspectors and auditors who can go into the business and do everything that is now done in cases where the debtor actually makes an assignment. My view is that once an assignment is made the business is destroyed.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Even with the amendment there would be nothing in the law to prevent such a debtor from informally calling his creditors together and trying to make an arrangement with them. If his creditors are willing to accept a composition informally, they are at liberty to do so.

Mr. CLARK: But he cannot go to the court after he has consulted them informally and get the court to approve the compromise. That is what was done in this case.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: That is exactly the objection we find—that two-thirds of the creditors should, before assignment, bind the other third. If it is possible for such a debtor to arrive at an arrangement with his creditors, there is no objection to his doing so. It was found in nearly every province that many debtors would take advantage of this provision for composition to do away with their assets, and if there was no settlement between them and their creditors there would be very little left of the estate when they came to assign.

Mr. BAXTER: I would ask the minister to be good enough to hold this section with the other one and give it a little more consideration. The section of the original act of 1919 dealing with this subject has been so much amended that it is impossible to follow the amendments. But the original scheme provided for a decision by the majority of the creditors, and that accomplished something that you cannot get by a voluntary agreement, because one creditor or more than one standing out may utterly destroy the opportunity. Under the original plan the court did not approve until after the creditors had voted, and there was also a provision by which 10 per cent of the creditors could demand an investigation of the bankrupt under oath. But it might require more than his examination; it might require the submission of his books and the examination of other persons. I suggest that the minister strengthen the provision on that line. You may still allow the benefit of the secrecy and still give the opportunity for getting all necessary information, but, no small group of dissident creditors—who may be dissident only for the purpose of forcing the payment in full of their own debts—can block the creditors who are willing to give the debtor a chance for a fresh start.

Section stands.

On section 14—Security to be furnished by trustee.

Mr. BAXTER: Should this not provide that the trustee shall give security to the satisfaction of a majority of the creditors? I can well understand that you could not satisfy all the creditors. There should be some rule applicable to the thing.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Section 42 of the act, subsection 14 provides as follows:

> Subject to the provisions of this act, all questions at meeting of creditors shall be decided by resolution carried by the majority of votes, and for such purpose the votes of creditors shall be calculated as follows:
>
> For every claim of or over twenty-five dollars, and not exceeding two hundred dollars—one vote;
>
> For every claim of over two hundred dollars and not exceeding five hundred dollars—two votes;
>
> For every claim of over five hundred dollars and not exceeding one thousand dollars—three votes;
>
> For every additional one thousand dollars or fraction thereof—one vote.

Mr. BAXTER: I still suggest that it would be better to say, "to the satisfaction of a majority of the creditors."

Mr. CLARK: I have given the minister a copy of an amendment which I propose in connection with this section, and which, I think, would overcome the difficulty regarding the creditors which has been pointed out by the hon. member for St. John City. My

suggestion is that the section read as follows:

Every trustee appointed by the creditors as hereinafter provided shall within seven days give security in cash or by bond of an approved guarantee company, satisfactory to the official receiver, conditioned for the due accounting and for the payment over and transfer of all moneys and property received by him as such trustee.

The objection I see to the amended section as it stands in the bill is that the creditors may not understand the security which should be given by a trustee. The official receiver, on the other hand, is an officer of the court and deals with such matters daily; he knows the nature and the value of the security that should be given in such cases. Then again we may have cases where the custodian appointed is one of the creditors, and he may be a friend of the trustee appointed, and use his influence to see that no security is given or only nominal security, whereas if the matter is left to the official receiver and the different security laid down in the act is taken, namely, cash or the bond of a guarantee company, all would be safeguarded.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: The creditors are most directly interested. I understand that my hon. friend wishes the receiver to have a say in the matter, that he should name the company?

Mr. CLARK: Not necessarily.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: That he should approve it.

Mr. CLARK: As to the amount, yes.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I think the creditors should decide that.

Mr. CLARK: I cannot think of any instance in the courts where the court does not say: I leave it to the registrar to fix the security; or the court itself says the security shall consist of a bond by a guarantee company conditioned in such and such an amount. That is the usual procedure.

Mr. CARROLL: Probably what my hon. friend is afraid of is that the persons fixing the security would be interested parties, which is of course opposed to the ordinary legal procedure.

Mr. CLARK: Yes.

Mr. CARROLL: That would be the objection I would see.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I understand that my hon. friend wishes the receiver to fix the amount and the form of the guarantee, and not leave it to the creditors?

[Mr. Clark.]

Mr. CLARK: Yes.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I do not see much objection to that.

Mr. CLARK: And it should be cash or the bond of a recognized guarantee company.

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): I do not think the security should be limited to the bond of a guarantee company. If the bond is satisfactory to the creditors it does not matter whether it is a guarantee company or not. There are places where these guarantee companies have no office and you could not find an agent to issue a bond. I submit that if the bond is approved by the official receiver, that should be quite sufficient, without limiting it to a guarantee company.

Mr. CLARK: The objection raised by my hon. friend (Mr. Black) is overcome by section 13 with the proposed amendment which provides that all these assignments shall be made in certain localities, and the localities will be such that there cannot be an instance where the registrar carries on where there is not a guarantee company.

The CHAIRMAN: It is moved by the hon. member for Burrard that section 14 be amended by substituting therefor the following:

Every trustee appointed by the creditors as hereinafter appointed shall within seven days give security in cash or by bond of an approved guarantee company satisfactory to the official receiver conditioned for the due accounting and for the payment over and transfer of all moneys and properties received by him as such trustee.

Amendment agreed to.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Is the hon. member for St. John satisfied now as to a majority of the creditors?

Mr. BAXTER: This makes it all right. This goes to the official receiver. If it had remained in the original form I would have thought it advisable to submit an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: The next amendment is to provide that the last paragraph of section 14 on page 6 of the draft bill be amended to read as follows:

And provided further that nothing in this section shall have the effect to terminate the security heretofore given by any such person; such security shall be kept in force until such time as the Governor in Council is satisfied that all moneys and properties received by the trustee have been duly accounted for and paid over to the parties entitled thereto.

Mr. BAXTER: I would move to substitute for the phrase "to terminate" the words "of

terminating." To say "the effect to terminate" is not very good.

Amendment (Mr. Baxter) agreed to.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I would ask the minister if it is intended to have the Governor in Council exercise authority in these proceedings. This would rather indicate that it is. What is the real scheme? Is the ultimate authority with the courts or with the Governor in Council?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: This refers to bonds heretofore given, and that right has already been given to the Governor in Council

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: This is merely as to past business.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Yes.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 15—Appointment of trustee.

Mr. BAXTER: I have not had time to examine the voting section very carefully, but I do not think there is any provision that a certain proportion of the creditors shall be represented at the meeting for this purpose. Clause 2 says:

> A trustee may be removed and another trustee appointed or substituted by creditors by ordinary resolution at any meeting of creditors.

That would leave it open for a meeting at which it would not be anticipated perhaps that such a step would be taken, and you would have the matter dealt with by perhaps a small proportion of the creditors. It seems to me there ought to be some provision so that there would be at least a substantial body of the creditors or of the claims represented, for this is quite an important meeting, and very often there is not much more in these estates than the sort of fighting that goes on between one side that wants one representative and another side that wants another. I know the minister does not want to lend the legislation to the assistance of any party quarrel of that kind.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: If a trustee is not honest and the creditors find it necessary that he should be removed, and if they had to wait until there was a full meeting with two-thirds of the creditors represented, it would mean a delay of three or four weeks, and in the meantime, how would you administer?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is not that covered?

Mr. BAXTER: You have the security for him if he is not honest.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Yes, but it is not sufficient to have the security. You have to liquidate in the interest of the creditors, and in some cases a delay of three or four weeks might be very injurious to their interests.

Mr. BAXTER: You are going to give notice anyway?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Notice is given of the meeting and the creditors have to appear.

Mr. BAXTER: Then have it put in the notice and it is their own fault if they do not turn up. Provision may be there but I have not been able to follow it up. If you are sure all will get their notices it will be their own fault if they do not turn up.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Suppose at a meeting of creditors they are informed that the trustee has acted dishonestly and they wish to remove him why should it be necessary to wait for another meeting, with special notice to the creditors, to authorize such removal? After all the creditors are there. They are not interested in removing the trustee unless they think he is not acting honestly. He is acting for them, and why make it so hard for the creditors to effect a change if they find it is necessary for the good of the creditors at large?

Mr. BAXTER: I will only say this: The section as drafted allows the trustee to be removed for cause by the court, but it does not require any cause for removal by the creditors.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: This is a repetition of the old law.

Mr. BAXTER: Probably there were faults in the old law and it was amended many times. No doubt it can be amended again.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not think this provision is the same as in the old law which appears to be the point taken by the hon. member (Mr. Baxter). Under the old law a majority of the creditors who held one-half, or more, of the amount of the accrued debts could do this. Theoretically, I think the minister is quite right, but the trouble is that this is not a theoretical question. In most of the difficulties with assignments in the past you have two factions trying to get control of an appointee. Now I can see what the objection of the hon. member (Mr. Baxter) is. He does not wish to have these factional fights. He does not want to have one man

in one day and somebody else in the next day. We have had that condition in Ontario under the old law.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Suppose we were to say a majority of the creditors.

Mr. CARROLL: You cannot simply say a majority of the creditors.

Mr. BAXTER: You might say a majority in number of the creditors who hold accrued debts and so on.

Mr. CARROLL: I think it should be a majority in interest. For example one person might have control of 75 per cent of the claims. He should have the real interest in the matter. Twelve others might control only 12 per cent of the whole of the claims. I am only suggesting this for the purpose of getting the provision properly worded.

Mr. BAXTER: I agree with my hon. friend in that respect. I think it would be preferable to have it worded "a majority in amount of the claims" rather than a majority of the number of creditors. But I would suggest to the minister that as there are other sections that are being held this one also might be deferred. I would be perfectly willing, even at the risk of a little more draftsmanship, that in case of dishonesty the creditors could act at once and irrespective of the size of a meeting. Nobody wants to protect dishonesty. On the mere question of substituting one man for another let it be a majority in amount of the estate. In any other case let the matter go to the court.

Mr. CARROLL: The court may now remove a trustee for cause. Would it be satisfactory to my hon. friend that the trustee might be removed by a majority in number or interest of the creditors at a meeting?

Mr. BAXTER: I am impressed by what the Minister of Justice says. I do not think that in the case of manifest dishonesty we should hold the creditors back from acting and compel them to go and show that cause to the court. I am willing if dishonesty is established that a bare majority in numbers of the creditors should act on that. What I want to provide against is putting in A to-day and then moving to put in B to-morrow. That is only a mischievous proceeding and helps no one.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: We will reconsider the section.

Section stands.

[Sir Henry Drayton.]

On section 16—Right of manufacturer.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is the effect of that?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: This is to protect the time in which a manufacturer of a patented article must apply to repurchase. The delay runs from the date of the appointment of the trustee rather than from the date of the assignment or the receiving order.

Section agreed to.

On section 17—Sales in the province of Quebec; sales of hypothecated immovable property.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Will the minister explain what change is made here?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: In the case of immovable property, whereon a hypothec or privilege exists, such property shall not be sold by the trustee unless he is authorized by the judge after permission given to him by the inspectors to that effect, and after notice having been given to each hypothecary or privileged creditor whose name is entered on the register that the registrars of the registration division are obliged to keep according to the laws of the province. According to these laws when a hypothecary or privileged creditor lodges notice with the registrar in every case where a sale is to take place by the sheriff, and such property is to be sold, the registrar has to notify the creditor. We exact the same from the trustee. He will be authorized to sell such real estate on which there is a hypothec only with the permission of the judge and the inspectors and after notice has been given to the creditors who have such hypothes or privilege on that property. Then he will proceed to sell the property exactly in the same method, 9 p.m. and after the same notice, as when the sheriff effects such sale. He will have to give such notice and to sell at auction, if he is authorized in writing by the creditors to do so, in order to save costs. This is satisfactory, I understand, to the creditors of the province of Quebec who have been asking for such an amendment to protect their rights.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I suppose what my hon. friend means is that preferred creditors in Quebec have been objecting that their rights have been interfered with under this insolvency law?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: No. Some properties were sold by the trustees without the

creditors knowing about the sale, and this sale can free the properties of mortgages, hypothecs, privileges only if they are sold by the sheriff. By these amendments, however, we wish to authorize the trustee to proceed himself with the sale without going to the sheriff; but this he will do only after authority has been given to him by the judge, and by the inspectors, and after notice has been given to the creditors. He will replace the sheriff where such consent or authorization has been given to him.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I suppose the complaint really is that notice was not given in the past.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Under the present law the trustee could not discharge the property; the property had to be sold by the sheriff, and such a procedure is sometimes very expensive. It is in the interest of the creditors, the trustee and the debtor, that the sale should take place at auction by the trustee. The intention is to save money, to protect the rights of the creditors and to protect the creditors generally.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Why cannot you in Quebec make the valid sale that you can make in Ontario under the bankruptcy law?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: It is not the same law.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The procedure is under the same bankruptcy law.

Mr. MARTELL: The system of procedure is different.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: We provide our system of procedure under this legislation.

Mr. MARTELL: My hon. friend knows that we in the English-speaking provinces have a certain form of procedure. The courts and officials of Quebec are accustomed to an absolutely different form of procedure. While I quite agree with my hon. friend, who is a lawyer of many more years' standing than I am, he knows very well that lawyers become acquainted with a certain form of procedure. Quebec has become accustomed to a certain form of procedure, and it wants to carry that out. As I understand the matter, in Quebec they had no authority to discharge the debtor; in Ontario they could do that. In Ontario the property could be sold by the sheriff, and in Nova Scotia and other provinces it could be sold by the trustee and discharge given. I understand this section is intended to apply only to Quebec.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: That is what I am saying. In Ontario, if a property is mortgaged, a sheriff could sell it and discharge the mortgage. It is the same in Quebec..

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is the necessity for this change?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: To facilitate the liquidation, to give full title.

Mr. MARTELL: To save costs.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Under the law of Quebec, is it suggested that, if the judge says so, the property can be sold without being subject to the mortgage.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: No.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then why do we have this trouble about the judge in this clause?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: The judge cannot discharge the mortgage. We now legislate to this end, that with the permission of the judge, the permission of the inspectors, and notice being given to the creditors, the trustee will have the right to sell and discharge the property, which is something that cannot be done in Ontario.

Mr. BAXTER: I am not going to attempt to discuss this clause because I know simply nothing about the procedure. I do not even know whether the remarks I am going to make pertain to this particular clause or not. Since the House rose I was in conversation with the hon. member for George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs), and there are some matters that he wishes to speak of that are peculiar to the law of Quebec. They may or may not bear upon this clause. I have not the knowledge to say so. I am going to suggest to the minister that, perhaps, he let this clause stand until that hon. member is here, and if what he wants to say bears upon it, he will have an opportunity of discussing it.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I have seen the hon. member for George Etienne Cartier, and he wishes to speak only as regards the preference of the landlords. As to this, he is perfectly well satisfied, and he made that declaration this afternoon in the House.

Section agreed to.

On section 18—Description of debtor's property.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is the effect of this amendment?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Section 18 is to amend section 25 of the act. It is to render the property of a debtor acquired after the assignment and before his discharge, available to his creditors. The present act makes a distinction in this respect between a debtor adjudicated bankrupt and a debtor who has made an assignment. The result is to encourage assignments since the assignor virtually gets a discharge automatically by this provision. There is a distinction between a receiving order and an assignment. Under this amendment all property that is acquired by a debtor up to his discharge goes to his creditors without any distinction between the case of the receiving order and the voluntary assignment.

Mr. BAXTER: The old section called him a debtor in one line and a bankrupt in another, and this is to call him the same all through.

Section agreed to.

On section 19—Abstract of receipts and disbursements.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is the reason for the change?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: It is to require the trustee to give notice to the creditors with the final dividend sheet, that he will apply to the court on a certain day for his discharge. Subclause (2) amends section 37, subsection (7) of the act to make it articulate with the provisions for the appointment of a custodian and his duties. The authorized trustee hitherto has advertised the assignment and called the first meeting of creditors. This is now to be done by the custodian. It is a change in the procedure.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: A distinction is made between the dividends paid. In subclause 2, final dividends are mentioned. The first subclause apparently deals with a dividend, and then the trustee is to give "notice that he will apply to the court on a day named therein for his discharge." He would not apply until after the final dividend was paid, would he? Or does that refer only to the final dividend? It does not read that way in the amendment as drawn, but it may have that effect.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: When the trustee pays his last dividend he gives notice to the creditors that at a certain date he will apply to the judge for his discharge.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not think that the proper side notes have been given. The first one refers to the abstract of receipts and disbursements. Is the minister quite sure that subsection 2 refers to cases of final dividends?

[Sir Henry Drayton.]

Sir LOMER GOUIN: The side note is not correct.

Section agreed to.

On section 20—Remuneration of trustee.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: This enables the inspectors and the court to give to the trustee a remuneration in excess of 5 per cent, which in the case of small estates has proved inadequate. If, for instance, an estate realized $1,000, five per cent would only be $50, and I do not see how a trustee could be expected to act for such a remuneration. It is deemed wise to leave it to the court and the inspector.

Section agreed to.

On section 20A—Release of security.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: This provides for the release of the security on the discharge of the trustee.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: We have not this section before us but I presume the minister can assure us that this is the purpose of it.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Yes, that is the purpose.

Section agreed to.

On section 21—Application of trustee for discharge.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: It is provided that the trustee shall apply to the court for his discharge within fifteen days of the payment of the final dividend.

Mr. BAXTER: That is, for the discharge of himself as trustee?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Yes. We propose now to make the period thirty days. We considered that fifteen days was not long enough, and as the trustee could not be appointed in any other case until he got his discharge it was represented that this provision might work a hardship on trustees. If a judge were not in a position to render judgment in that time a trustee might be deprived of a valuable appointment. We therefore provide that the trustee shall apply within thirty days and if the charge is refused he shall be ineligible to act in any subsequent case.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That is much better.

Section agreed to.

On section 22—Meetings of creditors.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: By this we propose that the meeting of the creditors shall take place at the office of the receiver, who shall decide any controverted points; and there is an appeal to the judge from his decision.

Mr. CLARK: Is it the first meeting of the creditors that is to take place in the office of the receiver?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Yes.

Mr. CLARK: Suppose a business has failed in the town of Barrie, say, which is an instance that was suggested this afternoon; there is no local registrar or official receiver there. The official receiver for that particular locality is in the city of Toronto, and it is reasonable to think that the major portion of the creditors would be located in Barrie. Is it intended that these creditors, in order to attend the first meeting of creditors, must journey to Toronto to secure representatives there?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Does the hon. member think that the receiver should go to Barrie?

Mr. CLARK: Frankly, I say that would be preferable, especially in view of the fact that the official receiver can now appoint someone to represent him.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: It is necessary to fix some place where the creditors shall meet, and if the meeting is to be official and of that solemn character which it should possess, there is no better place at which it could be held than the office of the receiver. If the creditors do not wish to travel they can very well send proxies. There are creditors all over the country in every province and I do not see really how you could have a better arrangement than this.

Mr. CLARK: I am thinking more particularly of small businesses in small communities. I do not think that this applies to my own district, but it certainly does apply to smaller communities all over the country where small businesses fail and go into bankruptcy. The creditors might be located in a little town and there would not be much solemnity to the occasion if they had to journey a hundred, or fifty or twenty-five miles to the office of the receiver to attend a meeting of creditors. As a matter of fact, I believe that in many instances the estate would be so small that the travelling expenses of the creditors in going to the office of the official receiver might be equal to the whole estate.

Mr. MARTELL: Does not my hon. friend think that if these things may occur in certain districts it is a good practice to have a prothonotary act as official receiver? He is a clerk of the court, and everyone who goes into court is struck by the solemnity of the proceedings.

Mr. CLARK: I think my hon. friend misses my point altogether. I am directing attention to cases where the official receiver has no office in the town. Take my hon. friend's own community, for instance. Supposing the nearest official receiver resided in the city of Halifax, and the creditors of the insolvent concern lived in his home town, they would all have to journey to Halifax to attend the first meeting before the official receiver. That is the situation I am presenting to the minister. It would be most unreasonable and unjust to the creditors, in many instances the expense would be prohibitive to them, and as for the issuing of proxies, through the failure of any of the creditors to attend the first meeting there would be no one available to represent them.

Mr. MARTELL: We may not have any official receiver in my particular county. That is one reason for putting the matter in the hands of the prothonotary. But supposing a merchant fails in my county, the majority of the creditors are very apt to be resident in Montreal, Toronto and other large centres. Would my hon. friend say that under such circumstances the official receiver should journey to those cities? Why not let the creditors retain some good local solicitor to appear before the court in their behalf? When the clerk of the court is clothed with the authority of an official receiver there is always due solemnity about the proceedings.

Mr. CLARK: If my hon. friend is looking for a job this would be the best way of getting one.

Mr. MARTELL: No, I am not looking for a job.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: If the minister is determined that we shall go through these meaningless forms before we get down to business, I do not know that he can adopt any better course. Apparently because there is difficulty in Quebec he thinks it perfectly reasonable that we should inconvenience creditors in Ontario by requiring that these two unnecessary things be done, involving delay and expense. As my hon. friend to my right (Mr. Clark) said, you may have all your creditors at a place where there is no receiver. We were discussing a similar case

this afternoon—not a hypothetical case, but an actual case of a man failing in northern Ontario and not a single creditor living within one hundred miles of his home town. There is the option on one hand of one person taking a railway trip, and the option on the other hand of perhaps twenty-five creditors or more taking the railway trips. Well, if we are to have these troubles perhaps it is just as well that the twenty-five should be obliged to travel instead of one.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: It is precisely for those creditors who live far from the receiver's office that we make such a provision to protect them. We are not legislating especially for Quebec, we are considering the whole Dominion. It was represented to us that the present law was abused, that authorized trustees would sometimes decide to have a meeting of creditors where it would be impossible for them to attend. By this amendment we provide that the first meeting of creditors shall take place at the office of the receiver, which is supposed to be the centre of the district. Taking Ontario—leaving out Quebec for the moment—Toronto is the centre. It is not the intention to bring all creditors to Toronto; we have in mind by a later section to divide the province into various districts and to locate a receiver in the centre of each. I do not know that we could choose a better place for meetings of creditors than the centre of the district in which the bankruptcy takes place. This amendment is not to embarrass creditors, it is to protect them.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The case I put to my hon. friend was that the creditors were already in Toronto. The insolvency occurred at Sault Ste. Marie, where there is a local registrar and where you have the assignment, but all your creditors are hundreds of miles away down in Toronto. Under this law they would have to go to Sault Ste. Marie.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: No.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It may be very good for the creditors' health that they should have to take these journeys at their own expense on top of the money which they are already out, but I really do not think they will be of this opinion. So far as geographical boundaries are concerned, my hon. friend is going to have trouble. The centres of commerce are not fixed by geographical boundaries. You will have a place in a particular section of territory from which all your freight and all your credit movements will radiate, and if that be on the outskirts of the community instead of in the centre, as he says that is the place where the convenience of creditors should be considered. But I suppose my hon. friend has absolutely made up his mind that all this has to be done? I was not in the House for a few minutes after dinner and do not know whether in the interval the section as to the appointment of local registrars was adopted.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: That is to be considered on Monday.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then perhaps we are considering all these sections in advance of time, because they will only be important if my hon. friend is determined to put through the other section.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: If we leave the law as it is to-day we are entirely in the hands of the receiver. My hon. friend speaks of the interests of Toronto creditors. Well, supposing an assignment is made at Sault Ste. Marie in favour of the official receiver, who would be the registrar. With the law as it is to-day he might decide to have the first meeting of creditors in Winnipeg or Montreal. Would that be fair to the creditors generally?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: No, absolutely unfair, and my hon. friend is giving us one of those hypothetical cases that we need never worry about. All these men want to hold their jobs. The receivers, who can be thrown out by the creditors, call their meetings in such a way, in any case I ever heard of, as to help the creditors and make their course easy. Men do not usually go against their self-interest. If my hon. friend has a case of a man failing at the Soo and having creditors' meetings called in Winnipeg or in Montreal, I could understand his position, but I am afraid he will never find such a case.

Mr. MARTELL: Does my hon. friend not think that the creditors should seek the court rather than that the court should seek them? Under the scheme he submits the registrar or referee would go all over the country to discover all sorts of claims some of which might be purely fictitious, devoid of credit from every possible point of view. The registrar gives due notice; the creditor has to file his claim. If the registrar goes from place to place in order to find out who the creditors are he will run up a bill of costs which will derogate from the interests of the other creditors. So that when notice is given of the locus in which the registrar is situated, every person interested should go to that

locus to put in his claim there. That is what the minister is after.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am afraid my hon. friend was out this afternoon when I was addressing myself to this question. If he had been here he would know that I did not want any pesky registrar at all. I do not want the method of appointment changed.

Mr. MARTELL: With all due deference to my hon. friend, I say that the proper registrar is the prothonotary the clerk of the court, for these officials are known to every person in the municipality or county.

The CHAIRMAN: Clause 2 as amended, carried.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: On division.

On section 22, subsection 4—voting by proxy.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is the import of the amendment?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Section 42, subsection 13 provides for the lodging of proxies with the trustee; they are now lodged with the custodian. That is the only change.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the subclause carry?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think we had better have all these carried on division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Carried on division.

On section 23—proof of debts.

Mr. BAXTER: The original act provides as follows:

> A debt may be proved by delivering or sending through the post in a prepaid and registered letter to the trustee, a statutory declaration verifying the debt.

Now, the amendment makes it optional to send the proof either to the custodian or to the trustee. As I understand it, when the trustee is appointed the custodian ceases to function. Suppose someone sends proof of debt to the custodian after that official ceases to function; is there anything to tell the ex-custodian to hand these things over to the trustee?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: There is no special provision for that. If my hon. friend thinks it is necessary, I would be prepared to accept the suggestion.

Mr. BAXTER: Does the minister not think it would be well to do it, just to stop carelessness? However, so far as I am concerned the section may pass.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: This is one of the difficulties of the proposed changes: you have one man here to-day and another to-morrow, and the people know they have the right to send proof of debt to either. I think my hon. friend is going to find difficulty with his scheme.

Section agreed to.

On section 24—secured creditor to value of security.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: This amendment is to require secured creditors to value securities only in the case of a demand by the trustee. Heretofore the secured creditor has been obliged to value the securities within thirty days of the receiving order or assignment on penalty of being disentitled to rank as an ordinary creditor if his claim is in excess of the value of the security. As the secured creditor may not know of the insolvency it is unfair that he should be penalized for failure to value within thirty days; it is sufficient to compel him to value when the trustee so demands. If the trustee asks for a valuation and if the creditor neglects to value, then he is disentitled to rank as a creditor for the surplus over the security. This subsection is also amended to make it clear that the secured creditor shall be entitled to receive dividends only in respect of the balance of his claim in excess of his valuation; this result is doubtful under the present section. It is further provided that subsection 3 shall be repealed, which requires a secured creditor to identify the property covered by the security within ten days on penalty of forefeiture. He must, of course, identify the property if the trustee contests his claim, but it is manifestly unfair to compel him to identify within ten days under penalty of forfeiture. Suppose a creditor pretends that he has a lien on certain goods. If he files his claim with the trustee, the trustee will either accept his claim or contest it. If he contests it, then it will be the duty of the creditor to identify his property, but if his claim is contested we do not see why the creditor should proceed to such identification within a period of ten days.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Would it be necessary in both cases? Supposing you have a claim on goods. Unless those goods are identified, unless it be that under the new act it is recognized that we are going to have delay, and I think we are going to have it, surely one of the very first things is to take an inventory of your goods, put your valuation upon them and the like. Get to know what the assets are, but you cannot do that

unless you first find out whether those assets are subject to lien. I would have thought that was one of the first things to make clear. I would have thought that the trustee would have a right to try and make the creditor distinguish the goods he claims.

Mr. MARTELL: Surely the hon. member knows that the first thing to do is to take an inventory of the goods. Subsequently you find out what the liens are, but at the outset you take a full inventory of all the assets. When it is known what stands against them, that is submitted to your creditors.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is that to be for an indefinite date? I suppose my hon. friend thinks it ought to be done some time. Before, it had to be claimed within ten days. Does he think that is too soon? But surely one of the first things for the trustee to do is to know what the goods of the insolvent really are. I would have thought that was absolutely elementary.

Mr. MARTELL: That is plain.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Surely then the law ought to stand and the man ought to say: These are my goods, and not the goods of the insolvent.

Mr. MARTELL: Your liens come in after the inventory is made.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: If there is a claim filed by the creditor it is accepted or refused. Simply because the creditor goes to the trustee and says: I hold security on such-and-such goods, that does not change the position. By the mere fact of the creditor filing his claim, the trustee knows what the claim is, and he is in a position to contest the same if so disposed. Because a claim is filed it does not necessarily have to be accepted. I do not see what difference it makes. Why force a creditor who has a lien to proceed to such identification under a penalty of losing his privilege unless he does it within ten days?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What length of time does the minister think should be set apart for the identification of these lien goods? Sooner or later it has to be done. How long a time does the minister want?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: As soon as the creditor claims, the trustee is informed. We are told by men who have had a very large practice in bankruptcy matters that this is of no use, that it is only a cause of trouble. It does not help in the liquidation, and that is why we have brought down the amendment.

[Sir Henry Drayton.]

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the section carry?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not think we did more than discuss the first section.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Subsection 2 amends subsection 5 to enable the trustee to sell any goods the creditor fails to value. The creditor has to value his property if he is asked to do so. This is to supply an omission in the existing law which does not provide for the case where the creditor omits to value. If the creditor omits to value the trustee cannot sell. We provide to this effect, that whether he values or not the trustee will have the right to sell.

Subsection 3 amends subsection 7 of the act, which provides for substituting the amount realized by the sale of a security for the amount at which the creditor valued such a security, to make it clear that such substitution extends to sales by the trustee under subsection 5 of the act as well as to sales by the creditor. This is necessary by the amendment to subsection 5.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend this afternoon or this evening dealt with the question of hypothetic and mortgage properties in Quebec. I suppose he there was dealing with claims similar to those dealt with by this section, and we had machinery provided for in the case of Quebec. Is there any difference made as a result of these amendments in the ultimate solution of these questions as between Quebec and the other provinces?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: No.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: So far as the results are concerned similar justice is done all over the country.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I just wanted to make sure that that would be the effect of this. I confess I cannot make it out.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: There is no difference. Subsection 4 amends subsection 8 of the act to enable a creditor to amend his valuation at any time before sale instead of within two months. If the property has changed in value there is no reason why the creditor should not be permitted to change his valuation. He is limited to two months under the present law, but we say that he should have the right to change his valuation whenever he finds it proper to do so. There will be no loss to the creditors by his doing that.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The only trouble I see is this, and I have no doubt my hon. friend has considered it: Ought not these things to be wound up a little quicker than a delay of two months would render possible? Why should there be so much delay?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: This amendment does not extend the delay.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: You do not think it will?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Not at all. If the sale was to take place in six weeks the whole thing is finished.

Section agreed to on division.

On section 25—Wife's claim.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What does the minister say as to this?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Section 25 amends section 48, subsection 2. It is to repeal the provision whereby a wife's claim for money lent her husband for the purposes of his business is postponed until other creditors are paid. As the wife is frequently unable to refuse to make such a loan it is thought to be unfair that she should suffer under the existing disadvantage. This was explained by our friend from Dorchester this afternoon. He thought the wife should be protected.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I just wanted to make sure of one thing there, Mr. Chairman, and that is what the minister's opinion is. I have not the acts before me as to the effect of this amendment, whether the old laws which permitted all kinds of abuses to be worked as against creditors would again be put into effect, or whether this would be absolutely confined to bona fide approved claims of the wife in the shape of loans to the husband's business.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: The amendment to that effect is very clear.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It reads that way here, but I have not the act itself before me and I wanted your opinion.

Section agreed to.

Sections 26 and 27 stand.

On section 28—Examination of bankrupt by official receiver.

The CHAIRMAN: It is proposed to strike out subsection 1 and replace it by the following:

Subsection 1 of section fifty-four, as amended by chapter eight of the statutes of 1922, is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

54. Where a receiving order or authorized assignment is made the bankrupt or assignor shall present himself before the official receiver who shall examine him as to the causes of his insolvency and the disposition of his assets and shall put to him the questions provided by the general rules or questions to the like effect. The official receiver shall make notes of such examination, and shall communicate them to the creditors at their first meeting. If the bankrupt or assignor fails to present himself at such an examination within three days from the making of the receiving order or the filing of the assignment, the court may by warrant cause him to be apprehended and brought up for examination, and may order him to be committed to the common goal of the judicial district in which he resides for a term not exceeding twelve months. Furthermore, the bankrupt or assignor shall make out and submit to the Official Receiver a statement of and in relation to his affairs in the prescribed form verified by affidavit and showing the particulars of the debtor's assets, debts and liabilities the names, residence, and occupations of his creditors, the securities held by them respectively, the dates when the securities were respectively given, and such further or other information as may be prescribed by the court. Such statement shall be submitted within seven days from the date of the receiving order or assignment, but the court may for special reasons extend the time. It shall be the duty of the custodian to verify the debtor's statement of affairs and to make an inventory of his assets.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: This amendment is to require the bankrupt or assignor to present himself before the official receiver within three days of the making of the receiving order or assignment to be examined as to the disposition of his assets and the causes of his insolvency. This is the English law and it is considered a very important feature of their act. The official receiver is to make notes of the examination and to communicate the same to the creditors at their first meeting.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I was trying to follow the amendment as it appears in the bill, but I ran out of type here in a very short time. I think my hon. friend has got some long typewriten amendment he is asking the committee to adopt.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: The amendment was read by the chairman.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Perhaps we might have it read again.

The CHAIRMAN: It is proposed to strike out the section as it appears in the bill and substitute a new one.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: No wonder I experienced considerable difficulty in trying to follow it as printed in the bill. I wonder if my hon. friend cannot have copies made?

Mr. CARROLL: I quite agree with the hon. member. In order to follow intelligently the progress of an important bill of this kind we should have the data the minister has before him, or it should be in the possession

of the clerk of the committee and available to members. While not objecting to the present proceeding, I think that in future when important bills of this kind come down we should have all the necessary information before us in order to know exactly what is being done.

Mr. MARTELL: How can my hon. friend have placed in his hands all the data that the minister has? The minister has come here with the notes he has read showing why he desires these amendments. I do not see why the minister should be called upon to supply every member with copies of his notes.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I will give my hon. friend (Sir Henry Drayton) a copy of the amendment if he wishes it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: From my reading of the amendment which has been handed to me by the minister, it appears to provide for an immediate examination which, of course, is a very good thing. Is this the English form of procedure?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: That is the English law.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Can the minister tell us from memory what the real change is as compared with the present law?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Under the present law the debtor can only be examined after a vote of the creditors or inspectors. By this amendment we are providing for a compulsory examination immediately after the assignment, so that the creditors when they meet, will be informed of the position of the estate.

Mr. CLARK: I have not had an opportunity of studying this amendment carefully but I think the objection I raised to an earlier section also applies to this, namely, that the debtor may have to travel one hundred miles or more for the purpose of this examination within three days of the assign-
10 p.m. ment. I think that is correct, is it not? Now, it is safe to assume he will come down say to Toronto from Barrie, and attend before the official receiver for examination. The official receiver knows nothing about the particular business in question, and is not a qualified person, I should say, to examine the debtor in regard to it. The result will be that the examination will be conducted by a man who knows nothing about the business.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I may say in answer to my hon. friend that the questions will be put by the official receiver in the same form as provided for in the English law.

Mr. CLARK: Is that provided for by the bill?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: In effect, yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I wonder if the minister thinks that is a sufficiently searching examination. I confess I did not realize for one minute that the only kind of examination that the creditors would get the benefit of would be an examination conducted by a registrar of one of our courts. That would be a kind of cross-examination that would generally take us virtually nowhere. It would never get under the hide of a fraudulent bankrupt.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: This does not deprive the creditors of examining the debtor afterwards. They may petition the court, and they will be granted that opportunity of examining the debtor at any time they wish.

Mr. CLARK: The circumstances in this country are quite different from those in England, because in England the distances are nothing. Furthermore, the centres there are large and, therefore, it is safe to assume that there will be an official receiver in every centre and that a debtor will not have to travel far as in this country. Therefore, if the questions are of a stereotyped nature, why not have them printed, send them to the local registrar and let the debtor fill out the answers to the questions and swear to them before the local registrar? I can see many instances where the poor debtor will not have the money to travel, and I assume that the court or the country is not going to put up the money for him to make such a trip.

Mr. MARTELL: My hon. friend undoubtedly desires to have the most searching examination. All parties have the right to be represented by counsel, to examine and cross-examine. Then if the registrar rules against them, they have a right to appeal against his decision to the court. What more does my hon. friend want? What right have people who may have a good claim to pay the expenses of a registrar travelling throughout the country?

Mr. CLARK: I am not suggesting that the registrar should travel in order to do this. I am making this suggestion in order to save money for the creditors. I am suggesting that the local registrar is a perfectly fit and proper man to take the examination, because it is, after all, only a stereotyped examination.

I think I am correct in saying that these questions take a set form. Therefore, the debtor can write down his answers just as easily as he can deliver them by word of mouth.

Mr. MARTELL: If the examination is stereotyped and stereotyped questions are set, a solicitor may advise his client, who may be the debtor, what sort of answers to give that may be evasive. I do not think he should be given the form of questions at all.

Mr. CLARK: I am not presuming fraud on the part of the debtor or his counsel.

Mr. MARTELL: In the case of the average bankrupt there is probably an element of fraud.

Mr. CLARK: I am trying to get an examination that will be of some value, and I am endeavouring to save some money to the estate. On this preliminary examination, is it provided for in the legislation that debtor and creditor shall be represented by counsel?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: The debtor can be assisted by counsel if he likes. The hon. member has objected that the debtor may not have enough money to travel from his domicile to the receiver's office. If the debtor is as poor as that, I do not suppose the creditors would be very anxious to examine him. All we do is to protect the creditors, and I do not see why my hon. friend should be so much interested in the debtor. It is all very well to see that the debtor gets fair protection. On the other hand, he is generally the one who is the cause of loss to the creditors, and it is only just and right that the creditors should have some opportunity of examining their debtor and knowing what he has done with their property, because, after all, it is their property he has used and disbursed.

Mr. CLARK: I think the minister has misunderstood me. I am not objecting to the creditors having an opportunity to examine the debtor. I am not thinking of the interest of either; I am trying to think of the interests of both. If we can save money, that means that the creditors will receive a larger dividend. On the other hand, I can think of many instances where a debtor, when he has come to the state where he becomes bankrupt, may have assets which are worth a great deal of money, but he may be without a cent of ready cash, and within three days he may be in a fix where he is subject to a penalty through no real fault of his own. What I want to get at is this. If this preliminary examination is going to be an extensive one, conducted in the presence of counsel, it is going to be more than a preliminary affair; it is going to be an exhaustive and expensive affair and to last over a considerable period of time. If it is going to be an exhaustive affair, it should not take place within three days of the assignment, because the registrar will not be sufficiently seized of the nature of the business to enable him to carry on this examination. If, on the other hand, it is going to be only a preliminary affair, with stereotyped questions, the same questions put to one debtor that will be put to all, that can be done just as well on a printed sheet. Let the debtor write his answers down and swear to them before a notary public. If that is not considered satisfactory, then the debtor should be entitled to attend before the nearest local registrar of the Supreme Court to the place where the debtor is living, so that these questions may be put to him, and then he can take his oath and give his answers to the questions. I am not clear, under the clause of the bill, whether this is to be in the nature of a preliminary examination, or whether it is intended to be an exhaustive examination in the presence of counsel representing all parties.

Mr. MARTELL: Would my hon. friend, if he were going to court, give beforehand to the party opposite the questions that he was going to ask? If you send out a number of stereotyped questions—

Mr. CLARK: I am asking the minister that question.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: There are formal questions to be put; if the receiver finds that he should put other questions, he will be at liberty to do so.

Mr. MARTELL: The parties will have the right to be represented by counsel.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Has the minister really found any necessity for this in administering the act? This is not what I was thinking of—a full examination; it is a matter of the purest formality. I assume there is a series of questions one would naturally put to a debtor: what assets he has, the reasons for his insolvency, questions looking to whether or not he has made disposition of his assets, a general discovery of assets. That is what such an examination amounts to on a regularly stereotyped line. Has the minister found any necessity for that? At one time I had a good deal to do with insolvency matters, but that is so long ago now that I am not as familiar with the subject as I used to be. But my recollection is that examinations that

ever amounted to anything always occurred after something had been found out. An examination as a rule is no good at all except in cases where there is fraud of some kind, either in getting rid of property, or transferring property or in preferring certain individuals. My experience was that you never got on to anything like that, unless you knew just what you were after and worked out a good line of cross-examination. I believe that this examination by itself might be more educative to the dishonest debtor than useful to the creditor. Has my hon. friend found any troubles arising because we have not had this complete examination in the past?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Yes, we were told by some trustees that such an examination should be required in all cases, and from what we have learned from some interested creditors it is very important that thorough examinations should be made. My hon., friend, with the experience that he has had in dealing with such cases, knows as well as I do that it is always well that creditors should have the right to examine the debtor—

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Oh yes.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: —so that they may know what he has done with his property—

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Undoubtedly.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: —and may ascertain the details of different claims that might be filed against the estate by some of his family or his friends. I do not understand why objections should be raised to the amendment we now offer. This is the law as it is in England and it has been found of great use to the creditors. We have been informed that it would be of some advantage to creditors in this country if it were embodied in our legislation, and that is why we have proposed it. If, of course, it proves of no benefit to the creditors in any case it will not be put to use by them. But when we are asked to pass this provision, which is the law in England, and which the experience of everyone who has practised at the bar for some years recognizes to be useful, it seems to me that it should be accepted without further discussion.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend says that if the creditors do not want to use it they will not, but my recollection is that the debtor is obliged within three days to present himself for examination, which examination must be made.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: If my recollection is right, every bankrupt is bound to do this.

[Sir Henry Drayton.]

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then it is not a matter of option; the examination must be made. My hon. friend has entirely mistaken the object of my inquiry. I want to find out, where an examination is not calculated to discover fraud, whether it has been found necessary to have such an examination at all. If the minister says it is necessary, very well. I entirely agree that there is a necessity for a thorough examination, and if this were to be a real examination conducted by counsel, I could see the utility of it. I find, however, that it is to be a stereotyped form of examination.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: There is nothing to prevent an examination on any grounds.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Suppose a man comes within three days and makes a discovery which the registrar thinks is a full and perfectly good and free discovery. The registrar thinks he is a fine gentleman, and there the matter ends. Does that stop the creditors themselves from conducting an examination on their own account? Supposing the creditors themselves desire to examine the man a month afterwards, can they do so, or is the right of examination exhausted by this inquiry on the part of the registrar?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: They can examine him whenever they like. As to the question of travelling, it is provided that the assignor shall present himself to the receiver within three days. As he must assign personally into the receiver's hands, there is no reason why he should not ask to be examined on the same day. One trip would therefore be sufficient for both purposes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I was concerned in making sure of the right of further examination. What section gives that right?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Section 56.

Section agreed to.

On section 29—Examination of Debtors.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: We are adding a new subsection 2. The first part provides for the examination of all persons who are supposed to know anything about the affairs of the assignor. Under the present law, only the employee of the assignor and the assignor himself may be examined. We propose to amend it to give the right to the creditors to examine any person who may be thought to possess any knowledge of the affairs of the assignor. The last part of the amendment provides that the debtor shall be examined as to

the administration of his affairs. He can ask for protection, as the law now stands, against prosecution in any criminal court. By this amendment we propose that any information that he may give under oath may be used by the creditors against him in any action they may take. If he is so protected that no such use may be made of any of his answers, I do not very well see that there would be any use in the examination.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Mr. Chairman, the section of which you have been kind enough to let me see the typewritten copy does not seem to me to cover one of the points raised by the hon. minister. It says, "Any person liable to be examined under the provisions of this section." Is there another amendment for our consideration as to what people are liable to be examined?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: If you read the beginning of section 29 in the bill the amendment will be clear.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then the context does not show us exactly how that examination is to be held. Is it to be taken before a special examiner under the ordinary rules? For example, in Ontario whom will the examination be held before?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: (reading.)

Where a receiving order or an authorized assignment has been made the trustee upon ordinary resolution passed by the creditors present or represented at a meeting regularly called or upon written request or resolution of a majority of the inspectors of the estate may without order examine under oath before the registrar of the court or other prescribed person the debtor or any person who is or has been an agent, clerk, servant, officer, director or employee of the debtor respecting the debtor, his dealings or property,

It will be the same examination before the registrar or any other officer designated.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then who will determine what the word "reasonably" means, having regard to the new section? Have these words been given any judicial interpretation—"any person reasonably thought to have knowledge of the affairs of the debtor." That may be used to very great advantage or very harshly, or it might be made merely a source of expense.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: He will appear before the registrar or some other officer, and if he has any objection to raise he will raise it and the registrar will decide.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I would have thought that the ordinary way of proceeding there would be to get from the registrar authority to bring the man before him, and that he would not grant this authority unless it was shown prima facie that the man sought to be examined had some knowledge of the affairs of the debtor. It looks as if subpoenas could be issued for anybody.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I do not think that creditors would be interested in calling any persons merely for the pleasure of annoying them.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The mere issuing of a subpoena would not cause the attendance of any man unless it was reasonably shown in the first instance that he had some knowledge of the debtor's affairs.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: What does my hon. friend suggest?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I was asking my hon. friend. Frankly, I confess I have not had very much chance of considering this.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: This is not an amendment; it is in the bill.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: But I am afraid this is the first time I have read it. It certainly seems to me that if the section goes through it will not do what my hon. friend expects. Before anyone could be in default under a subpoena it would have to be shown that he was a person who could reasonably be thought to have knowledge of the affairs of the debtor, and that would have to be established prima facie some way or other.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Does my hon. friend wish to let it stand or not?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I hope my hon. friend will come to the conclusion that we are really helping him if we say, "passed on division."

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I hope my hon. friend will do a little more in that direction.

Section agreed to on division.

On section 30—Powers of court regarding conditional discharge:

Sir LOMER GOUIN: This is to amend subsection 5 of section 58. The subsection reads as follows:

The court shall refuse a discharge in all cases where the bankrupt or authorized assignor has committed any offence under this act or any offence connected with his bankruptcy or assignment or the proceedings thereunder, unless for special reasons the court otherwise determines, and shall on proof of any of the facts mentioned in the next succeeding section, either—

We propose to strike out the words, "unless for special reasons the court otherwise determines."

Section agreed to.

On section 31—Officer to be assigned to duty by Chief Justice, etc.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Stands.

On section 32—Tariff of costs and fees.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: This is to enable inspectors of the court to approve payment of legal fees in excess of 5 per cent of the gross proceeds of the estate. In some cases assets have been lost because there was no provision to pay the necessary legal charges to recover them.

Mr. CLARK: I would suggest to the minister that he strike out the words "in writing of the inspectors and" so that the amendment will read, "except with the approval of the court." My reason for the suggestion is that the trustee deciding to do certain work must first consult his inspectors under the provisions of the act. When he receives their authority he instructs the solicitor to go ahead. There are many cases where the value of the work is largely in excess of 5 per cent of the gross proceeds of the estate, and that is particularly true where the assignor holds large properties in trust for other persons. In fact a large portion of the assets may consist of these trust assets; the actual assets of the estate may be very small. In cases where the inspectors instruct the solicitor to go ahead and do the work, obviously the solicitor should be paid reasonable fees for doing that work. In practically all cases the court fixes the fee payable to solicitors or counsel. A tariff of fees is laid down and the court first directs taxation of the bill of the solicitor. I cannot see why it should be necessary to secure the approval of the inspectors in writing of such bill, because they do not understand what are proper fees to be paid the solicitors. The court, on the other hand, is dealing with that question every day, and I think it will be quite sufficient to leave it entirely to the court to say whether or not it is reasonable that a solicitor in a certain case should be paid more than the five per cent. If it is decided that he shall be paid more than five per cent, then it is fair to leave it to the registrar to decide by means of taxation what actual amount the solicitor should be allowed.

[Sir Lomer Gouin.]

Mr. MARTELL: Does my hon. friend not think it would be better for the registrar to tax the costs in the first instance, and then if the parties are not agreeable, to have the judge decide the matter?

Mr. CLARK: I am only suggesting what I think is the custom not only throughout Canada but in Great Britain as well. The court in all such matters directs the solicitor's account to be taxed by the registrar and then the registrar taxes it.

Mr. MARTELL: With all due deference to my hon. friend, I may say that the practice in our province is that the solicitor's bill is taxed by the taxing master. Certain fees are prescribed; there is a maximum and a minimum, and the maximum can only be exceeded when the court or a judge so rules. If a solicitor is not satisfied, he may appeal to a judge for a rehearing and retaxation.

Mr. CLARK: That is not the point at all. This is a case where it must be decided in the first instance whether or not a solicitor shall be at liberty to present a bill. The court decides that; it is decided every day in winding-up proceedings. When the court decides that the solicitor is entitled to present a bill, then it goes to the taxing master, who taxes it. If the solicitor is not satisfied with his bill he has the right to appeal to the judge as my hon. friend has suggested.

Mr. MARTELL: I am not familiar with the system of taxation in the various provinces, but does my hon. friend mean to say that a solicitor is entitled to have costs taxed where the act does not entitle him to costs?

Mr. CLARK: No; my hon. friend has not followed me at all. He has not got the point.

Mr. GOULD: I suggest that where the money procurable from the insolvent's estate is not sufficient to pay the solicitor's fees, the solicitor himself shall become one of the creditors and go on a pro rata basis the same as the rest.

Mr. MARTELL: A Daniel come to judgment.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I understand that my hon. friend suggests that the word "in writing of the inspectors and" be struck out.

Mr. CLARK: Just leave it, "except with the approval of the court."

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I have no objection to that.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 34—Commencement of the act.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Did I understand my hon. friend (Mr. Baxter) to propose an amendment with regard to the removal of a trustee by majority of creditors?

Mr. BAXTER: I was only making a suggestion upon which the minister might work out something.

Mr. GOULD: I have gathered from the discussion that has taken place that this bill pertains more particularly to large investments, that is, to institutions in urban centres. It has occurred to me that some provision might be made, through an addition to the act, to provide for smaller businesses, we will say, in the country, or agriculturists, or both —provision whereby the smaller business man or the agriculturist might be enabled to settle with his creditors and start his business life over again. As there will be further discussion on the bill on a later occasion I just give that thought to the minister and the committee for their consideration.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I think the hon member will find that the provisions in the present act cover such cases. Farmers and wage earners are entitled to assign whenever they wish, and can get their discharge.

Section agreed to.

Progress reported.

SUPPLY—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Hon. W. S. Fielding (Minister of Finance) moved that the House go into Committee of Supply:

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I would ask my hon. friend who is leading the House whether he thinks it is worth while starting anything fresh at this stage, in view of the very depleted benches by which he is surrounded.

An hon. MEMBER: How about your own?

Mr. FIELDING: Does my hon. friend say that he desires us to go on with the estimates?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I was wondering whether anything would be gained by starting new business now.

Mr. FIELDING: Whether we gain anything will depend very largely on my hon. friend and those sitting near him.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not think that much will be gained.

Mr. FIELDING: It is still early. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries is prepared to go on with his estimates.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: We can take order No. 35. It is a Senate bill.

Motion withdrawn.

PETITION OF RIGHT ACT AMENDMENT

Sir LOMER GOUIN (Minister of Justice) moved the second reading of Bill No. 165 (from the Senate) to amend the Petition of Right Act.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Marcil in the chair.

On section 1—Revocation of fiat obtained by fraud.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: The amendment is to authorize the Governor in Council to revoke any fiat which he might have granted on a petition of right whenever he discovers that the granting of such fiat was induced by misrepresentation, concealment or non-disclosure on the part of the petitioner of any material fact which in the minister's opinion should have been truly stated or disclosed for the minister's information in the consideration of the petition. Passing an order in council revoking such fiat and depositing that order in council with the clerk of the court, puts an end to the case. Here is how subsection 2 reads:

> A copy of any order in council revoking or withdrawing the Governor General's fiat upon any petition of right as aforesaid, certified by the clerk of the Privy Council, may be filed in the Exchequer Court, and thereupon the petition shall abate, and all further proceedings in the action shall be and be deemed to have been, by the revocation or withdrawal of the fiat, perpetually stayed.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: This bill looks to be a perfectly proper bill, but I suppose it was brought in for the purpose of correcting the mistake of the government in granting the fiat in the famous Hoppe lease case.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: We do not admit we ever committed an error. There is not legislation to cover any special case. We only thought it was advisable to make our position perfectly clear, that whenever a fiat had been granted and we discovered that we were misinformed or deceived we would have the right to revoke such fiat.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am quite sure, Mr. Chairman, that the coincidence is just simply something that is remarkable.

Mr. GRAHAM: It just synchronizes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The synchronization is really complete. It is perfectly wonderful that just after a committee of the Senate dealing with the Hoppe case recommends such legislation this legislation is brought down and there is no connection between the two at all. Well, Mr. Chairman,

apparently we have not got out of the age of miracles yet.

Mr. MARTELL: Does the hon. member believe in miracles?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I never did before but I am asked to believe in them to-night.

Mr. MARTELL: I am glad to see you are waking up.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend is perfectly correct, Mr. Chairman. It is a great thing to brighten up, and it is a great thing to be able to listen to the declarations now made by the minister without a smile of incredulity. I ask my hon. friends though seriously whether it is not a fact that the Hoppe leases were referred to a committee of the Senate, and that as a result of its inquiries such a state of affairs was ascertained that the department presided over so ably by my hon. friend—I do not say he did it—recommended that the fiat should be withdrawn, stated that if the facts had been known the fiat would never have been given, and that this bill is necessary for the purpose of carrying that report into egect. Am I not right?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: An investigation took place in the Senate into the Hoppe leases. The Deputy Minister of Justice appeared before the Senate committee as a witness, and he was told that a certain agreement had been come to between a party and the heirs of the Isenberg estate. The Deputy Minister of Justice wrote a letter to the chairman of that committee telling him that if he had been informed of what he had since heard and had been told during that investigation he would probably have not granted a fiat.

I said at the outset in explaining the bill and in answer to my hon. friend that this was not legislation specially brought down for the Isenberg estate. This bill was introduced in the Senate so as to make our position perfectly clear, that there should be no doubt as to our right to revoke such fiats whether it be in the Isenberg case, or any other case that might be now pending or arising in the future. There is no mystery in the whole thing. If my hon. friend is satisfied that this is good legislation, he should approve of it and let it pass.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I quite understand that my learned friend is in one sense perfectly right. He is perfectly right when he says that this is not a special private act which is passed for the purpose of undoing the mistake of granting the fiat in the Hoppe case. That is perfectly true. It is not special in that sense at all, but it is an act nevertheless, a general act, for the purpose of enabling the government to undo the wrong they did in granting the fiat. That is what it is for. I think it is right under the circumstances that the wrong should be righted and the fiat which ought never to have been granted recalled, and if this is necessary for doing that I think this legislation is right. Is it a further term in connection with the granting of this improvident fiat, which hon. gentlemen were warned against, not once, but twice in one year, that this cancellation is to be accompanied by a cash payment?

Mr. MARTELL: May I ask my hon. friend what is the usual rule in applying for a petition of right?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am afraid my hon. friend is getting more like an Irishman every minute.

Mr. MARTELL: I simply want to know.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What I said is not meant as any offence against the Irish at all; I boast of a fair amount of that strain myself. I am merely referring to the fact that an Irishman is supposed to answer a question by asking another. Now my hon. friend has been doing that pretty regularly to-night when a question has been put to the minister. I do not mind answering my hon. friend's question but I do object to his rudely interrupting when the minister wants to answer a question that has been properly put to him.

Mr. MARTELL: I am not rude at all; I am simply asking you to give the rule.

Mr. CARROLL: I would suggest that my hon. friend from West York read section 2 of the bill which will explain the whole thing

> Nothing in this act shall be construed or interpreted as a legislative interpretation, declaration or limitation of the prerogatives of the Crown in dealing with the issue or revocation of any fiat granted upon petition of right.

Mr. BAXTER: We are all taking a hand at stopping the minister when he is very anxious to make a reply. I would suggest to the last hon. member who has spoken he should read section 1 when he will see that it is retroactive. I will ask him to ask the minister whether there is any other case in esse or in posse, except the Hoppe case, to which the retroactive feature of this legislation is to be applied. I think it would be a first rate thing to apply to that case, but is

it suggested that there is any other case known to the government where a fiat has been improvidently issued.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: This is not retroactive legislation.

Mr. BAXTER: Not in section 1? Yes.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I beg your pardon.

Mr. BAXTER: Let me quote the section:

In the case of any petition of right as to which the Governor General has heretofore granted or may hereafter grant—his fiat—

And so on. Then you act upon that. It applies not only to a petition of right which may be granted in the future but also to a petition which has been heretofore granted.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: It is not as to any pending litigation that it is retroactive.

Mr. BAXTER: Yes and it is right that it should be.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I understood my hon. friend from West York to put a question. He wants to know what the government is going to do in the matter of reimbursement?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I asked whether it had been stated in this report, or agreed that the money would be paid. What is the stand of the government in that matter?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I have not got the report before me. I understand, though, that the report goes to the extent of saying that the Senate would recommend the payment of the moneys that were disbursed. I am not sure that this is an exact statement. However, I cannot give any answer to my hon. friend as to what the government would do if that question were put to them.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I take it from what my hon. friend says that the government have not got as far yet as to consider the report of the Senate. Does he accept it in so far as putting the government—

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I cannot speak for the government, I can only speak for myself.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: —putting them in a position to remedy the wrong which they did. The minister says this is not retroactive legislation. I want frankly to say that I will not support it unless it is retroactive because I understood this bill was for the purpose of righting the wrong done in the Hoppe case in the granting of that fiat. I understood that this bill was brought down for the purpose of changing the general law so that that fiat might be recalled. If I read the bill properly I think my hon. friend is wrong because the first section states clearly:

In the case of any petition of right as to which the Governor General has heretofore granted or may hereafter grant his fiat that right be done, and whether or not the petition has been or is filed in the Exchequer Court of Canada, and at any stage of the proceedings in the said court, the Governor General in Council may upon the report of the Minister of Justice withdraw and revoke his fiat, if the minister reports that the granting of the fiat was induced by misrepresentation, concealment or non-disclosure on the part of the petitioner of any material fact which in the minister's opinion, should have been truly stated or disclosed for the minister's information in the consideration of the petition.

I do not think the minister had the wording before him when he said this was not retroactive.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: What I mean is this: It is not retroactive in the sense that this would apply to any case now pending. It is not retroactive in that sense.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I would have thought it was retroactive to the fullest extent. If there is any way in which we can make it more certain that that action does not go on, and that the people of this country are not defrauded, we should follow it. However, I think the section is pretty well drawn. I think it is just as retroactive as we can put it. For instance in subsection 2 of section one.

A copy of any order in council revoking or withdrawing the Governor General's fiat upon any petition of right as aforesaid, certified by the clerk of the Privy Council, may be filed in the Exchequer Court, and thereupon the petition shall abate, and all further proceedings in the action shall be and be deemed to have been, by the revocation or withdrawal of the fiat, perpetually stayed.

I think that is a good provision. I think that that is probably going as far as we could go. Then as to the saving clause which my hon. friend (Mr. Carroll) noted:

Nothing in this act shall be construed or interpreted as a legislative interpretation, declaration or limitation of the prerogatives of the Crown in dealing with the issue or revocation of any fiat granted upon petition of right.

I think perhaps we might have a question as to what that really means.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I shall ask permission to drop it. That is not necessary.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It should be struck out, it only weakens the bill.

Mr. MARTELL: Before the section carries I wish to explain why I asked one or two questions. Probably I am a little hoarse and my hon. friend opposite did not quite understand me. I asked those questions with a view to securing information. I have a little

but not great familiarity with the question of petitions of right. Every subject has a right to petition the sovereign and the Crown has the right to issue a fiat, which fiat issues in order that right may be done. But supposing any person applies for a petition of right and the Crown, as represented by the cabinet ministers, refuses to grant that right; to whom should people appeal in order to have it declared whether they have been rightly or wrongly denied that right? Now, irrespective of what party may be in power persons will apply for a petition of right. I have in mind a case where a petition of right was refused and by the party which I support. I believe we have a Supreme Court of Judicature in this country to which we refer all cases, whether constitutional or otherwise, in the form of a stated case, and that court should have the right to say finally whether or not a petition of right or a fiat should issue. If you do not do that people will never get justice in this country because politics will enter in and no minister will admit that he ever did wrong in his own department. That was my only reason in rising to ask questions of lawyers who have been longer at the bar than I have touching this matter. I am sorry that I am a little hoarse to-night or I would have talked 11 p.m. at much greater length in protest against any cabinet, or any government having the power to say finally whether people should be denied the right to appeal to the courts of the land in order to have their cases tried on their merits. Now, as the case stands to-day a person may petition to the Minister of Justice for the issue of a fiat. Naturally the minister, in connection with whose department the petition is entered, is very apt to say, "We have done no wrong," and to go to the law officers of the Crown and argue his own case. I submit that should not be final. I believe it would be good legislation in this country, where a petition of right is denied by the government, to give the Supreme Court of Canada the right to say whether a fiat or petition of right should issue. That may be considered radical from a lawyer; but I consider that is the proper way to deal with the matter, because no man should be denied justice or deprived of an opportunity of contesting his rights in the courts of the land.

Mr. SHAW: I should like to ask the Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin) a couple of questions, the first question for a matter of information. Supposing the Minister of Justice has been imposed upon, and a fiat has been granted by reason of some misrepresentation or some fraudulent non-disclosure; would the minister not be entitled to cancel the fiat without any legislation whatever?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: That is possible, but we want to make it perfectly clear.

Mr. SHAW: The second question that I want to ask the minister is whether or not he proposes, when this legislation is passed, to apply it to the Hoppe case.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: As to that we will consult our lawyers, and if it is applicable, we will apply it to that case.

Mr. MARTELL: I should like to have an answer as to whether there is any possibility of having my suggestion followed out. If there is argument in favour of a fiat or petition of right, could the matter not be carried to the Supreme Court of Canada to determine whether or not a fiat should issue in the event of the government deciding that it should not issue?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The hon. member addressed the question to me in the first instance, and I say that there is no appeal. I may say to him that he has found a Minister of Justice big enough to say when he is wrong. He did give the fiat last year, and he is now saying that it ought not to have issued.

Mr. MARTELL: I am satisfied with the Minister of Justice, and he is a big man too.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported.

Sir Lomer Gouin moved the third reading of the bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: When shall the bill be read the third time?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Next sitting of the House.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: The bill has to go back to the Senate.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Owing to the fact that the bill has to go back to the Senate, I will withdraw my objection.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

PRIVATE BILLS

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 179 (from the Senate), for the relief of Grace Lees Smiley.—Mr. Boys.

Bill No. 182 (from the Senate), for the relief of Laura MacBrien.—Mr. Sheard.

Bill No. 183 (from the Senate), for the relief of Chester Abbott Redmond.—Mr. Church.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King, the House adjourned at 11.05 p.m.

Monday, May 28, 1923.

The House met at three o'clock.

NATIONAL PARKS AND RESERVATIONS

Hon. CHARLES STEWART (Minister of the Interior) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 185, respecting National Parks and Reservations.

He said: We propose by statute to separate the parks in these reservations which were formerly administered as a whole. The purpose is simply, first, to provide for their better administration as recreation grounds, and second, to ensure their better preservation as sanctuaries for the breeding of wild life. It is sought, also, to give the Governor in Council power to set aside reserves for historic sites. We can very much better explain the various provisions of the bill in committee, but these are its main purposes.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

MR. FRED T. CONGDON

Mr. HANSON:

1. Has Fred T. Congdon been appointed by the present government a royal commissioner to inquire into and report on the question of gratuities voted by former directors of Grand Trunk Railway to themselves and others shortly before the road was taken over by the government.

2. Was the said Fred T. Congdon formerly a member of parliament for Yukon territory?

3. Was the said Fred T. Congdon public administrator for Yukon territory and for what period?

4. Were charges of mismanagement and improper conduct in the administration of the Wiley estate in Yukon made against the said Fred T. Congdon as public administrator?

5. Was the late Augustus Power, K.C., legal officer of the Department of Justice, appointed a commissioner to inquire into and report on said charges?

6. Did the said commissioner report that said Mrs. Wiley and her infant daughter suffered loss, injustice and hardship due to manner of the administration of said estate by said F. T. Congdon?

7. Did the government of Canada subsequently recommend to parliament the grant of a sum of money to said widow and her infant daughter or either of them on compassionate grounds?

8. Was a grant of money made by parliament to the said widow and her infant daughter or to either of them?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Yes, appointed but resigned owing to ill-health.

2. Yes.

3. Yes, from the 13th March to 30th September, 1901, and from 20th May, 1905, to 2nd April, 1907.

4. Yes.

5. Yes.

6. The report of the commissioner is included among the papers of which a return has been ordered by the House of Commons. The report speaks for itself.

7. Yes.

8. Grant of $10,000 made by Vote 574 of the Supplementary Estimates 1912-13 to Charlotte Wiley, in full satisfaction of claim for loss of mining claims, the property of her father on the date of his decease.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OUTSIDE BUREAU

Mr. JACOBS:

1. What was the total sum paid by the government for printing, outside the printing bureau each year for the past five years?

2. What was the cost to the government of printing the Labour Gazette outside the printing bureau each year for the past five years?

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK:

Answer of the Department of Labour:

1. Nil.

2. Answered by answer of King's Printer, dated May 3, to same question.

Answer in so far as respects the Department of Public Printing and Stationery:

1.

Fiscal Year	Printing Binding etc.	Halftones, Lithographing etc.	Total
1918-1919..	$270,780 51	$ 82,559 43	$353,339 94
1919-1920..	215,859 81	88,316 14	304,175 95
1920-1921..	157,026 74	127,636 22	284,662 96
1921-1922..	144,768 99	126,792 46	271,561 45
1922-1923..	126,083 00	141,088 18	267,171 18

2.

Fiscal Year—	Total
1918-1919..	$19,372 96
1919-1920..	26,416 62
1920-1921..	31,972 54
1921-1922..	32,721 10
1922-1923..	26,710 71

PORT ARTHUR ELEVATOR

Hon. Mr. STEVENS:

1. What was the total amount of No. 1 standard screenings at the government elevator at Port Arthur for the years ending August 30th, 1920-21-22?

2. What was the total amount of revenue received in each of the above years from all screenings?

3. Were the said No. 1 standard screenings recleaned in the said elevator?

4. If so, what was the total revenue for each year:—(a) from the recleaned screenings, (b) from the refuse screenings?

5. During the said years, to whom, at what price and what amount did the government sell, (a) No. 1 standard screenings, (b) recleaned screenings, (c) refuse screenings?

6. Were the said screenings at any time offered to public tender?

7. Did the government officials mix the grain extracted from the said screenings with other grain in the elevator?

8. In accounting to the shipper for screenings, as provided by law, was said accounting and payment for the No. 1 standard screenings before being recleaned or only at the rate allowed for refuse screenings?

Hon. Mr. ROBB:

1. It is difficult to determine what information is required by this question. We have no knowledge of the term "No. 1 Standard screenings." The net dockage, as set by the inspector, on cars received at the Canadian Government Elevators for the crop years ending 30th August, these years, was as follows: 1920, 96,563 bushels; 1921, 243,211 bushels; 1922, 198,879 bushels.

2. Gross revenue, 1920, $13,146.10; 1921, $1,835.00; 1922, $21,797.50. Less W/R bought in 1920, $17,588.65; 1921, $7,722.16; 1922, $2,-246.58. Total net revenue or loss, (loss) $4,-442.55; (loss) $5,887.16; (profit) $19,550.92. Figures for elevator year ending 31st July, each year.

3. All original dockage is recleaned as often as necessary to remove all graded grain.

4. Revenue from screenings; recleaned 1920, $13,146.10; 1921, $1,835.00; 1922, $21,105.00. Refuse, 1922, $692.50.

Figures for elevator year ending 31st July, each year.

5.—

(a) No sales.

(b) RECLEANED SCREENINGS,—Year ending 31st July, 1920.

1919	To Whom Sold	Price	Quantity	Amount
		$ cts.	lbs.	$ cts.
Dec. 5	Feed Div., Dept. of Agriculture	30 00 per ton	69,000	1,035 00
" 12	J. D. McGregor, Brandon	30 "	60,000	900 00
1920				
Jan. 27	United Grain Growers, Wpg	30 00 "	67,302	1,009 53
April 19	Supt. Experimental Farm, Lacombe	42 00 "	66,000	1,386 00
June 16	M. Sellers & Son, Fort William	54 50 "	120,000	3,270 00
July 7	" "	30.25 "	50,000	756 25
	FLAX SCREENINGS			
April 3	Henderson Transfer & Lighterage, Duluth	24 00 "	23,860	286 32
June 25	M. Sellers & Son, Fort William	28 00 "	192,000	2,688 00
July 7	" "	30 25 "	120,000	1,815 00
			768,162 or 384–162 tons	13,146 10

RECLEANED SCREENINGS—Year ending 31st July, 1921

1921	To Whom Sold	Price	Quantity	Amount
		$ cts.	lbs.	$ cts
Jan. 24	D. H. McFadden, Emerson, Man	16.00 per ton	60,000	480 00
" 26	T. H. C. Prouse, R.R. No. 4, Brandon	16 00 "	60,000	480 00
July 8	N. M. Paterson & Co., Fort William	14 00 "	80,000	560 00
" 14	T. H. C. Prouse, R.R. No. 4, Brandon	9 00 "	70,000	315 00
			270,000 or 135 tons	1,835 00

RECLEANED SCREENINGS—Year ending 31st July, 1922

1921	To Whom Sold	Price	Quantity	Amount
		$ cts.	lbs.	$ cts.
Oct. 28	J. Shaw, Carberry, Man	9 00 per ton	70,000	315 00
Nov. 4	M. Sellers & Son, Fort William	10 00 "	60,000	300 00
Dec. 20	M. Sellers & Son, Fort William	10 00 "	60,000	300 00
" 19	Alex. Smith, Gretna, Man	9 00 "	80,000	360 00
" 29	M. Sellers & Son, Fort William	10 00 "	66,000	330 00
" 30	T. H. C. Prouse, R.R. No. 4, Brandon	9 00 "	66,000	297 00
1922				
Jan. 21	M. Sellers & Son, Fort William	9 00 "	60,000	270 00
" 25	Dom. Experimental Farm, Brandon	14 60 "	600 bags ground, (60,000 lbs.)	438 00
Feb. 2	A. E. Johnson, Glenboro	9 00 per ton	60 000	270 00
" 9	M. Sellers & Son, Fort William	10 00 "	458,000	2,290 00
" 21	" " "	9 00 "	1,374,000	6,183 00
Mar. 2	" " "	9 00 "	420,000	1,890 00
" 21	" " "	9 00 "	606,000	2,727 00
May 30	Walsh Henderson & Co	8 00 "	600,000	2,400 00
June 14	"	8 00 "	120,000	480 00
July 17	Stevens Grain Co., Winnipeg	9 00 "	190,000	855 00
			4,350,000 or 2,175 tons	19,705 00
June 6	M. Sellers & Son, Mill Oats 28c. bus		5,000 bus.	1,400 00

(c) REFUSE SCREENINGS—Year ending 31st July, 1920

Nil

REFUSE SCREENINGS—Year ending 31st July, 1921

Nil

REFUSE SCREENINGS—Year ending 31st July, 1922

1921	To Whom Sold	Price	Quantity	Amount
			lbs.	
Dec. 19	Alex. Smith, Gretna	Nil	56,000	Nil
" 31	W. B. Sime, Port Arthur	Nil	60,000	Nil
1922				
Jan. 17	Gillespie Elevator	Nil	50,000	Nil
	Great Lakes Trans. Co	Nil	545,390	Nil
	Port Arthur Elevator Co	Nil	150,000	Nil
	Thunder Bay Elevator Co	50 cts. per ton	150,000	$ 37 50
" 24	Port Arthur Shipbuilding Co	50 "	670,000	167 50
Feb. 3	Thunder Bay Elevator Co	50 "	500,000	125 00
	Gillespie Elevator Co	Nil	50,000	Nil
	Port Arthur Shipbuilding Co	50 "	400,000	100 00
" 16	Thunder Bay Elevator Co	50 "	200,000	50 00
	Port Arthur Shipbuilding Co	50 "	400,000	100 00
" 23	Thunder Bay Elevator Co	50 "	150,000	37 50
Mar. 2	Port Arthur Shipbuilding Co	50 "	300,000	75 00
			3,681,390 or 1,840 tons, 1,390 lbs.	692 50

6. Yes; sold to highest bidder or at market price.

7. Certainly. Dockage as set by the inspector does not contain any commercial grain; therefore it is essential that the elevator does not allow any commercial grain to remain therein. This must be separated and binned with grain of the same grade.

8. An accounting to the shipper for screenings was made according to law, that is, by the issue of a warehouse receipt for screenings for the quantity set by the inspector.

The elevator has no control whatever over any disposition which the shipper may wish to make of such warehouse receipt. The Canadian government elevators do not make any cash returns for screenings.

RETURNED SOLDIERS—DEATHS FROM TUBERCULOSIS

Mr. LADNER:

1. What is the number of deaths from tuberculosis in each of the provinces of men who served in the Great War, during each year since the war up to this date, and what number of such men had their domicile in such province before enlistment?

2. What is the number of new cases of tuberculosis reported each year since the war according to provinces, showing also the number of such men who had their domicile in such provinces before enlistment?

3. What is the total number of men who served in the Great War now under treatment by the government for tuberculosis according to the last available records?

Hon. Mr. BELAND:

1. Statistics, showing the number of deaths by disabilities, by provinces, and the pre-war domicile, of pensioners, and patients, are not maintained by the department. The total, by years, of men suffering from tuberculosis who died while on the treatment strength of the deparmtent, or while in receipt of pension for that disability is:

Year	Number
1916	12
1917	41
1918	141
1919	391
1920	459
1921	404
1922	348
1923 (1st quarter)	70
Total	1,866

2. Statistics in respect to number of primary and re-admissions to treatment for tuberculosis show:

	Men	Cases
Total Primary Admissions to Dec. 31, 1920	9,157	
Total Re-Admissions to Dec. 31, 1920		449
Total Primary Admissions during 1921	598	
Total Re-Admissions during 1921		752
Total Primary Admissions during 1922	485	
Total Re-Admissions during 1922		1,122
Total Primary Admissions 1-1-23, to 31-3-23	115	
Total Re-Admissions, 1-1-23, to 31-3-23		289
*Total Primary Admissions to date, 31-3-23	10,355	
Total Re-Admissions to date, 31-3-23		2,612

*Shows the number of men, who on admission for treatment, were suspected to be suffering from tuberculosis, as well as those in whom the existence of the disease was established. In many of the former class, who are admitted primarily for observation, the existence of tuberculosis is not established and the diagnosis is changed accordingly. The number in whom the diagnosis of tuberculosis was subsequently confirmed is therefore less than the total admissions indicate.

3. On April 21, 1923, the number of men undergoing treatment for tuberculosis as patients of the department was: In Canada, 1,051; in United States, 103; in British Isles, 26; Total, 1,180.

CIVIL SERVICE LIST

Mr. BLACK (Yukon):

1. At what date was the last Civil Service List published?

2. At what date will another list likely be published?

3. What is the reason for delay in publishing list?

Hon. Mr. COPP:

1. The last edition of the Civil Service List was submitted to parliament at the first session of 1919 and contained the records up to the 1st April, 1918. The provision which required the Civil Service Commission to issue the annual Civil Service List was deleted from the Civil Service Act of 1918. Consequently since that date there has been no statutory provision for the publication of an annual list.

The work of reclassification which has been in progress since the fall of 1918 has made it difficult if not impossible to compile a Civil Service List which could have been even approximately accurate by the time it was ready for distribution. The commission has not therefore considered it advisable to submit any recommendation to the government in this matter up to the present time.

2. Owing to the entire permanent service being now under the Civil Service Commission a complete list to-day would contain at least three times as many names as the 1918 edition and would be correspondingly expensive to produce. The commission would not be prepared to proceed with its preparation save under direct instructions from the government.

3. Answered by No. 1.

CORNWALL CANAL—ALLEGED PARTISANSHIP

Mr. STEWART (Leeds):

1. Have charges of political partisanship been preferred against Augustus Blackburn, lock tender, James T. Shields, lockmaster, and John Waldrof, lock hand, employed on lock number twenty-one of the Cornwall canal?
2. Has any investigation been held?
3. If so, who was the commissioner who conducted the same?
4. What was the result of such investigation in each case?
5. Have any of the said employees been dismissed?
6. Is it the intention of the government to dismiss any of said parties?

Hon. Mr. KING (Kootenay):

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. Thomas R. Mayberry.
4. Blackburn admitted the charges; Shields and Waldrof pleaded not guilty and in their cases the evidence was insufficient to establish the charges.
5. No.
6. As Blackburn admitted being chairman of the Conservative ward committee, acting as chairman of public meetings in the interests of the Conservative candidate, canvassing and drawing voters to the polls for the same candidate, his services will be dispensed with by the department.

MESSRS. BOVILLE, FISET and COULTER

Mr. KELLNER:

1. What is the number of years of service in the public service of Mr. T. C. Boville, ex-Deputy Minister of Finance, Dr. R. M. Coulter, ex-Deputy Minister of Post Office Department, and General Fiset, ex-Deputy Minister of Militia?
2. What was the annual salary of each of the above-mentioned, the date of their retirement, and what is the annual pension of each of them?
3. What leave of absence was allowed to each one of the said gentlemen at the date of his retirement and what salary was paid during that leave?

Hon. Mr. COPP:

Department of Finance

T. C. Boville:

1. 37 years.
2. Annual salary $6,000; date of retirement April 1st, 1920; retiring allowance, $3,733.33 per annum.
3. Three months' leave of absence was given from date retirement was authorized for which payment was made at the rate of $6,000 per annum. Mr. Boville had, however, taken considerable sick leave prior to 1920.

Department of National Defence

General Fiset:

1. Major General Sir Eugene Fiset is an officer of the Permanent Active Militia, who is seconded therefrom for duty with the Civil Service; his retirement is not as a member of the Civil Service but as a member of the Permanent Active Militia, and has been based on a total service of 30 years and 220 days.
2. General Fiset's salary as Deputy Minister and Vice-President Defence Council is $10,500 per annum.

The date of General Fiset's retirement on pension, under the Militia Pension Act, will be April 1, 1924. The annual pension payable on his retirement will be $5,686.19 per annum, to be increased after 3 17/365 years by $88.81 when unpaid pension dues for service in South Africa will have been paid, and after 2 179/365 years by $525 when all unpaid pension dues will have been recovered.

3. Owing to the serious impairment of his health due to overwork during the late war, General Fiset's medical advisers insisted upon an absolute severance from his public duties. He was therefore granted one year's sick leave with pay from November 1st, 1922, which leave owing to General Fiset's condition at the present time, has been extended to the 31st March, 1924.

Post Office Department

Dr. R. M. Coulter:

1. 25 years, 5 months.
2. Annual salary, $6,000; date of retirement, 1st January, 1923; retiring allowance, $4,200 per annum.
3. Nil.

ST. MARGARET'S BAY ROAD, N.S.

Mr. JONES:

1. How much, if any, federal money has been paid out of the good roads appropriation towards the St. Margaret's Bay road in Nova Scotia?
2. Does the amount paid represent forty per cent of production? If not, what per cent does it represent?
3. How many miles have been constructed upon which the Dominion payment is applicable?
4. If nothing has been paid, is it intended that any Dominion money shall be contributed toward this road?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. $131,091.49.
2. Forty per cent of $340,228.72, as recommended by the Chief Engineer of the Federal Highways branch.
3. 17.5 miles.
4. Answered by No. 1.

MONTREAL POST OFFICES

Mr. RINFRET:

1. How many post offices are there in Montreal?
2. Where are they located?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM (for Postmaster General.)

1. 117.

2. Office—location:

Montreal (Head Office), St. James st.
Postal Station A, 571 St. James st.
Postal Station B, 324 St. Catherine st. W.
Postal Station C, 802 St. Catherine st. E.
Postal Station D, 317 Centre st.
Postal Station Delorimer, 1128 Mount Royal ave. E.
Postal Station E, 1832 Blv. St. Lawrence.
Postal Station F, Notre Dame & Richmond.
Postal Station G, Arcade street & Pine ave.
Postal Station H, St. Catherine & Bishop.
Postal Station M, 116 Letourneux ave.
Postal Station N, 120 St. Catherine st, E.
Postal Station Notre Dame de Grace, 5382 Sherbrooke st.
Postal Station O, de l'Eglise st.
Postal Station Outremont, 1126 Laurier W.
Postal Station R, Corn. st. Denis & Beaubien sts.
Postal Station S, 222 Boulevard Monk.

Sub Offices:—

Ahuntsic, 6441 Lajeunesse st.
Beaudoin st., 2097 N. Dame st. W.
Bordeaux, 2202 Boulevard Gouin.
Cartierville, 123 Boulevard Gouin.
Cote des Neiges (Ouest), 1869 Cote des Neiges Road.
Cote St. Louis, 1315 St. Denis st.
Cote St. Michel, Cote St. Michel Road.
Cote Visitation, 2132 Blvd. Rosemont.
Dominion, 54 3rd ave. Dominion Park Lachine.
Dorval, Lachine.
Greenfield Park, 70 Devonshire Road.
Lachine Locks, 212 St. Joseph st., Lachine.
Lakeside, Pointe Claire.
Leduc, 1089 St. Catherine st. E.
Long Point, 3973 N. Dame st. E.
Montreal Nord, Blvd. Gouin E.
Montreal South, 25 Victoria ave.
Montreal West, 46 Westminster ave.
Mount Royal, 164 Graham Rd. Corn. Kindersley st.
Notre Dame des Victores, 742 Mont Sabre st.
Ontario st., Centre, 441 Ontario st. E.
Ontario st., East, 778 Ontario st. E.
Park ave., cor. Prince Arthur st. & Park ave.
Park ave. extension, 271 Beaumont.
Pointe Claire, Montreal.
St. Catherine st., West, 900A St. Catherine st., W.
St. Cunegonde, 94 Vinet st.
St. Denis st., 282 St. Catherine st., E.
St. Jean Baptiste De Montreal, 1324 Bldv. St Lawrence.

Sub Offices.—Continued.

St. Jean de la Croix, 2850 Bldv. St. Lawrence.
St. Lawrence st., Centre, 508 Bldv. St. Lawrence.
St. Louis Square, 544 St. Denis st.
St. Paul, 1649 Church ave.
Sault au Recollet, 898 Bldv. Gouin East.
Tetreaultville, 4341 Honfleur st.
Valois, Pointe Claire.
Verdun, 1253 Wellington st.
Victoria ave., 381 Victoria ave.
Villeneuve, cor. Marie-Anne E. & Delaroche.
Villeray, 3440 St. Hubert st.
Ville St. Pierre, 20 6th ave., Ville st. Pierre.
Youville, 3814 Lajeunesse st.
Sub Office No. 15, 1030 Ontario st., E.
Sub Office No. 16, 271 Bldv. St. Lawrence.
Sub Office No. 17, 401 St. Denis st.
Sub Office No. 18, 1911 Masson st.
Sub Office No. 19, 320 N. Dame st., W.
Sub Office No. 20, 2096 Ontario st., E.
Sub Office No. 21, 2497 Ontario st., E.
Sub Office No. 22, 892 Lacombe ave.
Sub Office No. 23, 1505 Bldv. St. Lawrence.
Sub Office No. 26, 658 St. Antoine st.
Sub Office No. 27, 713 Wellington st.
Sub Office No. 31, 486 Roy st., E.
Sub Office No. 33, 449 Rachel st., E.
Sub Office No. 35, 3049 St. Catherine st., E.
Sub Office No. 37, 321B Rachel st., E.
Sub Office No. 38, 1420 Ontario st., E.
Sub Office No. 41, 1241 Van Horne st.
Sub Office No. 42, 2698 Notre Dame st., W.
Sub Office No. 43 481 Gilford st.
Sub Office No. 44, 2231 Papineau st.
Sub Office No 46, 345 St. Antoine st.
Sub Office No. 47, 244 Laurier ave.
Sub Office No. 48, 1575 Notre Dame st., W.
Sub Office No. 49, 513 Delorimier ave.
Sub Office No. 50, 882 Laurier ave., E.
Sub Office No. 51, 117 Bernard st.
Sub Office No. 56, 301 Colbrooke ave.
Sub Office No. 58, 311 de Fleurimont.
Sub Office No. 65, 225 Amherst st.
Sub Office No. 66, 119 St. Denis st.
Sub Office No. 68, 1345 St. Catherine st., E.
Sub Office No. 69, 2275 Jeanne d'Arc ave.
Sub Office No. 72, 433 Amherst st.
Sub Office No. 73, cor. Beaubien and St. Hubert sts.
Sub Office No. 75, 1465A Wellington st.
Sub Office No. 77, 437 Mount Royal ave., E.
Sub Office No. 85, 781 Charlevoix st.

Sub Offices.—Continued.
Sub Office No. 86, 1158 Castelnau st.
Sub Office No. 93, 1185 St. Denis st.
Sub Office No. 95, 447 St. Catherine st., E.
Sub Office No. 101, 37 Hector st.
Sub Office No. 103, 1159 Papineau st.
Sub Office No. 104, 2217 St. James st., cor. Lenoir.
Sub Office No. 105, 597 LaSalle ave.
Sub Office No. 106, 210 St. Viateur st.
Sub Office No. 107, 166 Notre Dame st., Lachine.
Sub Office No. 108, 2501 St. Denis st., cor. Bélanger.
Sub Office No, 109, 342 Forsythe st., cor. Hogan st.
Sub Office No. 110, 34 Broadway ave.
Sub Office No. 111, 803 Lasalle Road, Verdun.
Sub Office No. 112, cor. St. Denis st., & Laurier ave.
Sub Office No. 113, 30 Cadillac st., Guybourg.
Sub Office No. 114, 1194 Rochambeau st.
Sub Office No. 115, 126 Lebrun st.
Sub Office No. 118, 6071 Shergrooke st., W.
Sub Office No. 119, 3201 Christophe-Colomb st.
Sub Office No. 120, 6235 Sacre Cœur ave.
Sub Office No. 122, 41 McCord st.

IMPERIAL SHIPPING COMMITTEE

Mr. EVANS:

1. Is the Imperial Shipping Committee continuing its inquiries as decided at the Conference of Prime Ministers and representatives of the United Kingdom, the Dominions and India in 1921?
2. Are the reports of the above committee available to members of this House of Commons?
3. Who is the Canadian representative on that committee?
4. Why did the Canadian representative oppose the resolution at that conference recommending the constitution under royal charter of a permanent committee to carry out the duties specified in the report of the Imperial Shipping Committee dated June 3rd, 1921?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. Yes.
2. The reports are printed and published by His Majesty's Stationery Office in London and may be obtained directly from that office or through any bookseller.
3. Honourable P. C. Larkin was appointed a member of the committee on April 15th, 1922, in the room of Sir George Perley resigned..
4. The published summary of the proceedings of the conference does not disclose why the representative of Canada did not agree to the resolution recommending the constitution under royal charter of a permanent committee.

S.C.R. EMPLOYEES, VANCOUVER & VICTORIA

Mr. McQUARRIE:

1. How many employees of the Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment department are there now in the service of the department in (a) Vancouver; (b) Victoria?
2. How many have been relieved of their appointments since the 1st of January 1922, in respect of each city?
3. How many of those relieved were returned soldiers?

Hon. Mr. BELAND:

1. On the 15th of May, 1923, the staff of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment numbered: (a) in Vancouver, 230, (b) in Victoria, 24.
2. Since the 1st of January 1922, there have been retired from the employ of the Department: (a) in Vancouver, returned soldiers 64, others 21; total, 85; (b) in Victoria, returned soldiers 9, others 2; total, 11.
3. Answered by No. 2.

POSTMASTER OF LAROUCHE

Mr. HANSON:

1. Was the postmaster of Larouche, Chicoutimi-Saguenay county, dismissed? If so, for what reason?
2. Was an inquiry held in these parts on account of this employee? If so, by whom was it made and what did it cost? If not, why?
3. Is it true that one named E. Dubois was put in charge of this post office?
4. Does the government know that this Dubois is a public insolvent, having failed several months ago?
5. Were petitions addressed to the government recommending the said Dubois to this position? If so, how many electors signed them?
6. Does the government know that it would have been easy to find in Larouche, in the neighbourhood of Dubois, many of its good partisans, responsible from all viewpoints and well qualified to fill this office?
7. Is it the intention of the government to uphold, notwithstanding, the nomination of Dubois?
8. What is the total salary connected with the office of postmaster at Larouche?
9. Who recommended to the government the nomination of the said Dubois?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM (for Postmaster General):

1. Yes. Political partisanship.
2. No. Dismissed on statement of member of parliament that to his personal knowledge postmaster was guilty of acts of partisanship (See Hansard 15th February, 1923, page 286)
3. J. E. Dubois was placed in charge.
4. No.
5. No.
6. No information.
7. No complaints have been received against the public service rendered by Mr. Dubois.
8. $60 per annum (minimum remuneration).
9. Dr. Savard, M.P. Office in question removed from operation of the Civil Service Act by order in council 1053 of the 29th June, 1922.

POSTMASTERS DISMISSED IN CHICOUTIMI-SAGUENAY

Mr. HANSON:

1. How many postmasters in the county of Chicoutimi-Saguenay were dismissed since the 1st January, 1922?

2. For what reasons were these dismissals made?

3. Were inquiries made in the localities where the dismissals were effected, in each case? If so, by whom?

4. If inquiries were held what amount was paid to the investigator as salary and daily expense?

5. Are these inquiries over? If not, how many are still to be made?

6. Were complaints made to the government against dismissed postmasters for bad management of their offices, or improper execution of their duties? If so, in what cases?

7. Is it true that certain changes were made temporarily? If so, is it the intention of the government to make the present office holders permanent?

8. Is it true that in the county of Chicoutimi-Saguenay, between the years 1897 and 1921 inclusive, no dismissal was made for the reason of partisan politics, and that the only changes effected were made only for bad service or by voluntary resignation?

9. Have instructions been issued for the holding of other inquiries against further postmasters in the district of Chicoutimi? If so, against whom?

10. Are there inquiries which have not yet been completed? If so, in what cases?

11. Will these inquiries be continued? If so, when?

12. Have inquiries been held that will not result in the dismissal of employees? If so, in what cases?

13. Is it the intention of the government to continue this policy of dismissals under the cover of inquiries which are but excuses in the eyes of the public?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM (for Postmaster General):

1. Eleven.

2. Eight, Political partisanship; Two, removal of post offices to more suitable locations; One, mismanagement.

3. Partisanship: Four cases investigated by commissioner appointed for that purpose, (Order in Council 2172 of the 16th October, 1922); Four dismissals made on personal statement of member (See Hansard, 15th February, 1923, page 286).

Change of site and mismanagement: Investigated by District Superintendent of Postal Service, Quebec.

4. Partisanship commissioner, $374.48, total expenses.

5. Yes.

6. Yes. Port Alfred; Canton Tache.

7. Temporary arrangements were made to continue public service pending permanent appointment by the Civil Service Commission. The permanent appointee will be nominated by the Civil Service Commission according to the established procedure.

8. Yes.

9. Yes. Against the postmaster at St. Gedeon Station and Jonquére.

10. Yes. See 9.

11. Cases still under review by commissioner appointed to investigate charges of political partisanship.

12. Decisions in outstanding cases will depend on finding of commissioner.

13. The procedure followed is identical with that put into effect by the Conservative government after the elections of 1911, except that in a similar period following the election of 1911, the Conservative government dismissed over 800 postmasters for political partisanship, the majority without public investigation, as against 62 by the present government, the majority after public investigation had been held.

POSTMASTER AT LABARRE

Mr. HANSON:

1. Was the postmaster at Labarre, Chicoutimi-Saguenay county, dismissed? If so, why?

2. Was an investigation held in that county in regard to this postmaster? If so, by whom, and what did it cost?

3. Is it true that a person named Thomas Debiens, of St. Bruno, was charged with the changing of this post office? If so, what amount was he paid?

4. Who was nominated in the place of the former postmaster?

5. Who recommended to the minister the nomination of the new office-holder?

6. If there was no investigation held how was the government notified?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM (for Postmaster General):

1. Yes. Political partisanship.

2. No.

3. No.

4. D. Lapointe.

5. On recommendation of Dr. Savard, M.P. The office in question was removed from the operation of the Civil Service Act by order in council 1053 of the 29th of June, 1922.

6. Dr. Savard, M.P., made a statement that to his personal knowledge the postmaster was an active partisan during the federal elections. (See Hansard, 15th February, 1923, page 286).

STE. ANNE-ST. CHARLES TELEGRAPH

Mr. HANSON:

1. What were the revenues from the telegraph line between Ste. Anne and St. Charles, in the county of Chicoutimi, during the past five years?

2. What were the revenues of the same line between St. Charles and Péribonka during the same period of time?

3. What were the expenses for the maintenance and salaries on each of these sections during the same years?

4. Does the government know that the length of this line there is a telephone system which serves all the parishes and which is in direct communication with all telegraph offices of the district, and that consequently the existence of this telegraph line has become absolutely useless from all standpoints?

5. Is it the intention of the government in these circumstances to discontinue immediately the maintenance of these two sections of telegraph, which have no reason for existing from the standpoint of public interest and economy?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. $323.47.

2. $23.13.

3. Ste. Anne-St. Charles, $4,201.90; St. Charles-Peribonka, $4,774.85.

4 and 5. Yes, and as the telephone system supplies all accommodation required in the district, negotiations are in progress with the view of disposing of this branch line at an early date.

MR. EUGENE CARON

Mr. HANSON:

1. Was Eugene Caron postmaster at Tadoussac, in the county of Chicoutimi-Saguenay? If so, during how many years?

2. When did he cease acting as postmaster?

3. If he gave in his resignation, why did he do so?

4. Is it true that it was proven to the Postmaster General that the said Eugene Caron, who was at the same time land agent of the provincial government of Quebec, and had considerable correspondence, profited of his position as postmaster to stamp his letters with used stamps which had been officially cancelled, and that it was for this reason that he was forced to give in his resignation immediately into the hands of the inspector who found him in fault?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM (for Postmaster General):

1. Yes, from 1st March, 1888, to 15th April, 1911.

2. 15th April, 1911.

3. Postmaster was dismissed.

4. According to departmental records the postmaster was dismissed for having affixed obliterated postage stamps to mail matter despatched from his office.

POSTMASTER AT HERBERTVILLE

Mr. HANSON:

1. Was the postmaster at Herbertville station, county of Chicoutimi, dismissed? If so, why?

2. Was an inquiry held in these parts on account of this employee? If so, by whom and what did it cost?

3. In his report did the investigator recommend the dismissal of the postmaster?

4. Is it true that petitions signed by the majority of the interested parties were addressed to the government recommending the retention of the old postmaster?

5. Is it true that the post office was temporarily confided to one Raoul Desbiens? If so, is it the intention of the government to leave him in that capacity permanently?

6. Did the government receive favourable petitions on the nomination of the said Desbiens? If so, what was the number of signatories?

7. Who persuaded the minister to make Desbien's nomination?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM (for Postmaster General):

1. Yes. Political partisanship.

2. Yes. Oscar Drouin, L.L.L., barrister, Quebec. Appointed commissioner to investigate charges of partisanship by order in council 2172, 16th October, 1922. Cost $128.75.

3. Commissioner Drouin found Mr. Asselin guilty of political partisanship.

4. Petition received bearing 123 signatures in favour of the retention of Mr. Asselin.

5. Yes. Permanent appointment is being made by Civil Service Commission.

6. No.

7. Mr. Raoul Desbiens placed in temporary charge on the recommendation of Dr. Savard, M.P., pending permanent appointment by the Civil Service Commission.

POSTMASTER AT ANGOULEME

Mr. HANSON:

1. Was the postmaster at Angouleme, Chicoutimi-Saguenay county, Mr. J. A. Menard, dismissed? If so, why?

2. Was an inquiry held on the premises against Mr. Menard? If so, by whom, and what did it cost?

3. Is it true that one named L. Laroche was nominated in place of Mr. Menard?

4. Did the government receive petitions asking the nomination of Laroche? If so, how many interested persons signed them?

5. Is it true that the Postmaster General had his secretary write Mr. Menard asking him if he received the Conservative paper "L'Homme Libre" of Quebec, as a regular subscriber or gratuitously? If so, what was the intention of the minister in having this letter written?

6. On whose recommendation did the minister make Laroche's appointment?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM (for Postmaster General):

1 Yes. Political partisanship.

2. No. Postmaster dismissed on statement of member of parliament that he was guilty of acts of partisanship. (See Hansard, 15th February, 1923, page 286).

3. Yes.

4. No.

5. No. But Mr. Menard may have received "card of inquiry" sent out by the secretary, Post Office Department, to persons whose names appeared on subscription list of L'homme Libre with a view to establishing "bona fides of subscription list," before granting statutory postal privileges. This is a routine departmental procedure and no specific record of the names of persons to which cards are sent is kept.

6. On recommendation of Dr. Savard, M.P., office in question was removed from the operation of the Civil Service Act by order in council 1053 of the 29th of June, 1922.

MR. GEDEON VERRAULT

Mr. HANSON:

1. (a) Was Mr. Gedeon Verrault dismissed as telegraph repairer on the section comprised between St. Charles and Péribonka in Chicoutimi-Saguenay county? (b) If so, why?
2. Was an inquiry held in these parts in connection with this employee? If so, by whom, and how much did it cost?
3. Is it true that a person named Rousseau of Roberval, was nominated in place of Mr. Verrault?
4. Were petitions transmitted to the government recommending the nomination of the said Rousseau? If so, how many electors signed them, and in what parishes?
5. Did the government receive other petitions recommending other persons than Rousseau for the same position? If so, who was recommended?
6. Who advised the government to nominate Rousseau?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM (for Postmaster General):

1. (a) Yes; (b) For political partisanship.
2. (a) Yes; (b) By Mr. Oscar Drouin; (c) No cost to the Department of Public Works.
3. Yes.
4. No.
5. No.
6. Dr. E. Savard, M.P.

POSTMASTER AT ST. JOSEPH D'ALMA

Mr. HANSON:

1. Was the postmaster at St. Joseph d'Alma, Chicoutimi-Saguenay county, dismissed? If so, why?
2. Was an inquiry held in these parts on this employee's account? If so, by whom, and what did it cost?
3. Is it true that this post office was given to one Marc Aurele Michaud, brought from Montreal specially for this position, and this temporarily?
4. Does the government know that the said M. A. Michaud was employed in recruiting soldiers in the county of Chicoutimi in 1915 and 1916, and that he disappeared from the county for being mixed in large embezzlements after an inquiry held by the Militia department?
5. Is it true that the government received a position largely signed by the citizens of St. Joseph d'Alma recommending the keeping of Mr. Verrault, the former postmaster?
6. Did the government receive petitions signed by citizens of St. Joseph d'Alma recommending the nomination of Michaud? If so, what was the number of those signing?
7. Did the government receive petitions or requests on the subject of this position recommending others than Michaud? If so. who were those recommended, who recommended them, or who asked for the position themselves?
8. If an inquiry was held, did the investigator recommend the dismissal of Mr. Verrault?
9. Who finally succeeded in having the nomination made of Michaud by the Postmaster General?
10. Is it the intention of the government to appoint Michaud permanently to this position?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM (for Postmaster General):

1. Yes. Political partisanship.

[Mr. Graham.]

2. Yes. Oscar Drouin, L.L.L., barrister, Quebec. Appointed commissioner to investigate charges of partisanship by order in council 2172, of the 16th October, 1922. Cost $77.76.
3. Marc Aurele Michaud, returned soldier, placed in temporary charge on the 16th January, 1923. Appointed permanently by the Civil Service Commission on April 19, 1923. In so far as department is aware Mr. Michaud is a resident of St. Joseph d'Alma.
4. No.
5. Yes.
6. Yes, fifteen signatures.
7. No.
8. Commissioner Drouin found Mr. Verrault guilty of political partisanship.
9. Mr. Michaud applied for permanent position in response to usual advertisement.
10. Mr. Michaud was permanently appointed by Civil Service Commission.

POSTMASTER AT ST. BRUNO

Mr. HANSON:

1. Was the postmbaster at St. Bruno, Chicoutimi-Saguenay county, dismissed for partisan politics only?
2. Was an inquiry made on the premises on this employee's account? If so, by whom, and what did it cost?
3. Did the investigator in his report recommend the dismissal of this employee?
4. Is it true that this post office was entrusted to one named Plamondon, who is a school inspector for the provincial government of Quebec, which position nets him a good salary?
5. Does the government know that this Plamondon, a civil employee, did not hesitate to take part in the federal as well as in the provincial elections?
6. Did the government receive petitions signed by citizens of St. Bruno recommending the nomination of Plamondon? If so, what was the number of those signing?
7. Did the government receive other petitions, or other signed requests, signed by citizens of St. Bruno, recommending other persons than Plamondon? If so, who were the persons recommended or who made these requests?
8. Who recommended to the Postmaster General the nomination of Plamondon?
9. Is his nomination a recompense for his partisan politics?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM (for Postmaster General):

1. Yes.
2. Yes. Oscar Drouin, L.L.L., barrister, Quebec, appointed commissioner to investigate charges of partisanship by order in council 2172 of the 16th October, 1922. Cost $84.76.
3. Commissioner Drouin found Mr. Nap. Cote guilty of political partisanship.
4. Mr. Plamondon was the person selected by the Civil Service Commission after the vacancy had been regularly advertised. Department has no record of the salary re-

ceived by Mr. Plamondon for other than post office work.

5. Department has no such information.

6. No.

7. Petition received in favour of D. Harvey bearing 129 signatures and recommended by Dr. Savard, M.P.

8. Answered by No. 4.

9. Selection made by Civil Service Commission.

MR. JOS. BURNE

Mr. LAVIGUEUR:

1. Has. Jos. Burne, an employee of the Immigration department, been transferred to Quebec?

2. If so, what are his duties?

3. (a) What country is he from, and (b) how long has he been in Canada?

4. Who recommended him and what salary is attached to the position he occupies?

5. Does said Mr. Jos. Burne speak French fluently?

6. Is Mr. Jos. Burne the same person who had charge of the Immigration department canteen at St. John, New Brunswick, or elsewhere?

7. Has he always given satisfaction to the department?

8. Was there ever any report made against said Mr. Jos. Burne?

9. Were his accounts always kept and rendered in a satisfactory manner?

Hon. Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil):

1. Yes.

2. In charge of catering Savard Park Hospital and supervising catering service Immigration building under jurisdiction of Agent.

3. (a) Ireland, since January, 1912.

4. No recommendation. Transferred by instructions. Salary $1,320.

5. No.

6. Yes.

7. Yes.

8. No.

9. Mr. Burne does not handle accounts.

CONSEIL NATIONAL DES METIERS

Mr. LAVIGUEUR:

1. Has the Immigration department received a resolution from the "Conseil National des Metiers" of the district of Quebec, protesting against the transfer to Quebec of a certain member of the St. John, New Brunswick, Immigration department staff and from elsewhere?

2. Does the department intend to replace these persons transferred to Quebec with citizens of the city of Quebec?

Hon. Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil):

1. No.

2. In the event of any vacancies occurring the same will be filled in accordance with the provisions of the Civil Service Act.

CATTLE QUARANTINED AT LEVIS

Mr. BOURASSA:

1. What quantity of hay, straw, and grain was purchased by the government for the cattle placed in quarantine at Lévis, Quebec, during the years 1919 to 1922, inclusive?

2. What are the names and business addresses of merchants from whom these purchases were made?

3. What amounts were paid to said merchants for each of the above years?

Hon. Mr. MOTHERWELL:

1, 2 and 3. Nil. The government does not purchase hay, straw, grain or other feed for animals placed in quarantine at the quarantine station, Levis, Quebec. The owners of the animals purchase the feed themselves.

PURE-BRED SHEEP IN ONTARIO

Mr. SENN:

1. Did the Department of Agriculture receive a request from the Ontario government or any breeders' association to participate in a scheme for the importation of pure-bred sheep to be distributed at cost in the province of Ontario?

2. If so, did the department agree to accept any responsibility in the matter?

Hon. Mr. MOTHERWELL:

1. Yes, a request was received from the sheep breeders' associations in various provinces that some assistance be provided to pure-bred breeders in enabling them to import pure-bred rams for breeding purposes.

2. Yes, the department has accepted responsibility as follows: The Dominion and Provincial Departments of Agriculture are co-operating equally in defraying transportation and purchasing expenses on specially selected rams imported this year.

WAREHOUSING OF GRAIN

Mr. COOTE:

1. Do the same laws governing the warehousing of grain as specified in the Canada Grain Act apply to dockage over 3 per cent which is not the property of the terminals?

2. Where are dockages set on cars of grain which are consigned to Fort William and Port Arthur?

3. Does the purchaser or holder of a warehouse receipt receive the quality and quantity of dockage taken from the car as specified by the tariff?

4. Is the quality of this dockage established at the time the grain is graded? If not, why?

5. Where and how is the quality of this dockage determined, and is all grain cleaned to grade to assure the dockages being taken out before setting a standard for quality?

6. Is binning supervision of dockages exercised by the Inspection department as prescribed for by the Canada Grain Act, section 94-95?

Hon. Mr. ROBB:

1. All dockage regardless of ownership is binned together and is delivered upon the surrender of documents within 3 days; otherwise such dockage may be disposed of as provided for in the tariff governing the operation of public terminal elevators.

2. At the point of inspection, usually Winnipeg.

3. The holder of documents representing dockage receives the general average of quality of screenings as received by the public terminal elevator.

4. No, because it is not practical to bin separately the actual dockage from each individual car.

5. (a) Samples of dockage are being taken by officers of the Inspection department at each public terminal elevator while cleaning machinery is in operation, and the average quality of such dockage is determined from the samples so taken.

(b) Yes.

6. No provision is made in the Canada Grain Act covering the binning supervision of dockage by the Inspection department.

CANADA STEAMSHIPS—WAR CLAIMS

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River):

1. What are the names of the eleven ships for which Canada Steamships, Limited, have recently claimed the sum of $3,651,639.38 under War Claims?
2. When were these built?
3. When were these lost?
4. From whom were these eleven ships purchased by the Canada Steamships line, and at what price each?
5. What was the amount of war risk insurance paid on each ship?
6. What was the actual value of the ships?
7. By whom was the premium on war risk insurance paid?

Hon. Mr. COPP:

1. SS. Midland Queen, SS. Empress of Fort William, SS. Empress of Midland, SS. Dundee, SS. Strathcona, SS. Neepawah, SS. C. A. Jaques, SS. D. A. Gordon, SS. Armonia, SS. Tagona, SS. Acadian.

2. The claimant's affidavit does not disclose this.

3. SS. Midland Queen, 4th August, 1915; SS. Empress of Fort William, 27th February, 1916; SS. Empress of Midland, 27th March, 1916; SS. Dundee, 31st January, 1917; SS. Strathcona, 13th April, 1917; SS. Neepawah, 22nd April, 1917; SS. C. A. Jaques, 1st May, 1917; SS. D. A. Gordon, 13th December, 1917; SS. Armonia, 15th March, 1918; SS. Tagona, 16th May, 1918; SS. Acadian, 16th September, 1918.

4. The claimant's affidavit does not disclose this.

5. The claimant's affidavit discloses that the following hull insurance was collected: SS. Midland Queen, $162,546; SS. Empress of Fort William, $194,666.65; SS. Empress of Midland, $194,666.65; SS. Dundee, $305,955.57; SS. Strathcona, $294,433.33; SS. Neepawah, $321,200; SS. C. A. Jaques, $364,999.99; SS. D. A. Gordon, $255,350.50; SS. Armonia, $1,010,681.33; SS. Tagona, $485,900; SS. Acadian, $388,960; total, $3,979,360.02.

6. Value of vessels: SS. Midland Queen, $560,000; SS. Empress of Fort William, $760,000; SS. Empress of Midland, $760,000; SS. Dundee, $580,000; SS. Strathcona, 540,000; SS. Neepawah, $432,000; SS. C. A. Jaques, $630,000; SS. D. A. Gordon, 660,000; SS. Armonia, $1,490,000; SS. Tagona, $550,000; SS. Acadian, $669,000; total, $7,631,000.

7. The claimant's affidavit does not disclose.

PRICES CHARGED TO INDIANS

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River):

What prices were charged the Indians by the agency or the department during the years 1913-23 for a wagon, a saddle, working harness, blankets, fencing wire, implements (various), threshing outfits?

Hon. Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil):

PRICES CHARGED BLACKFOOT INDIANS' FUND TRUST ACCOUNT

——	1913	1914	1915	1916	1917	1918	1919	1920	1921	1922	1923
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Wagons	89 00	80 20	.....	.....	118 60	146 00	138 50	166 35	100 00	100 00	46 53
	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	128 33	134 50	.....
Saddle	.....	58 00	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Work harness	38 45	42 93	.....	.....	57 00	59 00	.....	55 08	57 77	57 50	25 00
	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	40 00	35 00	.....
	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	30 00	.....
Blankets	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	3 00	3 00	.....
Wire (fencing)	3 25	2 91	3 20	4 69	4 68	5 83	5 82	6 90	6 25	4 90	.....
Threshing outfits	1,408 00	1,399 20	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	2,450 25	.....	.....	.....
IMPLEMENTS											
Binders	149 00	133 50	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	249 50	125 00	.....
	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	175 00	.....	.....
Disc Drills	125 00	77 50	84 25	105 00	.....	.....	190 95	79 88	150 00	125 00	80 00
Sulky plows	50 75	.....	56 36	53 90	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	92 40	.....
Mowers	62 00	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	100 00	.....	.....	.....
Rakes	38 00	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Plows	.....	.....	.....	.....	118 60	.....	.....	.....	102 12	133 80	.....

COST OF CARRYING MAILS

Mr. LEADER:

1. What was the total amount paid by the Dominion government to the railway companies for carrying His Majesty's mail in Canada for the last fiscal year?

2. What was the amount paid to the Canadian Pacific Railway?

3. What was the total amount paid to the Canadian National Railways, including the Grand Trunk and the Grand Trunk Pacific?

4. Is it the policy of the government to grant mail contracts to the Canadian National Railways, whenever possible?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM (for Postmaster General):

It is not possible to give the exact figures in answer to the above questions as the railway accounts for March quarter have not all been adjusted yet. It can be stated, however, that the expenditure on railways will be approximately as follows:

1. $7,453,000.
2. $3,671,000.
3. $3,187,000.
4. Yes.

YUKON MINERALS EXHIBIT

Mr. BLACK (Yukon):

Will the govenment cause to be prepared an exhibit of ore and minerals from Yukon territory with data and facts informing the public of the wonderful mineral resources of that territory, the same to be placed with the Canadian Exhibit at British Empire Exhibition in England?

Hon. Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil):

An exhibit of this nature is at present in process of preparation.

DAYLIGHT SAVING

Mr. ROBITAILLE:

1. What are the instructions of the Post Office Department in its supplement of the Official Guide of the Canadian Postal Service of May, 1923, in regard to summer time?

2. Have these instructions been revised or cancelled?

3. Has the municipality of the city of Montreal adopted daylight saving?

4. Have the time tables of railways which carry the mail to or from Montreal, been changed so as to agree with the daylight saving time?

5. Has the hour at the Montreal Post Office been changed and have the clocks been put an hour ahead since April the 30th last?

6. If so, by what authority has this change been made?

7. How was the change ordered?

8. Is it not a fact, although employees arrive at the Post Office at 7 a.m., daylight saving time, they have hardly anything to do up to the arrival of mails at 8.30 a.m., daylight saving time?

9. Can these mails be distributed by the first delivery?

10. Does the minister intend to re-establish the normal hour?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM (for Postmaster General):

1. "Local Daylight Saving. It is necessary in all cases that arrangements shall be made to despatch and receive mails in accordance with the railway time tables; but in the matter of the time of the opening and closing post offices the postmaster may be guided by the action of the municipal authorities that is, in any place where the local authorities decide to adopt daylight saving time, the postmaster may do likewise."

2. Only where the exigencies of the public service necessitate a departure from the advice contained in May, 1923, supplement to the Postal Guide.

3. No.

4. No.

5. Yes.

6. By the Post Office Department through the intermediary of the Division Superintendent of Postal Service Montreal.

7. Answered by No. 6.

8. No.

9. No.

10. The department is prepared to adopt whichever time is most conducive to the rendering of an efficient and satisfactory public service.

C.P.R. MAIL SERVICE

Mr. CAMPBELL:

1. What is the total amount paid to the Canadian Pacific Railway in 1922 for mail service?

2. What is the total amount, paid for mail service, to the various lines under government control?

3. What is the toal amount paid to the Canadian Pacific Railway for carrying overseas mail from the various seaports inland, and what are the details for the contracts covering this work?

4. What is the total amount paid to the various government lines for services specified in the above question, and what are the details of contracts covering the work?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM (for Postmaster General):

1. Calendar year, 1922, $3,749,288.14.

2. Intercolonial, $1,042,404.49; Canadian Northern, $680,253.09; Grand Trunk Pacific, $338,673.83; Prince Edward Island, $20,745.29; Grand Trunk Railway, $1,194,517.40; total, $3,256,594.10.

3. It is not possible to give any figures in answer to this question as such mails are carried with other Canadian mails and transportation is paid for at a car mile rate. There are no contracts for railway mail service. The rates of payment are fixed by the government.

4. Answered by No. 3.

MR. W. R. LITTLE

Mr. LAVIGUEUR:

1. How long has Mr. W. R. Little been in the employ of the Immigration department?
2. What are his duties?
3. What is his salary?
4. Where does he come from and by whom was he recommended to the position he now occupies?
5. Does he understand and speak French fluently?

Hon. Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil):

1. Continuous employment Interior and Immigration departments 22 years, 9 months.
2. Commissioner of Immigration.
3. $4,020 per annum.
4. Scotland; by the Deputy Head of the Department of Immigration and Colonization on the 9th December, 1918.
5. Not fluently.

MOOSE RANGE DRAINAGE

Mr. KNOX:

1. What was the total cost to the Dominion government in connection with the Moose Range drainage project previous to 1919?
2. What was the cost to the government in 1919, 1920 and 1921?
3. What compensation did the Dominion government receive for the land turned over to the provincial government?

Hon. Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil):

1. No expenditure previous to 1919.
2. 1919, $1,600; 1920, $21,438.12; 1921, nil.
3. No land has yet been turned over to the provincial government.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

ALBERTA DRAINAGE COMPANY

Mr. KELLNER:

For a copy of all correspondence, letters, telegrams, orders in council and other documents, regarding the sale of a parcel of land, under Order in Council No. 811, dated April 26th, 1922, to the Alberta Drainage Company, Edmonton, Alberta, containing by admeasurement 12,800 acres more or less.

BONDED OR EXPORT LIQUOR WAREHOUSES

Hon. Mr. STEVENS:

For a return showing a list of all licenses for bonded or export liquor warehouses granted in British Columbia since January 31st, 1921, together with the names of parties to whom granted, date of issue, and the name of the provincial authority endorsing the same, including a copy of said applications and letters of endorsation from provincial authorities also any transfers from one bonded premises or district to another district, together with copy of all endorsations, etc.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING—WINNIPEG

Mr. McMURRAY:

For a return showing, (a) Amount paid for printing by the Dominion government in the city of Winnipeg from January 1st, 1911, to December 31st, 1921; (b) All contracts entered into by the government with printing firms in the city of Winnipeg, and money paid to said firms from January 1st, 1922, to date; and (c) All printing contracts, and correspondence in connection therewith, made by the Canadian National Railways in connection with various publications and other printed matter.

MAIL CARRIERS AND CONTRACTORS

Mr. W. C. GOOD (Brant) moved:

For a return showing the names and addresses, by provinces, of the rural mail carriers.

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Acting Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, taking this and the following motion together, I would ask the hon. gentlemen in whose names they stand not to press them. These returns mean the compilation of about thirteen thousand names, which would take weeks of time and cost a lot of money, and unless the information is of some special use to members of parliament, I would ask that the department be not put to this trouble and expense. I may add that these lists are sought after a good deal by various departmental stores, patent medicine firms, and so on, and the department has always taken the position that if any private concern wants these lists the country should not be put to the expense of compiling them; the firm itself should pay for the lists.

Mr. GOOD: My information is that there are only about three thousand of these names.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am taking the two motions together; these include about thirteen thousand names. If you grant one motion, you must of necessity, on principle, grant the other. If any private individual wants this information he should pay the expense of getting it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Shall I say dropped?

Mr. GOOD: Let it stand for the present.

Mr. SPEAKER: Stands.

Mr. WILLIAM IRVINE (Calgary East) moved:

For a return showing by provinces the names of all the rural mail contractors and the contractors operating between the post offices and railway stations in Canada.

Mr. GRAHAM: This motion includes mail contractors operating between railway stations and post offices maybe half a mile or three-quarters of a mile apart. There are about nine thousand of these men.

Mr. IRVINE: As the government, no doubt, has to send out pay cheques to these men every month or so, I wonder if it would be a difficult matter to compile the names from these cheques as they are being sent out.

Mr. GRAHAM: It would mean the compilation of thirteen thousand names with their addresses—quite a big job in itself. I may repeat what I stated in regard to the preceding motion that the department has always taken the stand that they do not give out this information unless it is for some special purpose. Before I became a member of this House I endeavoured to get these lists myself and was absolutely turned down by the department.

Mr. IRVINE: In that case Mr. Speaker, the hon. member will not object to my pressing the motion now?

Mr. SPEAKER: Stands?

Mr. IRVINE: No.

Mr. SPEAKER: Dropped?

Mr. IRVINE: No.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. SPEAKER: Lost on division.

ST. JOHN AND QUEBEC RAILWAY

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals) moved that the House tomorrow go into committee of the whole to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that the provisions of chapter 12 of the statutes of 1921, be amended by extending the time for the completion of the Saint John and Quebec Railway between Centreville, in the county of Carleton, and Andover, in the county of Victoria, New Brunswick, from the 31st day of December, 1923, to the 31st day of December, 1925.

He said: His Excellency the Governor General, having been apprised of the subject matter of the resolution, has given his consent thereto and commends it to the consideration of the House.

SAAR VALLEY COMMISSION

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. J. S. WOODSWORTH (Centre Winnipeg): Mr. Speaker, what is the attitude of the government in regard to the action of the Canadian representative on the Saar Valley Commission, Mr. R. D. Waugh, ex-Mayor of Winnipeg? He was reported by the press a little time ago to be offering his resignation because of the action of the majority of his fellow-commissioners. The latest English newspapers to come to hand—the Manchester Guardian, the London Nation and others—are very strong in their condemnation of the action of the majority of the members of the commission. I wonder if our Canadian government have any part in this matter and if so, what action they are taking to support the Canadian representative.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): The government has no intimation on the subject other than has appeared in the press. I understand that the gentleman referred to is an appointee of the League of Nations; he is not an appointee of the Dominion government.

ALLEGED SECESSION POSSIBILITY

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. WILLIAM IRVINE (Calgary East): I wish to inquire if the attention of the government has been drawn to a statement made by Hon. W. F. Roberts, Minister of Public Health in the province of New Brunswick, which appears in this morning's press, to the effect that the secession of the Maritimes and the formation of a Maritime dominion is an imminent possibility unless a truly Canadian national policy is outlined and adhered to. If the attention of the government has been drawn to this I would like also to know if in their opinion, this is not more disrupting to the Dominion than, say, a strike of miners in Nova Scotia, and if they found it necessary to send militia to combat the strikers—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. IRVINE: There is the question, Mr. Speaker.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): The attention of the government has not been drawn to the matter my hon. friend mentions.

BONUS TO TRIPLETS

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. J. L. BROWN (Lisgar): I have here a communication from one of my constituents requesting me to ask a question of the government. As the communication is very brief I will just read it; it is a matter in which the Minister of Immigration (Mr. Stewart) will be particularly interested:

We are told here that the government pays a bonus in the case of triplets who live. The — family have triplets, and if it is true that there is a bonus coming, will you please advise us what proceedings should be taken to obtain this bonus, either in the way of land or money. We will thank you for looking into this matter for us.

I wish to ask whether the present government has, or the former government had, any general policy in this respect. If not, I suggest the propriety of such a policy.

Mr. GRAHAM: Who says the West is not progressive?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think my hon. friend is right in suggesting that the Minister of the Interior is in a better position to answer that question than I am.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I will bring the matter to the attention of the government.

ISENBERG AND HOPPE LEASES

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. E. J. GARLAND (Bow River): I wish to ask the government if the statement appearing in this morning's Citizen is correct, contained in a letter from Mr. W. Murdock to the effect that the leases known as the Isenberg and Hoppe leases in Alberta have never been cancelled.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Decidedly, no. They have been cancelled.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): I would ask whether there is no system of registration so that the public may know of the issue of fiats for the reconsideration of such cases. Instances of this kind arise and the first intimation the public gets is that the case is under way. Is there no means of making the public aware of these matters?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The question is one which the hon. Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin) would be in the best position to answer. I will direct his attention to the question.

CANADA SHIPPING ACT—PILOTAGE

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) moved the second reading of Bill No. 166, to amend The Canada Shipping Act.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Will the minister explain this bill?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I explained the proposed legislation fully when the resolution was before the committee and my hon. friend was present; I can only repeat what I then said. The law as it is does not allow any discretion to the pilotage authority, in ports other than Quebec, Montreal, Halifax, and St. John, to refuse a certificate to the master or the mate of a vessel who may apply for it. The object of the bill is to replace the word "shall" by the word "may" and add the words "if his application be approved by the pilotage authority." At present the pilotage authorities, after the ordinary examinations and upon payment of the dues, are compelled to deliver a certificate to the master or mate making the application. The necessity for the change has been forcibly brought to the attention of the department through a special case which arose this season in the pilotage district of Miramichi. The channel there is very narrow, and capable men have to be employed as pilots. We cannot expect pilots to spend all their time there if their services are not always required; under these conditions they have no option but to seek other means of livelihood, thus leaving the port without competent pilots. The bill is necessitated by an opinion of the Department of Justice that under the law as it stands the pilotage authorities have to grant the certificate. Under the amendment the master or mate is allowed to pass an examination, and be granted the certificate only when the pilotage authorities approve.

[Mr. Brown.]

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

On section 1—Master or mate, if application approved, may be examined, and, if passed, may receive pilotage certificate.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: As I understand the minister's explanation, he wants in the first place an enabling clause, and in the next place a clause to prevent, if necessary, action being taken. On looking at the act I suppose the real change is this, that you can use substituted pilots with the assent of the pilotage districts of Quebec, Montreal, Halifax or St. John, but that others could not give that assent. Am I correct in that?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: And the next change is the substitution of "may" for "shall" in the sixteenth line?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes, and the addition of the words "if his application be approved by the pilotage authority."

Section agreed to. Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

CIVIL SERVICE SUPERANNUATION

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved the second reading of Bill No. 180, to amend the Civil Service Supermnnuation and Retirement Act.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Perhaps the minister would tell us what is being repealed by this section.

Mr. FIELDING: It is the clause which authorizes the Treasury Board to grant an extra term of years. That is the whole object.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I remember that.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, considered in committee, reported, read the third time and passed.

INSURANCE ACT, 1917, AMENDMENT

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved the second reading of Bill No. 184, to amend the Insurance Act, 1917.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

On section 1—Returns of British or foreign unlicensed insurance.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Will the minister explain?

Mr. FIELDING: This is to avoid the sending in of a duplicate return. There are several places where returns are required, and the object of this is to provide that where one return has been received in proper form, a duplicate shall not be required. That is the whole purpose of the first section.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I have not the act before me, but my recollection is that there was a change, not very much change in substance perhaps, but a change in the form for the definite purpose for which the return was required. Is the minister quite sure that if he waives these returns he will leave the company in the same position, having regard to the section requiring the return, that they would be in if they put in a false return, for instance?

Mr. FIELDING: I do not think it touches that at all. The Superintendent of Insurance has prepared the bill and he assures me it is to avoid unnecessary duplication.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: If my hon. friend is satisfied, I am not objecting.

Section agreed to.

On section 2—French version amended.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That seems to be different.

Mr. FIELDING: That is an error in the translation, that is all.

Section agreed to.

On section 3—Conditions of license for automobile insurance.

Mr. FIELDING: This creates standard conditions of policies for automobile business, that is all.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think we approved of that a couple of years ago, but it was not gone on with.

Mr. FIELDING: I presume not.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think it went through the committee.

Mr. FIELDING: I understand that the various interests concerned have been consulted in the matter and that the bill is not objected to.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Perhaps we had better get a little idea from looking over the marginal notes as to what this means.

Mr. FIELDING: I should be very glad to let the matter stand.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Oh, it would not take five minutes.

Mr. FIELDING: The automobile insurance business is comparatively new. This is simply to create standard conditions of insurance in this business as has been done in other lines.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Perhaps we might take it up section by section.

Mr. BOYS: Is this bill the result of suggestions made by companies interested in such insurance, or by whom? The minister is introducing it, but these things occasionally have some other origin.

Mr. FIELDING: This is the work of the Superintendent of Insurance and he informs me that he has been in communication with the various interests concerned, and that this bill is merely to meet a new condition that has arisen. It is not objected to so far as I know, but if any hon. gentleman desires me to hold it over I have no objection.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: In connection with paragraph (c) I would ask the minister whether that follows the usual clause as to mis-descriptions, mistakes in applications and so forth. It seems rather broad.

Mr. FIELDING: I think it follows the custom as respects other branches of the insurance business.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: This reads:

> If any person applying for insurance falsely describes the property to the prejudice of the company or knowingly misrepresents or conceals or omits to communicate any circumstance which is required by the terms of the written application—

I note that written application is required. That would be in the form, I assume, that the department will select, so it would not be open to the companies to enlarge that application. In other words, that form of application would be the form approved of by the department, and the companies could not use other forms?

Mr. FIELDING: Yes, I would so understand it.

Mr. BOYS: I have not had time as yet to go through all these clauses, but I see that it is necessary under one of them to have a copy of the application in the policy. From my own experience in business it seems to me it would be a very good idea if the agents of companies, or the companies themselves, were compelled to deliver to the insured a copy of the application at the time it is taken. I have, as a matter of fact, a case pending now, and there are many such cases where these policies are filled in, as a matter of convenience, by the agent of the company. I am not finding fault with that, but apparently the agent sometimes takes certain things for granted and inserts them himself, and then later on they turn out to be incorrect—not having been read over at the time by the insured—trouble results. I do not think it would be a hardship on the companies if their agents were compelled when taking an application for insurance to deliver a copy of that application then and there. In my experience I do not think I have ever run across a man who was able to show me the form of application that he had signed and if there is any sign of trouble it is difficult to get these copies from insurance companies. The insured, having signed the application, when he returns to his home in the evening will look over his copy. If he does not do it then he will not do it at all. If he looks it over he may find things in the application which should not be there.

Mr. FIELDING: I shall be pleased to leave the bill in committee and discuss the matter suggested by my hon. friend with the Superintendent of Insurance.

Mr. MANION: May I ask a question? I notice in glancing through the notes of the bill—I confess I have not read it over carefully—that the measure seems entirely for the purpose of protecting the insurance company, and I was wondering if the draftsman—I am not referring to the minister himself but to the official who drew up the bill—in any way took into account the very large number of owners of automobiles in the country, and if he did not draw the bill wholly with the object of protecting the company. In other words has the matter been gone into sufficiently fully by the draftsman to ensure that the companies are not making the regulations so strict as to vitiate, in certain cases, or do away with, the insurance. I hope that the interests of the owner of the automobile are being looked after. I know that the minister would not ignore that point, but I have seen bills put through the House on some matters in which the effect of all the provisions had not been thoroughly looked into. Now the owners of automobiles in the country would not become thoroughly familiar with a policy of this kind whereas the company would be looking entirely to its own interest. I simply point out that phase of the question to the minister.

Mr. FIELDING: I shall draw my hon. friend's remarks to the attention of the Superintendent of Insurance. I am perfectly sure that the superintendent, in preparing this bill, has had regard to the automobile owner as well as to the company. However, any suggestion on that line will be worthy of consideration, and before the bill is put through committee I will be happy to have the Superintendent of Insurance consulted in the matter.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: There is just one thing, going rather to the principle of this matter, that I would like to draw to my hon. friend's attention. On glancing over the act now I see that exceptions to insurability are made by the act itself. The usual principle as to insurance is that the insurance, when made, is an absolute contract unless exceptions are stipulated, and for the purpose of helping the public the law provides that these notices shall be printed very distinctly. In some instances, I think—I am speaking from recollection—red ink or larger type has to be used if the company desires to contract itself outside of the ordinary liability of an insurer. In other words, the exceptions have to be brought to the attention of the insured. Now, I point out to my hon. friend that this bill changes the rule altogether. This bill says that unless otherwise specifically stated in the policy of insurance, the company shall not be liable in a whole list of cases; for example if the interest of the insured in the automobile is not that of sole ownership, and so on. A man might very well desire to insure a partial but real interest which he had in an automobile just as much as if he owned it wholly himself, and I really think it should be pointed

out to him in black and white in his policy that that partial interest is not insurable. Then again, a man may well insure his automobile and have to raise a little money on it; that will not be looked upon as a very heinous thing to do. But under this bill if a man insures his automobile and happens to have or subsequently gives a mortgage, or a lien, against it the policy is void, though there is nothing in the policy to show that such is the case. I would suggest to the minister that he should look into the effect of this bill and see whether we really ought to depart from a pretty well settled principle in connection with insurance, namely, that if the insurer desires to make exceptions to his general liability the exceptions must be clearly shown on the face of the policy.

Mr. FIELDING: I move that the committee rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again. Before the bill is again taken up I will call the attention of the Superintendent of Insurance to the various points brought forward.

Mr. BOYS: Would the minister allow me to make another suggestion or two which might be considered by the superintendent when he is speaking to him. I would like to suggest that a copy of an application should always be given to the assured. Supposing, as often happens, loss is sustained and some question arises. The solicitor wants to see the application that his client has signed, but he has not got it. There is nothing which compels an insurance company to provide it, and while most of them do some are unwilling. I think there should be a clause in the bill which would compel an insurance company to provide a copy of the application upon the request of the assured or his solicitor. Then I would like this further suggestion to be considered: There should be a clause that the assured or his authorized agent should be permitted at any time to inspect the original application in the possession of the company. My reason for suggesting that is this. As I said before, very often answers are filled in by the agent and you cannot find that out by a typewritten copy. But if the opportunity was afforded of seeing the original application you could tell whose handwriting it is in, and get at what you want that way. I would like such a clause as that to be included if possible.

Progress reported.

OPIUM AND NARCOTIC DRUGS BILL

SENATE AMENDMENTS

Hon. H. S. BELAND (Minister of Health) moved the second reading of and concurrence in the amendments made by the Senate to Bill No. 72, to prohibit the improper use of opium and other drugs.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I would ask the minister to explain the effect of the amendments, as to whether the policy adopted by the Commons is or is not changed by them.

Mr. BELAND: Five amendments have been made by the Senate to this bill. Two of them are of minor importance, and were made at the instance of the department.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I take it that those are the first two.

Mr. BELAND: The first two involve only the addition of one word to the interpretation clause. The other amendments are more important but as far as we are concerned we have no objection at all to them. They make the intention of the bill clear. I refer to the amendment to clause 4 of the bill, which is the penalty clause. It has been divided in two, one having reference to indictment and the other to summary conviction, a penalty being provided in each case. The fourth amendment refers to section 14, on which there was some discussion in this House, and it has reference to the onus of proof. The amendment reads:

> Where any person is charged with an offence under paragraph (a), (d) or (e) of section 4 of this act, it shall not be necessary for the prosecuting authority to establish that the accused had not a license from the minister, or was not otherwise authorized to commit the act complained of, and if the accused pleads or alleges that he has such license or other authority, the burden of proof thereof shall be upon the person so charged.

It makes it a little milder, and I think more acceptable. The last amendment provides for the insertion of the words "and for the revocation of licenses" after the word "purposes."

Motion agreed to; amendments read the second time and concurred in.

DOMINION LANDS ACT AMENDMENT—COAL

Hon. CHARLES STEWART (Argenteuil) (Minister of the Interior) moved the second reading of Bill 159, to amend the Dominion Lands Act respecting the sale or other disposal of coal lands and coal mining rights.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Explain.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I think hon. members of the House will remember that the

present bill was submitted as an amendment to the Cancellation Act introduced by myself, to validate cancellation of leases. At that time I opposed this amendment, pointing out that the leases in question, were placed under the control of the Governor in Council and were not in the hands of the minister for disposal. Since that time, I presume, hon. members will have noticed that this has been the matter of a rather lengthy controversy in the Senate, both as to the question of the leases and as to the question of the issuing of the fiat in connection with those leases. Hon. members will remember that the Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin) introduced legislation on Friday evening for the purpose of the withdrawal of the fiat, and again the Senate has passed this amendment, and I am prepared to accept it, and will ask the House to accept it. It will place these lands under the control of parliament rather than under the control of the minister or the government.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I did not notice that there had been any great conflict in the Senate. It seemed to me that the government representatives in the Senate realized that a great mistake had been made last year, and that the government members in the Senate promoted this legislation; furthermore, that the government members in the Senate, upon looking into the question of the fiat, came to the conclusion that a very great error had been made in issuing that fiat. A bill has now been brought over from the Senate, which will enable the government to recede from a position which was entirely antagonistic to the real interests of the people. That is quite clear. I merely rise to point out that I do not think there was a fight in the Senate. I think they recognized unanimously that the present procedure was absolutely right, and I rise to congratulate my hon. friend on doing the right thing now, although he insisted on doing the wrong thing last year.

4 p.m.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, considered in committee, read the third time and passed.

LIVE STOCK ACTS AMENDMENT

SENATE AMENDMENT

Hon. W. R. MOTHERWELL (Minister of Agriculture) moved the second reading of and concurrence in the amendment made in the Senate to Bill No. 10, to amend and consolidate the acts respecting live stock.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Will the minister tell us what the amendments are and whether they affect the policy laid down by the House?

[Mr. C. A. Stewart.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The amendment made by the Senate reads:

There may be appointed from time to time by the Civil Service Commission, with the approval of the Governor in Council, such inspectors as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of this act.

These are the conditions that prevail with respect to the act at present, so that the amendment does not make any difference in the administration of the act.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It makes it quite sure.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: It makes assurance doubly sure.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Does the minister think it goes far enough to indicate to him, as a matter of principle, that Duncan Marshall should now be recalled?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Duncan Marshall was appointed under the provisions of the Civil Service Act.

Motion agreed to; amendment read the second time and concurred in.

SALE AND INSPECTION OF FRUIT

SENATE AMENDMENT

Hon. W. R. MOTHERWELL (Minister of Agriculture) moved the second reading of and concurrence in the amendment made by the Senate to Bill No. 11, to regulate the sale and inspection of fruit and fruit containers.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Explain.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: This is the same amendment as that which I read a minute ago, except that it is worded a little differently. It reads:

There may be appointed from time to time in accordance with the Civil Service Act, 1918, and any amendments thereof, such inspectors as are necessary for the purpose of this act.

This condition obtains now, and therefore the amendment, like a chip in the porridge, does neither good nor harm.

Motion agreed to; amendment read the second time and concurred in.

THE DAIRY INDUSTRY ACT, 1914, AMENDMENT

Hon. W. R. MOTHERWELL (Minister of Agriculture) moved that the House go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

That it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend the Dairy Industry Act, 1914, and to provide regulations regarding butter substitute and the re-manufacture of butter, the character and weight of butter, the keeping of records by manufacturers or dealers in

butter and cheese, and the examination of such records by inspectors, methods of establishing the guilt of persons charged with violation of the Act, and the procedure to be followed in all such cases.

Motion agreed to and House went into committee, Mr. Marcil (Bonaventure) in the chair.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: This resolution precedes a bill, which, I think, has not yet been distributed. The purpose of the bill is to amend the Dairy Industry Act, such amendments are being made as time and the changed conditions of the industry have proved to be necessary. Certain changes are provided for in the interpretation clauses with respect to the terms "inspector" and "analyst." The terms "milk" and "butter fat" have also been defined in the bill. I do not think the term "substitute for butter" is to be found in the bill, but I believe it is in the margin; it refers to the percentage of milk or butter fat that must be contained in butter, and the stipulation is made that this shall be 80 per cent and shall conform to the requirements of the Food and Drug Act.

Mr. TOLMIE: That does not refer to oleomargarine?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No; possibly that may come up at a later stage, but I cannot say with any certainty now whether it will or not. The bill also deals with re-manufactured butter. The term "manufactured" has hitherto been misunderstood. Sometimes it is used in reference to the original source of the manufactured article, but occasionally butter is re-made or re-churned, and there is a provision with respect to that practice. Possibly the section that is of most interest is that which deals with the weight of butter. In connection with charges that have been made in the past in relation to underweight in butter packages, there has been experienced a great deal of difficulty in proving that there has actually been such underweight. This difficulty has been inevitable under the terms of the act as it stands at present, because it is provided that the weight shall be so much at the time that the prints or the bricks were moulded or cut. When a pound print or brick goes to the retailer and is sold over the counter it is seldom the same weight as it was orginally, so that it is obviously exceedingly difficult to obtain a conviction for the selling of a package that is underweight when you have to prove the weight of the butter at the time it was moulded or cut. This term, "moulded or cut" is therefore being eliminated; the weight must be one hundred per cent at the time the butter is offered for sale.

Mr. BOYS: That applies to the retailer

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes. We shall discuss this point later on. There are difficulties in any case, but this is considered to present the minimum difficulty and is most satisfactory inasmuch as it assures the consumer of full weight. As I have said, it is next to impossible to secure any conviction when you have to prove what the weight of the butter was a month or two previously. There are also some other changes with respect to minor matters: certain books must be kept to conform with the new grading system, and provisions are being made with respect to prosecutions and so forth. But these are matters of detail.

Mr. TOLMIE: What is the meaning of the term "renovated butter"? Does this refer to butter made from renovated cream?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The provision in the bill with regard to renovated butter is intended simply to continue the prohibition.

Mr. TOLMIE: Does "renovated butter" mean butter made from renovated cream?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No; this provision simply prohibits the manufacture of renovated butter by the process which is practised in the United States.

Mr. TOLMIE: That is, re-churning.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No, it does not prohibit re-churning. There is a process of renovation in the United States by which the butter is electrified, and that is the practice that we are prohibiting.

Mr. TOLMIE: The word "renovating" here does not interfere with the liming of cream?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No; when the bill is under consideration I shall explain that feature of it. A big evil is creeping in in connection with the treatment of cream that has reached too high a state of fermentation when it reaches the creamery. There is no doubt that the inferior quality of a good deal of the butter that is turned out is due to this evil. The bill does not deal with this situation, however, which is one that, I think, calls for consideration. I had thought of raising the question before the special committee on Agricultural Conditions.

Mr. TOLMIE: Does the minister think that we could make butter fit for competition with European manufacturers competing in the British market, if we used cream of that kind?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No.

Mr. TOLMIE: Can the minister give us any information about the manufacture of what is known as "manna" in the province of Quebec?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I do not think it falls from heaven, and certainly we have had several prosecutions this year in connection with this product. Certain butters of not very superior quality are mixed with vegetable oils and sometimes there is as much as fifty or sixty per cent of butter fat in the compound, the rest being vegetable material. This is considered to be an attempt to circumvent the oleomargarine law. I do not know whether or not that is the intention, but certainly it would be pretty expensive oleomargarine that would contain fifty or sixty per cent of butter fat, which is the nature of "manna." It is obvious, of course, that the butter must have been of a distinctly inferior quality in the first instance, or it would not have been mixed with vegetable oils in this proportion. The same vegetable oil is used in the manufacture of oleomargarine, and I do not think there is any actual law that prescribes the amount of vegetable oils that must be incorporated in the compound to constitute oleomargarine. It is rather a confusing question.

Mr. TOLMIE: Under the law to-day the manufacture of oleomargarine is permitted only in certain establishments that are licensed for the purpose.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes, and it transpired that these places were apparently licensed. I do not know whether the intention was to get by with it as butter, or whether it was produced as oleomargarine. This is a sort of compromise compound containing butter and vegetable fats.

Mr. TOLMIE: You did not let it slip past you, anyway.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No.

Mr. TOLMIE: What results did you have in the prosecutions?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I think we got convictions, but it is some months now since I was inquiring into the matter. I will get details for my hon. friend.

Mr. TOLMIE: Does this act prevent the manufacture of what is called "filled milk"? And what are the actual ingredients of filled milk?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: That is a local term. The "manna" that we have just been speaking about may be termed "filled butter"; it is filled with other ingredients. In making filled milk the butter fat is extracted from the whole milk and replaced by foreign fats of a similar nature, such as cocoanut oil and peanut oil. The practice is not very general in Canada, but it is quite common in the United States and is prohibited in some nine or ten states. The standards for milk and butter are fixed by order in council under the Food and Drugs Act. In the bill itself there is rather a technical expression which, I think, with the carrying out of the tests embodied in section 1 of the bill stipulating that there shall be 3.5 of butter fat in milk, will have the same effect as prohibiting filled milk, for the simple reason that with this percentage of butter fat in milk there will be no object in adding any other ingredients. Of course, a lot of tests run a good deal higher than 3.5 per cent, which is somewhat low, but it is quite obvious that while the milk contains this percentage it is not simply whole milk with the butter fat extracted.

Mr. TOLMIE: In view of the fact that a bill is to be brought down after this resolution is passed, would it not be well to have this particular point covered in the bill?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: We have not used the term "filled milk" any more than we have that of "filled butter". We simply stipulate that butter shall consist of 80 per cent butter fat, which conforms to the Food and Drugs Act. We have a double standard, which will make it impossible for butter to be filled and sold as "manna". The requirement of 3.5 per cent of butter fat in milk will prevent any attempt at filling. However, if it is advisable to make it clear by elaborating the word "filled" we can discuss it in the committee on Agriculture.

Mr. MILLAR: Are there any substitutes for butter, other than oleo, that are forbidden by law? Also, what constitutes a violation of such a law? I noticed in the city a short time ago something that was labelled and looked very much like butter, but when I asked the retail merchant he said it was the best quality oleo. In the labelling there was nothing to indicate that the compound was oleo, and I was only told its true character when I asked about it. Would the labelling of oleo or any other substitute as butter constitute a violation of the law?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: During recent years the ingenuity of man has been exercised in seeing how many compounds could be put on the market to imitate butter. My hon. friend might very easily find in stores a com-

pound labelled "country roll", and he would have to turn it upside down to find the word "oleo". Sometimes the word is very indistinct, but usually it will be found on the bottom of the roll. Many people take that country roll to be butter. We all know what the country roll our mothers made was like, but this compound never saw the country in Canada; at the same time it is suggestive of butter. When it leaves the wholesaler the wrapper usually is on it, but when it is displayed for sale by the retailer frequently the wrapper is off and nowhere can the word "oleo" be found except on the bottom of the package. In reply to my hon. friend's question, whether there is any other compound besides oleo that can be sold legally, I think there are others, and it is scarcely possible to determine whether they are meant for butter or something else. But I think the proposed bill will prevent these imitations because they would not contain the required percentage of butter fat.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Mr. Chairman, there is no questioning the minister's diligence in providing regulations governing the quality of milk, butter and cheese; these dairy products are surrounded with regulations so strict that it is practically impossible for any adulteration to escape detection. The dairymen are not finding fault with such regulations. But I think there is good cause for complaint on their part that such regulations do not apply to those who add base ingredients to dairy products in order to take advantage of the latters' merits. This is a very common practice in this country to-day and it is so general in the United States that, as the minister has pointed out, a number of state legislatures have provided regulations against such adulteration. Reference has been made to "manna", which is, I believe, an endeavour to replace butter fat with a baser ingredient so that the compound may be disposed of at a greater profit. It is surprising how ingenious people are in their attempts to take advantage of something which has merit.

With regard to oleomargarine, which has been mentioned by the hon. member for Victoria City (Mr. Tolmie), I would point out that there is absolutely no fixed standard for this commodity. The packers have the absolute right and privilege to take dairy products into their packing houses, mix base ingredients with them, and sell the compound at an enhanced profit to themselves. Do the committee think it fair to enact regulations so strict with regard to the production of a food that is absolutely essential to the health of growing children, and at the same time allow the packing houses to adulterate this commodity and dispose of it to the public as a substitute for butter? I think our regulations have been altogether too lax in this respect, and I am surprised that the minister is not taking steps in this bill to provide against these encroachments. You may surround those who are producing dairy products with all these regulations, but you cannot compel them to continue their production unless they find it profitable to do so. During this parliament and in preceding parliaments advice has been handed out by agricultural experts, as well as by those who are not agricultural experts, as to what should be done to make agriculture a success. It has been suggested that the farmers, particularly those in the West, should go into the live stock business; many who do not know the conditions in that part of the country have held that this is the only hope of salvation for the farmer. At the same time the manufacture of a commodity such as butter, on which there is the lowest duty that applies to any commodity that comes into this country, is surrounded with regulations so strict that they are becoming a nuisance. And the minister gets up to-day and states that extra safeguards are to be provided respecting the butter-fat content of milk and dairy products, but no provision is being made in regard to the encroachment on this commodity of butter-substitutes which are left free from such regulations as apply to dairy products. Skilled chemists take advantage of the high quality of butter-fat by so treating it, through the substitution or inclusion of cheaper ingredients, as to enable them to impose it on the public—not to supply a reasonable demand, but solely to make a profit out of a product that is not their own and that has real merit. We collect no tariff whatever on the commodities which are being brought into this country and mixed with our dairy products—or if we do, ninety-nine per cent is refunded. We have heard a good deal during the last few weeks about the standing of the two old-line parties in this country on the tariff. It has been stated that stability has been given to the tariff and that both the old parties are protectionist; yet this is the kind of protection that is meted out to those engaged in agriculture. It is not to the credit of the two old parties that this has been allowed. Is there a country under the sun for which nature has done more than it has for Canada from an agricultural standpoint?—an ideal country, outside of the long winters we have, and even these are beneficial in

many respects. Yet the condition of affairs to which I refer is allowed to continue; even this session stricter regulations have been enacted regarding agricultural products than those applying to any other commodities. I protest, therefore, against the adoption of any further restrictions on the farmers unless you apply similar restrictions to those not engaged in agriculture, those not producing the basic commodities which are essential in connection with our most important foodstuffs and which are natural to our country.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I do not know what my hon. friend is talking about. I think he scents oleo in the air. If he does, all I can say is that last year he and I were on the same platform in that respect, and unless he has changed his view we are still on the same platform. Hence, I take it that he refers not to milk or cream, but to butter or to "manna." Is that what my hon. friend refers to?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Or to the butter-fat content of milk.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: We have that covered. The bill is not yet distributed, but I will read a paragraph from it; perhaps it will explain the point better. In fact, these details should not be gone into until the House has the bill before it. The bill says:

> Section 6 of the said act is repealed, and the following is substituted therefor:—
>
> "No person shall manufacture any butter containing over 16 per centum of water, or less than 80 per centum of milk fat."

If you get 80 per cent of milk fat into butter and 16 per cent of water, you have not much room for anything else. That conforms exactly to the stipulation provided by the Food and Drugs Act, applied, of course, to the content of butter. I was hopeful of getting the benefit of the views of our analyst on this subject before the committee on Agriculture. I do not pretend to know the terms, but I will read what section 1 of the bill says respecting milk fat or butter fat:

> "Milk fat" or "butter fat" is the fat of milk and has a Reichert Meissal number not less than twenty-four and a specific gravity not less than 0.905 at forty degrees centigrade and a Polenski number not to exceed 3.5.

I am not in a position to enlighten anybody with regard to these chemical tests, but I will at least have Dr. Shutt before the Agriculture committee to go into the matter in detail, and if these strange names do not do the trick, we will employ more understandable terms. I am quite with my hon. friend in all he says, and if this does not meet his wishes, he is a member of the Agriculture committee and he will find that we stand together on the requisites of this bill.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Motherwell thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 186, to amend the Dairy Industry Act, 1914.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Before the bill is read the second time I suggest that it be printed, as its merits can only be discussed on the second reading. The explanation given by the minister hardly conveys the meaning of the bill.

PATENTS OF INVENTION

SENATE AMENDMENTS

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Trade and Commerce) moved the second reading of and concurrence in amendments made by the Senate to Bill No. 20, to amend and consolidate the act relating to patents of invention.

Mr. CALDWELL: What is the effect of the amendments?

Mr. ROBB: They are only of a minor character. One is to correct a clerical error that was made by inserting a phrase in the eighteenth line that should have been inserted in the seventeenth line. Another relates to renumbering the sections. There are other slight amendments in no way materially affecting the bill.

Motion agreed to; amendments read the second time and concurred in.

COPYRIGHT ACT

SENATE AMENDMENTS

Mr. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Trade and Commerce) moved the second reading of and concurrence in amendments made by the Senate to Bill No. 24, to amend the Copyright Act, 1921.

Mr. MANION: I understand from the press that these amendments make a complete change in the bill as presented before the Senate. Is that correct?

Mr. ROBB: No. The Senate, I understand, did make some changes in committee which were afterwards referred back, and finally the Senate approved the bill as it left this chamber, with the exception of changing the date on which the act was to come into force. The

original bill provided that it should come into force on the first day of July, 1923. The Senate amended that to the first day of January, 1924, unless sooner proclaimed by proclamation of the Governor in Council. That is the only change that was made.

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): Although the Senate amendment, postponing the date of the coming into force of the act until the first day of January, 1924, may be somewhat of an improvement on the clause which would have brought it into force on the first day of July, 1923, the change might just as well not have been made because there is no possibility of Canada adopting the provisions of the latest Berne Convention by the amended date. A much later date should have been placed in the bill, and in this connection I should like to read a memorandum prepared by counsel on behalf of the authors:

> I observe that the Senate fixes the first of January, 1924, as the date on which the act is to come into force. They might just as well have left the date the first of July, because there is no probability that an arrangement can be arrived at with the United States by the first of January next.
>
> As you know, Congress does not assemble until December, and it has before it matters of so much greater concern that the Cabinet will not deal with such a comparatively unimportant thing as copyright relations with Canada until more pressing affairs are out of the way.
>
> If our act comes into force on the 1st of January without a new treaty with the United States, the result will be that works published in the United States after that date will not be protected in Canada.
>
> After having enjoyed this copyright protection in Canada for thirty years, the United States government will undoubtedly consider it an affront that its citizens have been made copyright outlaws in Canada, and it is not likely that the United States will continue the reciprocal protection to Canadian authors which they now enjoy.
>
> In consequence, Canadian authors will lose protection in a county they are chiefly concerned in, and as United States publications will be without protection in Canada, and with the Canadian market flooded with cheap piratical reproductions, Canadian authors will lose the benefit of Canadian copyright as well.
>
> These results will certainly follow if the Copyright Act comes into force before a new treaty is negotiated with the United States.
>
> In my opinion the new act should not come into force until the first of July, 1924, unless sooner proclaimed. This will give parliament at the next session an opportunity to consider the situation should difficulties develop with the United States in negotiating a copyright treaty. If the government is in earnest in improving the copyright law, it must make sure that all our existing international rights are preserved before changing the law.

I would like to know whether the minister has taken that phase into consideration because if, as pointed out by counsel, these are to be the results, we had better bring the act into force late enough so that we shall be absolutely safe.

Mr. ROBB: The government are quite aware that there has been a difference of opinion as between the authors, the song writers, musical writers and the printing trade regarding copyright, but this measure was considered carefully in the House, sent over to the Senate and considered carefully there. and the judgment of the Senate was that the date of coming into effect of the act should be extended until January 1st, 1924. The government concurred in and are willing to accept that amendment. I cannot agree with my hon. friend that anything would be gained by extending the date still further. It seems to me that it would be in the interest of all those concerned in Canada that the Copyright Act should become law. If it is found necessary at the next session to make further amendments the government will not be debarred from proposing them by any legislation that we may pass now.

Mr. HOEY: The minister is doubtless, by this time, aware that this legislation in its present form is very objectionable to the Authors' Association of Canada. When the bill was before the House and the amendment was introduced by the minister I supported it. I had been suddenly called into the House and laboured under the delusion that that amendment was submitted at the request of the Authors' Association. Since then I have learned that the authors are very much opposed to that amendment, and opposed to the present legislation because of its protectionist features. I think it is very regrettable that we should allow legislation of this kind to pass through the House. I cannot persuade myself that it was carefully considered. I think the majority of us did not understand the significance of the amendment at all. I rise on this occasion to voice my protest against it on these grounds.

Motion agreed to; amendments read the second time and concurred in.

SUPPLY—U.S. LABOUR DELEGATES DETAINED

CASE OF ALEXANDER HOWAT

Hon. W S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. J. S. WOODSWORTH (Centre Winnipeg): Mr. Speaker, I should like to take advantage of this, the first opportunity for several weeks, to bring to the attention of the House the case of Alexander Howat, about whom I asked some questions but whose appeal has been dismissed by the Act-

ing Minister of Immigration and Colonization. I do this not merely because of some degree of interest in the case of Howat himself, but on account of the serious precedent involved. The case first came to my notice through a telegram from the secretary of the Miners' Association at Glace Bay, Cape Breton, which reads as follows:

Howat ex-president Kansas Miners and Thomas Myerscough have been detained by immigration authorities McAdam Junction. Howat on his way here to address coal miners meeting soliciting their support for reinstatement of Kansas miners who have been expelled from the U.M.W. of A. Take up matter at once with Immigration authorities whom I am now wiring.

I took the matter up and immediately asked questions concerning the case on the floor of the House. The department finally gave a decision, which decision was appealed against by Mr. Howat. However, the minister finally decided the case against Howat. Now I understand from the American press that Mr. Howat is appealing to the Secretary of State of the United States in regard to the matter. The feeling of the miners themselves, not merely in Glace Bay but in other parts of the country, may be judged from a telegram I shall read, and I may say that I have received some half dozen similar messages from eastern and western Canada in regard to this case. This particular telegram comes from New Glasgow, Nova Scotia, and is signed by a committee of the miners. It reads as follows:

At a mass meeting held at Stellarton, N.S. representing two thousand working men of Pictou county the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

Whereas district twenty-six U.M.W. of A. held and celebrated May first as a May Day holiday each district celebrating in its own way, and

Whereas the members located at Glace Bay, Cape Breton, and vicinity, in combination with the Sydney steel workers invited Alexander Howat the deposed president of district fourteen, Kansas, to address mass meetings to be held at Glace Bay and at central points in the other sub-districts, and

Whereas said Alexander Howat was refused admission at the border line into Canada as being a dangerous alien character and one Van Bitner; representing John L. Lewis admitted who is also an alien;

Be it resolved that in the opinion of this meeting we consider this act of the Immigration department is not in accord with democratic principle of free liberty loving citizens of Canada but rather in keeping with despotic Russia under the Czar regime.

Be it further resolved that we forward a copy of this resolution to J. S. Woodsworth appealing for him to take the matter up with the Progressives and bring before the House for redress.

Now, as I understand the matter, the case of Howat is this: Several years ago a law was passed in the state of Kansas making a strike a crime. That would undermine the very foundation of trades unionism, and of the right of organized labour to conduct its own affairs. Howat happened at that time to be president of his union, and on account of his position was asked to go ahead and call a strike. He thereby came in conflict with the law of the state of Kansas, and as the trial went forward became in that respect a criminal. Let me call attention to the fact that Howat was exercising his responsibility as the president of the union when he proceeded to call the strike, and had the greater part of the union behind him at that time. Later on there was trouble between different sections of the United Mine Workers in the state of Kansas, and Howat was deposed from his position as president. According to my information he has been carrying on a campaign in different parts of the States and in Canada—the Canadian Workers being united, through the International Federation of Labour, with the American workers—in order to have his position made clear, possibly in order to secure reinstatement.

Now let me consider the grounds upon which Howat was refused admission to Canada. According to the press of that date he was denied admission on the ground that he would become a public charge. I interviewed the Acting Minister of Immigration with regard to this, and he told me that the news item was correct. Now according to the Immigration Act:

No immigrant, passenger or other person unless he is a Canadian citizen, or has Canadian domicile, shall be permitted to enter or land in Canada, or in case of having landed in or entered Canada shall be permitted to remain therein, who belongs to any of the following classes, hereinafter called "prohibited classes"—

From the sub-sections enumerating the classes in question I quote the following:

(j) Persons who in the opinion of the Board of Inquiry or the officer in charge at any port of entry are likely to become a public charge;

The Acting Minister of Immigration and Colonization informs me that Howat's appeal was dismissed on the ground that he was likely to become a public charge. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that there was no reasonable probability that Howat was likely to become a public charge in Canada. He was coming, on the invitation of the miners of Nova Scotia, to fill a lecture engagement, and there was no probability that he would be left without funds or become stranded in this country and be a charge on the resources of the Dominion. As a matter of fact, the Minister of Immigration and Colonization had no hesitation whatever in telling me that this was only a technical ground. The min-

ister informs me that instructions have been issued that any man from another country, including Great Britain, seeking entry to Canada who has a prison record shall be excluded. That means that in this case the real reason for excluding Howat was not that he was liable to become a public charge, but tht he had served a prison sentence on account of his having come into conflict with the laws of the state of Kansas.

There are several points I should like to bring briefly before the House. In the first place, I would charge the minister with not acting in this case in accordance with the law. The Liberals accused the late government of legislating by order in council. Apparently the present government does not even trouble to go the length of passing an order in council, but the minister himself undertakes to legislate as in this matter. I should like the minister to point out the clause in the act which permits him to exclude Alexander Howat. He has a right to exclude a man who is liable to become a public charge. He has the right to exclude other classes or persons expressly specified in the act, but he has no right to exclude a man simply on the ground that he has had a prison record. He has no right to issue instructions to that effect to his officers throughout this country. If the minister can thus disregard the law, I wonder how he expects other people to observe it.

The minister has, by his action in this case, created a new crime in the case of those seeking admission to Canada, that of a prison sentence. I would suggest that a great many of the men who are honoured in British history are men who, at one time or another, because they have advocated measures of reform were sentenced and had a prison record. In my early days I was brought up to read very carefully Bunyan's Pilgrim's Progress, and I was taught even, in those days that Bunyan had written his Pilgrim's Progress while he was a prisoner. John Bunyan would be excluded according to the ruling of the acting Minister of Immigration (Mr. Stewart). In discussing the matter with the minister I pointed out that there were some gentlemen to-day sitting in the British House of Commons who, during the war, for various reasons, had served prison sentences, among others Mr. E. D. Morel, one of the men who defeated Winston Churchill, and the Acting Minister of Immigration told me that if Mr. E. D. Morel, M.P. attempted to come to Canada he would be stopped at the border. I think that is an intolerable situation. My point is that the minister has no right to make regulations which would have that effect. In my own city of Winnipeg there are several men who have served prison sentences, William Ivens and John Queen, both members of the provincial legislature. If the American government should take similar action, these men who have been elected and re-elected by the votes of the people of their province, would be excluded from the United States. I take it that, under these circumstances, the Canadian government would have a good right to see to it that Canadian citizens occupying honourable positions in the legislatures of this country would have extended to them the right of entrance into the United States. I shall be very much disappointed indeed if Mr. Howat does not succeed in carrying his case further, and asking whether the Canadian government should exclude a citizen of the United States.

Mr. CARROLL: To what tribunal would Mr. Howat carry his appeal?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I presume it is a matter of international comity.

Mr. MARTELL: Where is international comity decided?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: It should be decided in such a place as this. That is why I am bringing it up in this House. I think it is a question for this House to deal with.

Mr. MARTELL: Does the hon. member think the parliament of Canada can determine the rights of all internationals? I always thought parliament only had jurisdiction over its own subjects.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Quite so, but we have no right to exclude people from the country, except on definite grounds, which are stated in this act, and we have excluded this man on grounds other than those stated in the act. According to the best British practice it has rather been the boast through many years, particularly shall I say the boast of the Liberal statesmen of Great Britain, that a great many of the Italian and Hungarian patriots have been enabled to come to Great Britain to place their case before the English people, and because of that they have to no small extent carried on that propaganda which has brought a larger measure of liberty in Italy, Hungary and other countries of Europe. Are we in Canada going to go back on these principles of British liberty? An editorial appeared in our local Journal on May 16, which was a splendid appeal for British liberty. One paragraph of this article reads:

5 p.m.

Britain and Liberty

Because Home Secretary Bridgeman deported certain English-born Irishmen from England to Ireland, a powerful British government is confronted with a crisis. Not only has the Englishman's passion for the liberty of the subject compelled return of the deported men and women; there is actual possibility that those responsible for deportations shall be prosecuted and that the ministry shall be censured in the House.

In what other country could such a thing take place? The men and women were of humble, lowly origin; without political influence; antagonistic to the interests of the Crown; and a generally dangerous nuisance. No matter. Their deportation was viewed as an invasion of the liberty of the subject, as an encroachment upon human rights, and immediately the voice of England rose up in compelling protest.

Of this is the greatness, the genius and the glory of the British race.

I should like to appeal to Britishers in this country that we in Canada maintain the best British traditions in dealing with matters of this character. Fundamentally such a decision as this is an attack upon freedom of speech. Only a few weeks ago the Acting Minister of Immigration rejected at the border James Larkin who was coming here to fill a lecture engagement in the city of Montreal. James Larkin afterwards returned to Great Britain. The question of his entry was taken up on the floor of the British House of Commons, and the Home Secretary took the ground that James Larkin could not be prevented from entering England because he was a British subject. Here again we have the same question arising. British subjects have certain rights the world over; they should have those rights in Canada as well as in other parts of the British dominions. It is only a few weeks since the distinguished French publicist Jean Longuet, a personal friend of Ramsay Macdonald, who has lectured throughout the length and breadth of Great Britain, and in the United States was asked to come to this country to fulfil certain lecture engagements in the cities of Montreal and Toronto. He was stopped at the border, but finally, as a special concession, he was allowed to come across into Canada, to fill two engagements, on condition that he would return immediately to the United States. Again let me say that that procedure, which is being carried out apparently as a set policy by the present administration, is not in keeping with the best British traditions.

It has been said, of course, that this man Howat was coming over here to raise some disturbance, and after his detention for several days, after the May Day celebration, it was pointed out that there had been very strange things said on May Day. As a matter of fact, it has been definitely denied that these extreme statements were ever uttered, either in the eastern part of the country, in Cape Breton, or in the western part of the country at Calgary. Apparently the speeches on that occasion were manufactured by the press, and not made by the men themselves.

Consider the situation. On a general international holiday, May Day, the workers, who form a very considerable portion of the population of this country, desire to celebrate in their own way. In so doing they are simply carrying out the request of the International Federation of Trade Unions. I have here a manifesto issued by that body in Europe, signed by J. H. Thomas, M.P., who cannot be accused of being one of the most radical of the labour members of the British House of Commons. It urges that all over the world the workers will celebrate their international holiday. Howat attempts to come over here to join in these celebrations and he is stopped. As far as the working class is concerned, I would say, in the first instance, that they regard this as an unwarrantable interference with Labour's own private affairs. I am not here to defend Howat, or any one section of the United Mine Workers of America. But, irrespective of its sectional prejudices, Labour contends that labour organizations ought to be able to bring over to this country whatever speakers they wish to select. One man representing one section of the United Mine Workers of America was allowed to come through and address a meeting; another man was stopped at the border. Is it for this government to decide which of the representatives of the unions will be allowed to come to Canada and address meetings? If it is, then it is time that we understood that very clearly. But I suggest that the government is going to undertake a pretty big programme if it is to decide just exactly what kind of policies are to be permitted to be advocated in Canada. Further, we regard this as discriminatory class legislation. I know of no occasion when an international bankers' conference has been prevented from meeting in this country. It is fairly well known to certain members of the committee on Banking and Commerce at the present time that some of the policies of our bankers in this country are actually outlined by bankers on the other side of the border; but we do not have any general objection raised to that, nor does the Minister of Immigration send any instructions to his officials on the border that bankers across the line are to be forbidden admittance to this country because their policies may not be in harmony with the policies of certain people in Canada. Imperialists from Great Britain can without

hindrance tour this country and address Canadian clubs from coast to coast on certain public policies; yet the Acting Minister of Immigration (Mr. Stewart) actually tells us that other members of the British House of Commons shall not be allowed to enter Canada for the reason that their policies are not consistent with the policies of those who at present sit on the government benches in this Chamber.

I appeal to the House once more, as I have done before, on behalf of these miners of Nova Scotia. I wish the House could understand a little bit more clearly how those men feel in this matter. They charge that in the past their constituencies have been so gerrymandered that it has been extremely difficult for them to elect representatives to the House of Commons. I am not undertaking to argue the case; I know that this is very freely stated in the eastern part of the country. They charge, further, that there have been unfair election tactics. Again, I refrain from arguing the point; I simply state as a fact that the allegation is freely made among the miners. They say that again and again they have sent deputations to the government asking for the most reasonable things, and these have been denied them. Last year they sent a deputation requesting that a royal commission be appointed to go into the whole question of the production of coal in Cape Breton. That commission was refused. This year they sent another deputation praying that the present government carry out its pledges and provide, for the old people among them, some system of pensions. Again their deputation was sent back empty handed. Under these circumstances, is it very much wonder that these men feel resentful. On their invitation, one of their fellow members comes to talk to them on a holiday, and they find that even the fundamental rights of British subjects are denied them, that they are not allowed to discuss these questions, and their guests are turned back?

I submit that if in reality we are seeking to avoid very serious industrial unrest in this country, if we are really sincere in the desire to bring about reconstruction through constitutional means, then this is the time when we ought to act in the proper spirit. There is no use talking to these men and advising them to use parliamentary methods, while again and again you make it impossible for them so to act. Then when on top of all that they find that they cannot enjoy the fundamental British rights of freedom of discussion, of organization, and so forth, I do not much wonder that there is the very deepest resentment, which sooner or later will manifest itself in ways that may cause apprehension throughout the country. Finally, I would appeal to a government that calls itself Liberal, that the old principles of Liberalism be not trampled under foot. I have no doubt the Acting Minister of Immigration himself thinks that he is acting in the best interests of the country. He says he does not want to stir up trouble; he wants to safeguard the miners from these dangerous demagogues from the United States. I have no doubt he is sincere; but I believe he is mistaken in his policy. I would again submit that he has gone altogether beyond both the letter and the spirit of the law which he is supposed to administer.

Hon. CHARLES STEWART (Acting Minister of Immigration): No doubt my hon. friend (Mr. Woodsworth) would object to admittance being refused anyone who happened to come within the purview of the law; but surely the people of Canada have a right to say whom they will admit to their midst. The argument my hon. friend uses is, however, directly in contradiction to that principle; apparently, he suggests that no offence which any human being might commit should constitute a ground for refusing to admit him into the country. Further, the hon. gentleman goes on to quote, as a case in point, the matter of the Irish agitators who were sent back from England. The situation is vastly different; Irish agitators are not aliens, they belong to the Empire, and necessarily are treated from a different point of view entirely. But people entering from the United States or any other foreign country are not in that category; and the gentleman in question, Mr. Howatt, spent fifteen months in gaol for an offence, in reference to the justice or injustice of which it is not my business to inquire. In addition to that he is one, so the information goes, who has been denied the privileges of his own organization, and is still denied them. I have no objection to his making application to the Secretary of State and bringing the matter up in due course, and I believe, from the press despatches, it was stated that he intended doing so. So far I have not been informed, either by the Secretary of State of the United States or through our own Department of State, that he has taken any such action; and personally I have no objection to lectures being delivered on behalf of the United Mine Workers of America, or the Bankers' Association, or the Manufacturers' Association, or the Farmers' Association, or any other organization. And that is not the ground on which this individual

was refused admittance to Canada; he was not admitted simply for the reason that it was feared he might become a public charge in Canada as he was in Kansas.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Does the minister say that he was a public charge in Kansas?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Undoubtedly, he was a public charge; he spent fifteen months in gaol.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Does the minister suggest that that is the meaning of the phrase "a public charge"?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): If my hon. friend is of the opinion that a prisoner is not a public charge on the community, I should like him to explain just what the status of such a person is.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: The phrase "a public charge" has a well-recognized meaning; it implies that a man has become dependent on the public for his upkeep. It is only, indeed, in a very extended sense of the expression, that one would suggest that a person who is in gaol is a public charge. The expression has an altogether different meaning from that which the minister ascribes to it.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): That is the advice I get from the officers who are paid to advise the members of the government on such questions. However, I do not intend to discuss the point further. I think that in all fairness it is reasonable to assume that anyone who commits an offence and is incarcerated in any public gaol in this country is a public charge on the Canadian people. I do not think there can be any question about that. But, further, I have a copy of the Chronicle in which I see a report that the gentleman has been refused the privilege of speaking in his own country. I am not keeping him out on that ground, though, for I am thoroughly in accord with my hon. friend that there should be freedom of speech. That is not at all the ground on which he was refused admittance. His partner came into the country because there was no similar reason for refusing to admit him; and he made his speech. But I have to be guided by the circumstances as I find them, in the case of Larkin, in the case of Howat, and in the case of a prisoner who comes to my mind at the moment, who is in a gaol in Montana. I have had half-a-dozen cases of this character since I became minister. I am perfectly willing to go into the merits of each case, but in a general way where people have served prison sentences I take it that it is not the business of the immigration officers to make an investigation as to why such sentences were imposed, and I do not intend, Mr. Speaker, to change that regulation in any particular. If later on it is proven that these men are entitled to come into the country, I have the privilege of admitting them.

Motion agreed to, and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

MARINE AND FISHERIES

Ocean and river service—maintenance and repairs to Dominion steamers and icebreakers, $1,500,000.

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries): There is a decrease of $100,000 in this item due to the lesser cost of fuel and provisions.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is the position of the John D. Hazen at the present time?

Mr. LAPOINTE: This ice breaker is doing work in the gulf of St. Lawrence just now.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: How many icebreakers have we in active operation at the present time?

Mr. LAPOINTE: We have the Mikula—that is the Russian name of the John D. Hazen; I do not know whether we ought not to give this icebreaker back its good Canadian name—the Lady Grey and the Montcalm.

Item agreed to.

Investigation into wrecks, $12,300.

Mr. SPENCER: How much of this amount was used last year?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I will get the information for my hon. friend.

Mr. NEILL: I wish under this heading to make some remarks to the House in connection with the wreck of the Alaskan which took place on the British Columbia coast last winter, and also in connection with the investigation into that wreck. I also wish to hang on to that so to speak, under circumstances which I will narrate, a plea for some further measure of protection in the way of life-saving on the coast of British Columbia. It will take some time for me to outline the case thoroughly, but I will be as brief as possible, and perhaps the fact that I did not waste the time of the House in discussing the budget may incline the committee to be indulgent on this occasion.

I am taking the wreck of the Alaskan as a typical case, although this is one of four wrecks that occurred last winter on this coast within a very limited area. There was loss of life in connection with some of the other wrecks, but there was a total loss of life in

the case of the Alaskan. This coast line along which all these wrecks occur lies entirely within my district. It is called the "Graveyard of the Pacific," and it is not a mere euphonious expression for magazine articles; it has behind it a very dread reality I remember the first occasion when I walked along this coast. Every mile or two, sometimes every quarter of a mile, I would come on the remains of a wreck. If it was a sandy stretch the wreck was still there and I have a distinct recollection of a 200-ton boat lying battered among trees on the edge of the sandy beach and far above ordinary high water. The rocky points had also taken toll; every place had a name, such as Michigan point and so on, all due to the fact that boats had gone ashore at these points within the memory of men then living, and in every case with loss of life, in many cases with a total loss of life.

The Alaskan was lost on the 2nd January of this year. The boat belonged to a little company of men living in Victoria or Vancouver. She was bought in the preceding November. Her owners ran her on one trip from Victoria to Barkley sound, which is on the west coast of Vancouver island. On the second trip she was lost with all hands. This boat was built thirty-seven years ago in the United States. I may say that even now—at that time still more so—the standards of shipbuilding in the United States are much less exacting than our Canadian standards. Consequently hon. members can judge of the character of a boat built thirty-seven years ago in the United States. It was constructed either of Douglas fir, known to be a soft wood, or else of Oregon pine, a still softer wood. I am quoting now, with one small exception, entirely from the evidence taken at the investigation. I have also used the coroner's inquest held on one of the bodies that came ashore and my personal knowledge of the local geography. This investigation was held under government auspices a few months ago. The Alaskan was a steamer of 13 horse power, and had what is known as a water-tube boiler. Her tonnage was not 150 tons but a few hundred pounds under. They build them like that in order to escape the regulation, because any boat of 150 tons or over has to be inspected annually by the government inspectors as regards her hull. Her machinery must be inspected anyhow. So the hull of this thirty-seven year old boat which was going out into the open Pacific in winter time had never been inspected by any government inspector from the time she was launched. She was bought at the time I am alluding to for $6,000. She was insured for $9,000 forthwith.

On account of the total loss of life I advised the government to have an investigation into the wreck, and this was ordered. Hon. members will recall that I have from time to time asked the government when the report was coming down. The answer given me first was that the report was delayed by the sickness of the stenographer who had taken the evidence, and later on by the sickness of the commissioner. I am not a bit surprised that they were sick. I have read the evidence and the report and their perusal and a comparison of them filled me with nausea. Therefore, I repeat, I am not surprised that anyone would feel inclined to be sick who had any responsibility whatever in the preparation of the report. For the result was a gigantic whitewash. It whitewashed everybody connected with the wreck. The only person not whitewashed was the Almighty, on whom blame was put for sending the storm, although it was a comparatively minor storm because the meteorological report says the morning of the day on which the Alaskan was lost there was only a fresh gale blowing and at night it was nothing more than a strong gale. In their desire to whitewash everybody in sight they even whitewashed a government official who was discharged by the department for neglect of duty in connection with the wreck. He too was covered with this universal coat of whitewash. But while very abundant it was from its very nature extremely thin, and certain very salient and prominent facts stick out which I purpose to bring to the notice of the House.

In the first place I am putting some responsibility on the government—though not by way of blaming the present government or the last government, or even, necessarily, a department; it is probably a condition of affairs that has grown up; the conditions have changed and the regulations have not. I am not blaming anyone in connection with the government, but the government of the day, as regards the future at least, have a certain responsibility.

Now, it arose in this way: The government appointed, I do not know how many years ago, a wreck commissioner to deal with these investigations of wrecks on the Pacific coast. It is an extremely important work, because the decisions sometimes involve hundreds of thousands of dollars in connection with wrecks or collisions. Well, they allotted to this

official $1,500 or $1,600, a year I am not sure which, and in case this might not be enough for a really competent man, whose duties would be very little inferior to those of a judge, they said: "If $1,600 is not sufficient, you are at liberty to indulge in private work." The wreck commissioner is necessarily a seafaring man, and a seafaring man is not very likely to be readily capable of adapting himself to some other occupation such as that of a stockbroker or a druggist. His only natural occupation must be in connection with seafaring matters, such as surveying, the testing of compasses, and so on. I am not saying that this man did such work, because I do not know, and I am going to be very conservative in my statements. But I do know that the regulations of the department under which he was employed permit him, if he so wishes, to engage in private work. Now, that is worse than if a judge were given a beggarly salary and told that he might go out and engage in legal work on the side, because a judge might do a great deal of legal work and yet never come in contact with his clients in the court over which he presided. Moreover, if there were any likelihood of that happening, he could get a brother judge to take his case. But this man is sole judge of these cases on the Pacific coast, and more than that, his clientele, if I may use the word, is limited. The number of men engaged in seafaring pursuits on the Pacific coast of British Columbia, that is, those who own boats there, is extremely limited, and if this man is to get employment, as he is invited to do by the government regulations, he must seek it from among the very men on whom he may sit to-morrow in judgment in connection with very important matters indeed. He must be familiar with all these men; he must be on friendly terms with them if he wants to get employment from them, yet he is put in the position of working for them one day and sitting in judgment on them the next. I do not say he ever did any such private work, because, as I have said, I do not know; but I submit that it is an undesirable position for the government regulations to create.

The government will say, no doubt, and say very truly, that the work offering on that coast in this connection is not large enough to justify the payment of a proper salary to a man who should devote his whole attention to it. Well, in that case it would be far better to close the office and either send a man from this coast to deal with the specific cases, or else put them in the hands of the judge in admiralty. There is a Supreme Court judge there who has made a lifelong study of admiralty matters; he sits as admiralty judge when occasion demands, and he has the advantage of being able to judge evidence properly, which no man not of the legal profession has the ability to do; moreover, he would be absolutely independent. Take whichever position you like, whether you send a man from here or whether you put the cases in the hands of the admiralty court there, it is highly desirable that the man who sits in judgment on these cases, who sits alone and has to deal with matters very technical and difficult in their character, should not have affiliations of a business or social or personal character with the men on whom he sits in judgment or the interests involved in the cases which come before him. I think that is absolutely incontrovertible, and so far as the government's responsibility goes, I suggest that they look into that aspect of it.

I do not suggest that this wreck commissioner was corrupt, nor do I intend, having safeguarded myself, so to speak, by that statement, to go on and by hint or innuendo suggest that he was corrupt, because I do not think so; if I did I would say so. But I do suggest that this evidence shows that he was very careless or very incompetent, or both. My opinion is that he was both. The evidence shows—and I am prepared to give the book and page for every one of these statements, but I will not detain the House; I will simply make the statements—that almost from the beginning of the case he was prejudiced in favour of the decision which he ultimately gave. He was partial in the bringing out of the evidence; he did not give the evidence its proper value, and he did not obtain evidence that was very material; evidence that was most vital was practically omitted. I wish to state again that I do not know any of the parties to the dispute. The only person I know in connection with it was a constable who was only a minor witness. I know none of these men personally or by repute other than as recorded in the pages of the sworn evidence taken in the course of the investigation. I will give you a short history of the case and later on I will refer to the lack of material evidence, and I think it will be admitted that what I say in this respect is correct.

I will give you a short history of the first trip, and I will give it to you from the evidence of men who were there, disinterested men who made the trip in their capacities as engineer or fireman, men who were not interested in the company and who had nothing to gain by telling the truth or otherwise. I cannot give you the history of the second trip, except as to its initial stages, because everybody was lost. One of the principal

witnesses was a Mr. Wilson, and the commissioner himself comments on the fair and frank way he gave his evidence. Wilson was an engineer; he had a first class Board of Trade certificate from the Old Country, and those of us who are familiar with the Board of Trade regulations in the Old Country know that that means he was a thoroughly competent engineer. He had had thirty years' experience; which shows that he was a thoroughly experienced man. He got a position as engineer to make his first trip from Victoria to Barkley sound. He went down and took a glimpse at the boiler. He asked the captain if the boiler had been inspected, and was answered in the negative, whereupon he said, "I am not going to sea until that boiler is inspected." The captain said, "Well, now, do not make any trouble; we have our charter and we want to go out. The boat is all right; the engine is all right; let us go out." The engineer said, however, "I am not going until I have inspected this boiler," and when he put it like that, they said, "All right; go and look at the boiler." So he took the top off it, or proceeded by whatever method is followed in such cases, and he found that there were four tubes missing, and four plugged—it was a water tube boiler—and that seven more were leaking. They were leaking with a pressure of cold water on the Victoria water system, which means about 80 or 90 pounds pressure. Of course, you need a higher pressure than that to run an engine, but with that pressure he found seven tubes leaking as well as eight that were out of business. He also found that several of the pumps were in bad shape, valves missing and packing gone, and that there were no wrenches with which to fix the pumps; it is recorded here that he had to send up town to buy some wrenches for the purpose. Mind you, this was a boat going out on the open Pacific in mid-winter, yet they had not enough wrenches with which to fix the pumps, and if he had not insisted on this investigation before they started they would have gone out with the pumps not working and with no tools available to make the necessary adjustments or repairs. After they had fixed the boat up—and he tells us they spent three days tinkering on it; they had no machine shop available—as he himself said, "We decided to make the trip." They started out, I understand, about one-thirty in the afternoon, and they had not gone very far "when we found the bilges flooding, and the pumps were choked; so we put into Beachy bay," which is fourteen miles from Victoria. Now these pumps had been tinkered with before they started, and they had proceeded only fourteen miles when this trouble occurred. Fortunately, they found a place where they could put in—it is not generally the case on the west coast that such a place can conveniently or readily be found. They put in at Beachy bay and spent all night fixing up the pumps.

Apparently they were satisfied then, and they started out again the next morning. They had not gone very far, I suppose about forty miles further, when they found there was no water in the boiler, and as you know, you need water to make steam, and if you have no water you cannot go very far. They were liable to drift on the rocks around Pachena Point, and the engineer in his log says that he had to use salt water for keeping up steam, which has about the same effect as if you used salt water for oiling a car in order to get a mile or two more out of her and reach safety. "I am afraid the old kettle won't stand it," the engineer says in his log. They altered their course; instead of going to Kildonan they went to Bamfield, which was the nearest place where they could get water and a sheltered place. The salt water which the engineer had used did enable them to get to Bamfield. They got water there and started off to their destination, which was about ten miles distant. They got there under these conditions, and incidentally I may say they struck the wharf going in and damaged it. "Not enough power" was the reason given. When they raised steam again the engineer had to take the top off the boiler and cut six more tubes out on account of the damage done by the salt water, making ten short out of about fifty. This all took time and in the meantime the boat was being towed around by some local boat so that they could get their cargo of fish on board. After some days they started out with a load and the first thing that happened was that the boat was on fire. The owners at the investigation described it casually as "a little scorching" but the engineer said in his evidence that it was enough to break the glass in the pilot house. That is where you stand to steer; it is the only place where you can steer from, and if the fire was bad enough to break the glass in the pilot house it would not have needed to get a great deal worse before it would have been impossible for them to steer the boat at all. On that occasion it was due to the shifting of the baffle-plates—I do not want to be too technical, but I cannot but be technical just here. I gather from the evidence that these baffle-plates are put on top of the tubes to prevent the heat rushing out too violently into the

funnel, something like a damper on a stove. These baffle-plates had got loose and the funnel got so hot that it set fire to the woodwork of the pilot house in the vicinity. They got the fire put out and fixed up the baffle-plates as well as they could. They did not stop to do that, but did it as they went along.

Next they had such a big load on, not only in the interior but also on the deck, that they noticed the deck buckled a bit and the doors jammed. The owner of the boat denied that, but he was not there, and this man who was there says he saw the deck buckled. They went on again and presently they found there was no water in the boiler, and the engineer said in his evidence "I was scared to take a chance by putting more salt water in. I was afraid she would burst or scald someone." So the weather being fine—it was smooth water and a very fine day for the time of year—she drifted around in the straits from eight in the morning till two in the afternoon. Less than half of that time would have sufficed to send her ashore and wreck her if the weather had been at all stormy, but fortunately the weather was smooth. Then a United States cruiser came along and gave her water. Then she started out again between two and three and by four o'clock they were out of water again. They drifted around in the dark until nine o'clock when the C.P.R. steamer the Tees came along and offered her a tow. They hitched on to the bitts, which is an iron frame fastened to the decks and is generally used to fasten the rope to when the boat is moored alongside the wharf. They hitched on to one of the bitts and in ten minutes had pulled it out. Then they pulled out the other one, and as the engineer said "The wood looked to be pretty rotten where it came out." The Tees came back again for another trial and hitched on to the mast. That stood, and finally they reached Victoria with water on the engine room floor. They managed to get to Victoria, which was not their destination, but Vancouver. There they overhauled the pumps. Three had no packing, and then they discovered why they had no water. There was a leaking pipe between the water cistern and the boiler, so they put a new cistern on the deck and that enabled them to get to Vancouver, their destination. They then put her into a repair place for repairs, and they took up this pipe and found that it was a two-inch galvanized iron pipe, and in the language of the engineer "it was pretty well rotten." They had to move the floor to get at this pipe; otherwise it could not be seen. This boat was supposed to be in first-class shape when she left, but this pipe had neither been tested nor examined. The owner gave as a reason in his evidence that he thought some time it must have been frozen, and then of course that would make a leak, and rust would follow after that. But the boat was supposed to be in first class condition and you could not look at this pipe without tearing up a little bit of the deck. This boat went to sea in a condition which I think I can show ultimately resulted in its loss.

The engineer then recommended a new boiler or re-tubing the old one, but his recommendation was not accepted. Then he said, "I am not going back to sea in that boat unless she is re-tubed or a new boiler put in." He was getting good pay and times were bad, but he told one of the assessors at this examination that he would not be a bit surprised considering the condition of the boiler to hear that something had gone wrong in rough weather. He was pressed to say what he thought caused the loss, and he replied that it must either have shipped a sea into the engine room or else a tube burst in the boiler. The sea could only come into the engine room through the doors and shutters, and there were the usual doors to prevent that. So it is more logical to take his other reason as being the correct one, that the tubes had burst.

Mr. MARTELL: Were there no port holes in the engine room?

Mr. NEILL: Port holes?

Mr. MARTELL: My hon. friend said that a sea could only come in through the doors. My hon. friend knows that there are port holes in every engine room, and the sea could get in through them.

Mr. NEILL: The port holes are very small and are made of very thick glass, and there would not be much danger of a sea breaking them. We are dealing with probabilities, not theories.

Mr. MARTELL: That is a probability.

Mr. NEILL: When the engineer was pressed to say why he thought that a burst tube would be dangerous he gave this explanation. He said, "There were too many tubes out already. If there were any more it would overrun the margin of safety. A few more would be dangerous." He was further pressed and he gave this explanation: If a tube leaks from old age, so to speak, it is only a very small pin-hole leak. It leaks gradually and it will be days or weeks before it becomes dangerous, but on account of salt water being used

in the boiler, patches of it would crust small pieces the size, say, of a five-cent piece at certain corners and elbows, and that would prevent water getting at the tube, and then the piece would burn out and the tube would burst and the water in all the tubes would run into the fire box and put out the fire. It was more dangerous on account of having used the salt water. The engineer was pressed to say that things were not as bad as he had said. He was asked, "After these repairs, don't you think she was all right?" The engineer replied, "After the repairs I would not have gone myself," and he did not go. He quit his job rather than go. That completes the history of the first voyage. I might mention that in leaving that wharf she knocked down six more piles. The reason was that she had too much power. On her way to Victoria she went on fire again, but that is part of the second trip. It sounds like a jest, does it not, but it is the solemn truth as revealed by sworn evidence.

That is the history of the first trip of that boat on the strength of statements made by reliable witnesses, the engineer and his assistant, dependable men who had certificates which they were liable to lose if they made a false statement. This testimony is better, in my opinion, than the interested statements of the owners, who sat back in their offices in Victoria and Vancouver and "thought and believed and supposed" for that is the tenor of most of their evidence if you subject it to a close scrutiny. Whatever evidence they had to support them was either from employees or firms that they had business contracts with as I will explain later on. Now, the distance from Victoria to Kildonan is roughly 130 miles so we have this situation: Here is a boat in a first class condition—or supposed to be. After having been further overhauled by her engineer and his assistant. she does not get 14 miles before she has to lie up all night to make repairs on her pumps. The next day she had to use salt water; she struck a wharf; she was towed around while being repaired. She starts out with so heavy a deck load that the deck buckles. Then she went on fire enough to break the glass in the pilot house. She breaks down and drifts in the open strait. She starts off again and again breaks down and drifts for five hours in the dark. She is picked up again and the tow tears out both bitts because the wood is pretty rotten, and at last crawls into Victoria with water on the engine room floor. And this was all in a trip of 130 miles, less than 300 miles on the round trip and most of it in sheltered water. What would have happened, I wonder, if she had gone down as far as Seattle or San Francisco where she would have been exposed during the whole trip to the buffeting of the Pacific ocean? I would like to quote here the view the commissioner takes of the incidents that I have described without a word of exaggeration. Here is how he dismisses all that. Addressing one of the principal owners he says:

> There is no doubt you had completed one voyage and, apart from little accidents it was completed successfully. A. Yes, sir.

Apart from "little accidents," Mr. Chairman, it was completed successfully! If it was not such a dreadful tragedy it would be too comical. It reminds one of the Apostle Paul and the boasting he did in his elderly garrulity, that he had been so many times beaten and put in gaol, that he had been stoned, that he had been shipwrecked three times, and had been in the deep for a day and a half. That, however, was the record of a life time of adventure. This happened in a week only!

Now to go on to the next trip. Unfortunately it was lamentably short because the vessel and crew were lost very soon after they started out. They started out from Vancouver and, as I say, knocked out six piles of the wharf. Seemingly the vessel had too much power. She went on fire on her way to Victoria and her baffle plates again shifted. Now the journey from Victoria to Vancouver is in inside waters therefore the vessel did not encounter any heavy seas calculated to bring about a shaking which would have caused these baffle plates to shift. The plates were fixed in Victoria and the vessel started out at eight p.m., but returned again at two a.m.—"too hot." Finally a man was got from Vancouver to fix the baffle plates. Presumably they were fixed properly because we heard no more about it. The vessel loaded a cargo of box lumber and started off again in absolutely calm weather; the meteorological conditions show that. She was next seen off Pachena Point thirty hours after she had left Victoria. Now Pachena is about seventy miles from Victoria and the vessel was able to do six or seven knots an hour. So that in ordinary fair weather she should have made that distance in about eleven hours. Instead of that she occupied thirty hours. Where was she during the nineteen hours which intervened? We have no record to show that, no one can tell. She must have spent those nineteen hours somewhere between Victoria and Pachena Point. We have no way of knowing what happened. Did she go into Beach bay to fix up her baffle plates, or did more tubes burst and were

efforts made to carry out repairs? No one can tell. What we do know is that she delayed somewhere for nineteen hours before she was seen off Pachena Point. The vessel was next seen at 3.30 p.m., by the lighthouse keeper, passed Pachena Point and heading towards cape Beale which was 6 or 7 miles distant and had she rounded that point she would have been in sheltered water. If there was a very strong wind and a heavy sea running from the start of the trip one could understand what had happened. But the meteorological report shows that the wind during the time was only moderate. It was not until afterwards that what might be described as a strong gale sprang up. So that during the nineteen hours referred to the vessel could and should have reached a place of safety long before the wind increased in violence. Anyhow the centre of the gale was some 200 miles north so that she would not have experienced the worst end of it. When first sighted by the lighthouse keeper the vessel was going very slowly but was too close in; she was either steaming or drifting towards shore. Now, if either a steamship or a sailing boat is near the shore in a heavy wind the first precaution to be observed is to get off that shore. It is therefore reasonable to assume that if this vessel was capable of steaming she would have changed her course, she would have steamed away from that shore and reached a place of safety because there was a harbour of refuge only a few miles away. But as the lighthouse keeper says she kept steaming or drifting to the shore.

Now, I think here is one of the most significant facts as to what really caused the loss of this boat. She was watched closely by the lighthouse keeper, or his wife, and during all that time, between then and dark, they saw no sign of steaming; no sign of smoke coming out of the funnel. The vessel was only a mile and a half away. In British Columbia they use bituminous coal and what is called "run of the mine" for steamships. This contains a great deal of slack and I can certify myself that it makes a very strong, black smoke. You can easily see it for quite a distance; I am well within the mark when I say that it is readily discernible at a distance of ten miles. This vessel was only a mile and a half away. It was being watched by somebody whose attention was called to the danger the boat was in and he swears that he saw no sign of smoke coming out of the funnel. Had that boat been in a condition to steam the onlooker would certainly have seen smoke belching out of her funnel. Everybody on board having been lost it is impossible that we shall ever ascertain the facts; but I suggest it is probable that a tube burst in her boiler and the vessel drifted around while her crew were trying to get it fixed up. At any rate with this vessel not steaming within a mile and a half of the rocks and a strong wind blowing towards the shore we can know exactly what was going to happen. If that was not the cause what did happen? There is no other suggestion that is tenable. I may mention that the practice when a vessel becomes disabled at sea is to send up a flare or other signal of distress. The watcher in the lighthouse continued to observe the motions of the boat until after it became dark and observed the crew put up several flares. It shows that the vessel was not abandoned—although someone suggested that she had been—that there were men on board and that they were not able to leave.

Now we have had the evidence before the Commission of Inquiry of some of the government inspectors who I think, came out very well, in regard to their actions in connection with the matter. Inspector Stevens, of Vancouver, speaks as follows and this is a vital point. He was asked if, when this boat was repaired, he should not have been informed of the fact and he said "absolutely." The examination continues:

Q. They should have notified you.—A. Yes. The act says so. I think it is section 591 or 624 where it says that the owners, masters or engineers should report to the steamboat inspector.

Q. They did not comply with that law?—A. If there was any damage to the boiler they should have notified us.

Q. Supposing the ship had been repaired?—A. If she had been repaired, there must have been some damage.

Q. And they should have notified you?—A. Absolutely.

And then he quotes the section of the act. If that notification had been given and if the inspector had come down and glanced over the condition of that boiler, I am safe in saying that the boat would never have gone out till her tubes had been repaired, and the salt water conditions made right. He did not know of her condition and was not supposed to know. The boat had suffered damage and it was their duty to report. I have looked up the act and I know the provisions in regard to it, and I say it was the duty of the owners to give notice. It was not so much because of what had been done in the way of repairs, but it was the safeguard; the inspector would have gone down and examined the boiler and said "That boat must never leave port till it is properly repaired." That was the only safeguard the crew had, and it

is for that reason I hold the owners responsible. I think there were four owners and one of them said he was an engineer. Therefore, he should have known what the law was. He said all the necessary things were done. He said in his evidence that the boat had been inspected and overhauled, but it is a fact that this inspector was not notified of these repairs.

Then again Inspector Cullam of Victoria happened to be coming along the street and saw the boat preparing to go out without any lifeboat. He rang up the owners and said "You cannot go out without a lifeboat." The owner approached the captain and tried to excuse it, and said "Do not make a fuss about it, it will be all right next trip, we have a nice little boat; come down and look at it, it will be all right." But Mr. Cullam, with admirable determination said "It is not all right; you do not go out with that dinky little boat, you must get a proper lifeboat." So alert was he that he telephoned the collector of customs and said "Do not let that boat go out until you get a permit from me." He thought they would try to go out in spite of his instructions, but he adhered to his determination and they had to get a proper lifeboat on that occasion.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. NEILL: Earlier in my remarks, Mr. Chairman, I said that among the faults I found with the investigation which we are considering was the fact that, as I believe, material evidence had not been adduced that could have been procured. I want to deal with that matter for a moment. The man from whose evidence I have been principally quoting, Wilson, was on the first trip of the boat, but he did not go out on the second. There were also a number of other men who, warned by the experiences which I narrated this afternoon, decided as well to quit the boat. None of these men were called; but there was one man in particular who undoubtedly should have been called, and that was Brock. He was the captain on the first trip; in fact, he owned the boat, having bought it under option from the vendors. He had bought it from them and had endeavoured to sell shares in it to various friends of his, among whom was a practical engineer named Redding. Redding canned the idea promptly, having given one look at the engines; but Brock went on the first trip of the boat, and on his return, Mr. Redding, who gave evidence at the investigation, meeting him, congratulated him on having escaped with his life; and Brock replied: "Yes, I saw the rats leaving the ship in Victoria and thought it was time to quit." Now, that statement might be taken in its literal sense, that Brock actually saw rats leaving the ship; but I take it that what he really meant was that, in view of the condition of the ship and the engines, he thought it was time to leave it, and that was why he did not go on the second trip. But, Sir, I wanted to submit Redding's evidence for this reason: he was asked several questions about the man Brock, who did not appear to be on the horizon at all. Amongst other questions, this one was put to him by one of the assessors:

> My question is, can he—

That is, Redding.

> —say whether Brock is out for the time being while the investigation is on?

That is to say, in other words, was he hiding or keeping out of the way? The answer made by the witness was:

> It is a question I would sooner leave unanswered.

That answer, I think, would naturally suggest to any of us the idea that it was highly desirable to procure the evidence of a man of whom it was at least implied that he might be keeping out of the way until the investigation was over. And the commissioner himself said: "We ought to have Mr. Brock's evidence." But what means did he employ to get Brock? He asked Mr. Wright, one of the owners of the boat, to get him; and if there is any truth in the suggestion that Brock was keeping, or was being kept, out of the way on purpose, Wright was the very man who was interested in seeing that he did not come to court. The commissioner entrusted to him the duty, or rather the business—because it was not his duty—to procure Brock in order that he might give evidence possibly against his interests; and the consequence, which I think was not unnatural, was that Brock did not appear. Nothing appears in the evidence to show why he was not procured, but I am told by a man who was present that the question was brought up on the last day of the investigation. The question was asked where Brock was, or why he did not come to give evidence, and the reply was made that he was at Powell river and had no money to come in. I do not know what the mileage would be, but at any rate it would not cost more than five or six

dollars for boat fare from Powell river to Vancouver; and the assertion that Brook had no money to come down from Powell river, and that therefore on that account his evidence was not available, was not, in my opinion, by any means satisfactory. I submit that that fact alone betrays the very strongest, I will not say suspicion—yes, I will say that; "suspicion" is the right word—suspicion of the competency of the court as conducted. It is absolutely inexcusable that the man who was the captain of the boat on the previous trip, in regard to whom the suggestion was made that he was keeping out of the way on purpose, and who was ordered to be brought forward for examination, should fail to appear, solely for the trumpery reason that he had no money to pay his fare. It was not the business of those in charge of the investigation to be satisfied with that bald statement, for the money could have been easily procured to bring him into court; and failure to procure him is unjustifiable and inexcusable from any point of view that can be taken.

There is another point which I would submit to the committee. One of the witnesses swore in the presence of the owner of the boat, or at least one of the owners of the boat, that it was so heavily laden that it buckled with the weight. The owner of the boat denied that, but still the assertion was made. On her first trip from Barkley sound to Vancouver she had a cargo of fish in boxes, no doubt consigned to various people in Vancouver. It would have been easy to ascertain the weight of that cargo, the invoices would have shown the number of boxes and their weight, and from this data they would have had a good idea whether she was overloaded to the extent of buckling her deck. Then again, no attempt was made to follow up that line of inquiry. On her second trip she was loaded with what are called box shooks, that is, fish boxes knocked down, four feet long one foot wide and one inch deep. They were piled up on deck, and the evidence showed there had not been the slightest attempt made to fasten the deck load by any means whatever. Thus you had this boat going out into the heavy sea with a lot of loose lumber on her deck, and every wave that broke overboard would lift two or three of the top shooks and wash them overboard with any member of the crew who might be standing on them. It would have been easy to ascertain from the stevedoring company how she was loaded—whether this cargo was thrown on like a heap of firewood, or whether any attempt was made to secure the deck load from being washed overboard. Even a vessel going out with a deck load of heavy timbers has these properly secured so that they will not be affected by heavy seas. But there was no attempt made to find out how the Alaskan was loaded, whether she was properly loaded or whether she was overloaded—information which could have been easily ascertained from the stevedoring company who loaded her in Victoria.

There is another serious failure on the part of the wreck commissioners; they did not visit the scene of the wreck. Suppose this House burned down to-morrow, and we had two commissioners engaged from Toronto to make an investigation, what would we think of them if, instead of visiting Ottawa and inspecting the scene of the fire, they proceeded to Winnipeg and held their inquiry there? The reason given by the commissioner was that the scene of the wreck was remote and difficult to get at. In reply to this, I may say that there is a well-equipped Canadian Pacific passenger boat which goes three times a month within eleven miles of the spot, and from there to the wreck is a comparatively easy walk over a trail. It would have been a rough walk and in wet weather rather unpleasant, but a woman made the trip the day after the wreck, and there was nothing to prevent any able-bodied men visiting the scene of the wreck, where they would have learned a good deal of very great value in the investigation. I may say that the coroner's inquest which sat upon one of the men's bodies that drifted ashore had no difficulty whatever in visiting the place. If the commissioners had visited the wreck perhaps we would have found in the annex to their report a definite statement as to whether the wreck was that of the Alaskan or not. Doubt is expressed as to whether the wreckage found belonged to the Alaskan or not, but there were reasons for that expression of doubt, as I shall show. But had they visited the scene of the wreck it would have been impossible for them to express any such doubt. The evidence showed there had been no wreck for ten years within ten miles of either side of the wreck found there. We have the small shallow bay there practically covered with this shook lumber—the cargo of the Alaskan—drifting all around; we have a lifeboat found there with the name "Vancouver" and corresponding with the boat purchased by the owners for the Alaskan; we have a number of life belts washed ashore with the name of the Alaskan on them; we have the body of a man, identified as one of the crew, cast ashore

at this place. Yet this commission that sat one hundred and fifty miles away found it impossible to say whether or not that was the wreck of the Alaskan. There was also a piece of wreckage thirty feet long and, I think, ten or twelve feet across—I forget the exact measurement—and its condition was such that it was highly desirable not to connect it up with the Alaskan, which perhaps was the reason that this dubiety was expressed. A piece produced by one of the witnesses—a constable, totally disinterested, having no connection with any of the parties—was so rotten that he said he had kicked it off the main piece of the wreck. Those interested tried to make out that it was not part of the wrecked Alaskan, but I think there can be no doubt it was. The coroner's inquest at least had no trouble in finding that this was the wreck. Their verdict in part reads as follows:

That the wreckage of the ss. Alaskan, as examined by them, was very old and rotten.

They had no doubt, having seen the wreckage, whether it was part of the Alaskan or not, and had this commission, as they could easily have done, visited the place they would not have had any doubts either.

There is another matter. A chain was discovered at the wreck about thirty or forty feet long. An attempt was made by the owners of the boat to suggest that it was a piece of old chain that had been lying on the boat deck for casual purposes; but that suggestion was destroyed by the evidence of one of the witnesses who swore it was attached to this piece of wreckage thirty feet long by twelve feet wide found at the spot. Next an attempt was made to suggest that it was a stay chain used for staying the mast, but further investigation proved that a stay chain in that particular place for that particular purpose would not exceed six feet in length. But it was imperative to prove that this chain had nothing to do with the Alaskan, and they next brought somebody into court who swore positively that the chain was not on the boat. On cross-examination, however, it developed that he had not seen the boat for three years, so that weakened his assertion very much. Now, I have here a small piece of that chain, and I will send it over to the members of the government so they can see how worn and weak it is. One end is broken off altogether, and some of the links are about the thickness of a sheet of paper. The constable said that this short piece was a fair sample of the thirty or forty-foot length. Some of the evidence went to suggest that the chain was the steering gear of the boat; but that is not so. From other evidence it appears that this was the limber chain. I am not going into a technical explanation. I need only say that such a chain is used in keeping the openings clear for the water to reach the pump, and if the chain breaks the water is very liable to fill up in the bilges and flood the boat. Whatever purpose this chain was used for, it is a sample of what was considered sufficient for the equipment of that boat. There is a saying that you can judge the unknown by the known. Well, there is something we can look at, at any rate, and so get an idea of the rest of the equipment. There is no question whatever that that was part of the equipment of the Alaskan.

Now, I want to quote briefly a few remarks by the lawyer who represented the relatives of one of the drowned men, the captain of the boat. Here are some of his remarks:

Mr. MacTaggart: I think it is quite clear from the evidence that if there had been any survivors the owners would have been called upon to answer in another court. The evidence shows that.

Further on he says:

In my opinion this investigation should have taken place at Pachena—

That is where the wreck occurred.

—and it could have been ascertained in ten minutes how she broke up and possibly how she was wrecked. If you believe the evidence of the men from the west coast that the large piece they found was a part of the Alaskan and that a piece was kicked off it by their feet, it shows what the condition of this vessel was. Mr. Gordon tells you that there was no other wreckage there and that, therefore, this must have been a part of the wreck of the Alaskan. Unless it is thought that these men came here to perjure themselves, their evidence must be accepted. It is a matter for your consideration. I maintain that that (indicating) is a representative piece of the hull of the Alaskan and, if that is so, it is quite time that there was inspection of the hull for vessels of 150 tons or less.

I quite agree with his remarks in regard to that. I want to quote for a moment the annex to the report. There was a short report saying the wreck was due to a gale, and then the annex goes into more detail. In the annex the question appears:

Was this boat when she left Victoria in good seaworthy condition?

And the answer given is as follows:

From the evidence of reputable persons in the employ of her former owners, the Pacific Salvage Company Limited, of Victoria, of responsible employees of Messrs. Yarrows Limited, shipbuilders, etc., of Esquimalt, B.C., as also other witnesses, the vessel when she left Victoria, B.C. on the 1st January, 1923, was as regards her hull and equipment seaworthy, etc.

You will note the expression: "From the evidence of reputable persons." No doubt

they were reputable—I do not suggest these men meant to perjure themselves at all—but who were they? Every man jack of them was interested. They were either the owners of the vessel, or they were the late owners who were in a sense interested, because it was asserted that they had O.K.'d her staunchness to the new purchasers. And the other people, the Yarrows and so on, they were shipbuilders, people who had contracts for the repair of this and similar boats, and who hoped to get more contracts in the future. As I say, they did not go there to perjure themselves, but they certainly went there to give as favourable evidence as possible for the owners. There is keen competition among shipbuilders, and naturally they are not going to injure their clients if they can help it, that is, if they can put things in as favourable a light as possible consistent with truth. You can make truth look a good deal nicer if you want to than if you do not; there is no question about that. The head manager of this salvage company, the late owners, who was trying to do the best he could for his friends, admitted on cross-examination that in all the six or seven years that they had the boat they had never let her go outside—"outside" means into outside waters. They had kept her inside, in smooth waters; that was his experience of the best way to handle that boat. We must compare the evidence of these interested people with the evidence of this engineer, who had no axe to grind; with the evidence of government officials, who were equally trustworthy; and I think I am right in saying that the evidence of these disinterested parties should have been accepted or should at least have been given more weight than the evidence of those who were clearly interested, directly or indirectly.

Then, I refer again to their report, from where I was reading before. It says:

> They found that the whole equipment was seaworthy but manifestly was unsafe to venture on such a voyage in such conditions of weather as existed at the time of her loss.

Now, the dictionary meaning of "seaworthy" is "fit or safe to go to sea;" so it would appear that this boat was fit and safe to go to sea but manifestly was unsafe to go if it went outside the harbour. Well, if a boat is fit to go to sea one must assume that it will be fit to encounter a reasonable degree of weather; I think there is no question about that. But they go on record as saying that the boat was seaworthy but manifestly unsafe to go to sea—there is the plain English of it—unsafe to go away from the inside harbour.

I am well aware that the loss of ships at sea is due either to foundering as the result of a heavy gale—swamping, in fact—or to a breakdown which puts the ship at the mercy of the sea and causes it very soon to go to pieces. This boat did not founder at sea, because she was seen drifting on to the rocks; therefore she met with some mishap; she became disabled. That disablement could not have been connected with her sailing abilities, because she had none; it must therefore, have been connected with her steaming abilities. I suggest that the reason was that her engines became disabled through the fact that one of these tubes to which I have alluded burst and had put out the fire, and there was no more steam available.

Turning again to the report, we find it stated that the condition of the machinery was "very good"—and that in the face of the facts that I have mentioned—and that "the boiler, however, would probably have had to have considerable attention paid to it at her next annual inspection." In the face of all the facts I have laid before the House—that this man gave up a job worth $200 a month rather than risk his life on the boat again; that he warned them that the boiler ought to be retubed; that they had given orders to the marine repair shops to be ready for them on a future ocasion; that a man named McGrath heard the captain say to one of the owners that "she ought to have been fixed up before, but we had not enough money and she will have to run a trip or two more before we can afford to do it"—notwithstanding all these facts, which are in the evidence, you have it solemnly stated that the boat was "very good," but she would probably have to have some overhauling in the near future.

To sum up the situation, we find this little bunch of would-be quick millionaires buying this boat on a shoe-string at $6,000—and insuring her immediately for 50 per cent more; we find them buying this rotten old hull that had not been inspected by the government for thirty-six years. We have them making this trip with all the accidents that the commissioner refers to as "little accidents," but which, perhaps, have a greater significance in view of what took place on the next trip. We find them cautioned and advised by their engineer, who said he would not go to sea; that he would quit rather than take the risk on it again, and also that there was an utter disregard of the regulations, which provided that in a case of that kind they should report these repairs to the inspector of boilers. We find them trying to go out of Victoria harbour without a lifeboat, and when called to question we find them offering an excuse and saying they would put

one on on the next trip. We find that one of the principal owners was an engineer, who knew or should have known what the regulations were. But they went out without reporting these repairs; they tried to go out without a lifeboat—in other words, they took a gamble, not with their own money and their own lives, but with the lives of the crew; for that was the stake, that was the issue. Unfortunately the boat was lost; they lost their bet—and who paid for it? Not the men who should have paid, not the men who would have got the benefit if they had won their bet, not the men who would have reaped the profits, but the unfortunate crew. It was they who paid for it; and their widows and children—one of them left six small children—will be paying for it for ten years to come in a life of poverty and, no doubt, insufficient educational facilities. But the owners of the boat—they do not have to pay for it; they will get their $9,000 of insurance where they paid only $6,000 for the boat. They will get their insurance money, which, I think, would be well described as blood money, for that is practically what it comes to. And I note that the price of blood has increased of late years. Judas Iscariot got thirty pieces of silver for betraying innocent blood, but my friends here were going to get, over and above the cost of the boat, three thousand pieces of silver for betraying the lives of eleven men. I notice that Judas Iscariot at least became repentant and tried to undo what he had done by giving back his blood money, but I do not see any sign of that in this case. I do not hear any word of this $3,000 of profit, profit by mens' lives, being handed over to the widows and children. No; they will collect their money and look for another boat to finance on a shoe-string as before, no doubt.

I am not talking simply for the sake of informing the House; I have one or two definite suggestions to make. These men are liable to a heavy fine under the act—I need not quote it; section 591, I think it is—for not reporting these repairs. I maintain that had these repairs been reported the engineer would never in God's world have let that boat go out in the condition she was in. The trivial repairs they did make—the tinkering—had they been reported according to law, these men would have been alive to-day. I suggest to the government, therefore, that in the ordinary course of business they should have these men prosecuted, not in any spirit of revenge—that would be a poor solace to the widows and children—but merely to impress upon them and to impress upon other ship owners inclined to do the like that they must not evade these regulations; that the regulations, apparently trivial, are intended for the preservation of life; that they are very important, and that they must be adhered to. The only way you can impress that on some people is by making them pay out of their own pockets. I suggest it is thoroughly proper and fitting that these men, if they have transgressed in that regard should for the sake of example be prosecuted and fined to the limit of the law. Now these men have been sacrificed. I perhaps was wrong in comparing the shipowners to Judas Iscariot because after all, his action was wilful and these men were not guilty of deliberately sending these men to their deaths. If they had known, I suppose they would not have done it, but they were guilty of this: They were guilty of risking these men's lives for selfish greed. Put it on the highest plane it was careless, selfish greed. They were willing to take a risk with somebody else's life. These men are gone. I do not want to go into any heroics about that, because nothing would be more out of keeping, but it is our duty if we can, to so consider the matter that these men shall not have lost their lives in vain. It might be some consolation to their widows if they knew that the loss of their husbands had drawn the attention of the government to the importance of having boats under 150 tons in burden inspected, and the men who work on this class of boats protected. My suggestion is that the limit under which inspection should not be enforced should be reduced from 150 to say 75 or 50 tons. I want to be moderate in order to get the government to accept the situation. That would mean instead of a crew of eleven men, there would only be perhaps four or five endangering their lives in boats of this age and under these circumstances.

The Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe) when he was announcing in the House the other day the policy, and it was a very liberal policy I am glad to say, which he intended to inaugurate in connection with life-saving appliances on the west coast, when he came to this feature of reducing the inspection limit, hesitated and said that the matter was under the consideration of the government. It is for that reason I am bringing the matter up to-night so that the influence of these circumstances may induce the government to decide definitely that they will introduce legislation of that kind. It could be very easily done.

It may be said, and it has been said, that any legislation of that kind would produce a very vigorous and a very strenuous protest. Yes, I have no doubt of it, and who will the protest come from? The very people that you want to get at under such regulations. It will not be the Canadian Pacific and big companies like that which have a reputation as well as money to lose. They would not send boats out in that condition. They would have them inspected whether the government demanded it or not. It is the very fly-by-night men that will buy a rotter boat on a shoe string that will howl at any such legislation being suggested. But let them howl. They are the ones we want to get at.

It may be said that it will cost a lot of money. The cost will be comparatively trivial. Even boats of this kind have to be tied up every year for an inspection of their machinery. They have to be tied up in port for twenty-four hours at least, and while their machinery is being inspected very little extra cost would be entailed in having the hull inspected at the same time. Moreover, the government maintains an efficient force of men to do that work, and it would not require a great many more inspectors, I doubt if it would require any more, to inspect these extra boats. It could be done at the same time the boilers are being inspected.

I want to summarize the lessons which I think this disaster teaches us. It was only a small disaster. There were only eleven lives lost, and we who hardly pick up a paper in our comfortable homes in the winter time without seeing the report of some small boat lost with a dozen lives may think it is trivial. How many men in Quebec and Ontario heard about this wreck? We on the Pacific coast do not hear about the wrecks on the Atlantic coast. It is only eleven lives, but if you multiply that often enough you reach the proportions of a great disaster. A loss of two hundred lives shocks the whole world and makes people seek what they can do to prevent a recurrence of such a disaster. It is equally important that ever-recurring small disasters of this kind should be stopped. I would therefore suggest that the lessons to be learned from this disaster are these: First, that office should be inspected, reorganized or closed altogether along the lines I suggested earlier; these boat owners should be prosecuted for their infraction of the law, which ultimately if not directly, led to this loss, and the standard of these boats to be inspected should be lowered from 150 to 75 or 50 tons. That has all to do with that phase of this question.

I have now only a few remarks to make on general life-saving appliances. It should come more properly on an estimate a little further down, but it is so intermingled with this subject that I might be excused in finishing my remarks for touching upon it now. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries the other day in the House in announcing a liberal policy of improving life-saving appliances outlined the following. He was going to install wireless apparatus at the lighthouses so that they could communicate, without having to trust to a land line which is nearly always down, with a boat that he would have stationed at Bamfield. It would not be very costly because he could use the fishery protection boats in the winter time when they are not being used in the fishery service. He promised to have that boat always in touch with the lighthouses by wireless and always ready to go out—two very important things. Another equally important, was a rather costly thing but one that I think is well worth the money, and that was the installation of a wireless direction finding apparatus, or whatever you call it, at Pachena. That would be well worth the money. I might explain for the benefit of the House—it will have to be explained a little later on as this money will have to be voted, probably in a supplementary estimate—that Pachena is the point at which the big boats coming up the coast, like the Valencia which was lost with fearful loss of life a number of years ago—these ocean going boats come up and strike Vancouver Island about Pachena, and there they should take a sharp right angle to go up the straits to Victoria, but in winter time in foggy weather they have to run by dead reckoning: that is the chart says they should cover a certain distance in a certain time, but unfortunately there are currents around that coast intermittent in character so that a ship running by dead reckoning may be ten or twenty miles out. That is what happened in the case of the Valencia. She came up on dead reckoning and thought she was ten miles from where she actually was, and she struck Vancouver Island and broke up with heavy loss of life. That is the place where a direction-finding machine would be of the greatest possible service, because any boat could there by wireless pick up her exact position from the station. It is one of the best things that could possibly be done.

There is one other thing I wish to urge upon the government in this connection, and

that is that they should maintain and improve the trail along that coast. It was cut out many years ago and bridges put in, which are now rotten. The trail is practically useless now, but it would not take a great deal of money, in fact, nothing in proportion to the value to be derived, if the government would have the windfalls removed, the trees that fall across the trail, and repair the bridges. It would not be necessary to have great big bridges. A four-foot bridge big enough for a man and a horse to get over would be sufficient. The necessity for that can be shown by a petition I have from the west coast. It is signed by only fifty people, but that means every person living along that coast. They say:

> From our personal experiences of the wrecks the past winter and those of other years we know that a road along the coast is the sole certain means of getting a line aboard wrecked vessels at any part of the coast. A road means speed, and speed generally is an important factor with distressed ships, and decides whether life can be saved or, as at present, mariners have to take their chance.

The other improvements suggested by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries are in the direction of preventing boats going ashore. This deals with the case where a boat unhappily has gone ashore and life has to be rescued. If there is a station at Bamfield within ten or fifteen miles of any point, with a rocket apparatus they could easily throw a line aboard. There would not have been a soul lost off the Valencia if that apparatus had been available at that time, because a line could have been easily thrown aboard. That is why I urge on the government, perhaps this is in connection with the Public Works Department also, to cut this trail out. It is the trail along which the telegraph line runs. It is almost of no use at present because in a storm where you would have wrecks the trees also come down, putting the telegraph out of business.

It may be said that I am taking an ungracious attitude, that half a loaf is better than no bread. That is a proverb and proverbs contain some measure of truth. There is another proverb that the strength of a chain is only equal to its weakest link. Here we have a series of life saving appliances, and if you leave out one item in this series of appliances you are not only going to cut off help from that method of approach but you are endangering the whole business. Occasions will arise when, if one item in this series is lacking, the whole thing will be null and void. It is for that reason that I urge the recommendations upon the government. I am quite conscious of the liberality the government have shown in their promises up to date. If the provisions I ask for are made, sea-faring men from Alaska to San Francisco will give them credit for it.

I only want to go a little further in regard to these measures for life saving and ask for these two things: That the standard of inspection of these boats be altered so that boats of 50 tons be inspected and that these trails be kept up. That is all I have to say on the subject. I hope my appeal has not fallen on deaf ears. While, in a sense, it is my business as the representative of a district in which that particular spot is located to bring this matter to the attention of the House it is no more my business than it is that of any other hon. member. The farmers from the prairies may think they have nothing to do with this subject, but they are as much and as vitally concerned in it as we are on the coast. The men who represent cities like Toronto are also as much interested in it. I need not say that our hon. friends from the Maritime provinces are equally concerned. It is a matter of concern to all of us. It is not a subject of individual interest. There is nothing in it for me politically if these reforms are carried out. The men who sail along that coast, and their wives and families, are not constituents of mine, and this question is of just as much concern to other hon. members as it is to me. It is a matter of national importance and if properly carried out will prove a matter of national credit. But if there is any failure to carry out these reforms to their full extent then I am sure it will be a matter of national reproach in which we shall all have to share.

Mr. GRAHAM: The Minister of Marine and Fisheries is unavoidably absent to-night and I would therefore suggest that this item stand. All of us will then have an opportunity of reading what my hon. friend has said before the item is taken up again.

Item stands.

DEPARTMENT OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS

Railways and Canals—Canada Highways Commission: To provide for the organization and payment of staff of the Canada Highways Commission, including A. W. Campbell, C.E., Chief Commissioner of Highways, at $5,000 per annum, and W. R. Symthe, Commissioner of Highways, at $4,000 per annum, $70,000.

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals): When this item was up before it was threshed out pretty well, but the hon. member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton) and the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Boys) asked for certain information. I have statements here which give that information pretty fully.

Mr. BOYS: I remember asking the minister for some information and he was kind enough to let me have it in the form of a document. I would like, if possible, to get some of that information upon Hansard. One of the questions I asked was, as to the various kinds of road construction which were in use in the province of Ontario.

Mr. GRAHAM: You have the information now. I gave you the only copy I had. Put it on Hansard.

Mr. BOYS: I thought it was for my personal use.

Mr. GRAHAM: Put it on Hansard. I do not happen to have another copy.

Mr. BOYS: Perhaps the minister did not understand me. Earlier in the day I wrote a note asking if I could retain this statement for my personal use. I thought I could do so but I will be pleased to send it over to the minister. I did not understand it was the only copy he had.

Mr. GRAHAM: You can put it on Hansard and then retain it.

Mr. BOYS: Personally I would be very pleased indeed to do anything I could to save the minister the trouble of reading it. If the committee would consent to its being placed upon Hansard that would give us the information. The statement the minister gave me consists of three pages.

Mr. GRAHAM: I have no objection to that being done if the committee will consent. I may say, Mr. Chairman, this is some information asked for at the last sitting when this subject was under consideration. The Commissioner of Highways has prepared it and it is rather voluminous. I think it would save time if the committee would consent to allow it to go on Hansard.

The CHAIRMAN: Has the minister the unanimous consent of the committee to place on Hansard the statement admitted?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. BOYS: Another thing I would like to know is the cost of the various highways in the province of Ontario by counties, the statement being brought down to date. That information was given some time ago but it would be of greater value if it were brought down to date.

Mr. GRAHAM: I have statements here which constitute a veritable library on the subject. I think they will be found to contain all that information. The committee will have to remain pretty late if I commence to read it. Therefore, if it will not be regarded as an imposition I would ask to have these statements also put on Hansard.

Mr. BOYS: Do these statements give the cost of highways by counties up to date?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Each road?

Mr. GRAHAM: I think it contains almost everything imaginable, including even the cost by townships.

Mr. BOYS: That will be better still.

The CHAIRMAN: Has the minister the unanimous consent to place on Hansard this information also?

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

The statements referred to by the Minister are as follows:

CANADA HIGHWAYS COMMISSION

TYPES OF ROAD

May 22, 1923.

There are six general types of road being constructed under federal aid judged from a "surface" standpoint.

1st. CEMENT CONCRETE PAVEMENT.—Consists of a slab of Portland cement concrete from 6 inches to 8½ inches thick and having a crown of about 1 inch in ten feet. Transverse expansion joints one-half inch wide are placed every 50 feet. The only base necessary for this type of pavement is a wall consolidated subgrade. Average cost per mile for this pavement 20 feet wide is $35,300.

2nd. BITUMINOUS CONCRETE PAVEMENT.—Consists of an intimate mixture of crushed stone, sand and bitumen laid 2 to 3 inches thick on a prepared base of cement concrete, waterbound macadam or well consolidated gravel. The aggregate is mixed at a high temperature in a special mixer and distributed and rolled while hot. Average costs per mile for this pavement 20 feet wide and 3 inches thick are as follows:—

On 5-inch waterbound macadam base	$33,400
On 7-inch waterbound macadam base	38,300
On 4-inch cement concrete base	43,500
On 6-inch cement concrete base	52,900

TYPES OF ROAD—*Concluded*

3rd. BITUMINOUS MACADAM PENETRATION.—Consists of crushed stone spread on the road to a depth of 3 or 4 inches, lightly rolled then sprayed with hot bituminous binder, which flows into and penetrates the layer of stone. The whole surface is then sprinkled with small stone and consolidated by rolling, so that the binder fills the interstices between the stones. This pavement is usually laid on a waterbound macadam base. Average costs for 20 feet wide and 4 inches thick are as follows:—

On 5-inch waterbound macadam base	$22,000
On 7-inch waterbound macadam base	26,900
On 8-inch waterbound macadam base	28,200

4th. WATERBOUND MACADAM.—Consists of crushed stone spread on the roadway, filled with crusher screenings and consolidated by watering and rolling. It is usually laid in two courses (except when used as a base for hard top) and varies in total depth from 7 inches to 10 inches according to traffic requirements and condition of subgrade. This type of roadway is frequently finished with a top dressing of road oil and sand or oil and limestone chips, which preserves the surface, prevents ravelling and keeps down dust Average costs per mile are as follows,—

20 ft. x 7″	$14,800
20 ft. x 8″	16,100
20 ft. x 9″	17,400

Oil treatment costs from $800 to $1,300 per mile in addition.

5th. GRAVEL ROADWAY.—Consists of a layer of gravel spread over the roadbed and consolidated by traffic or by rolling. It varies in thickness from 6 to 18 inches, depending on the character of the subgrade and the density of traffic. If the required thickness of gravel is greater than 6 inches it is usually laid in layers of 3 or 4 inches, each layer being consolidated before the next is applied.

The average cost of laying a gravel surface 20 ft. wide and 8 inches thick, based on a 2½ mile haul, is $4,700 per mile.

6th. IMPROVED EARTH.—This type of highway is formed by digging side ditches, throwing the material (such as it is) excavated therefrom onto the travelled way and grading it to a proper crown to shed water. Properly speaking the operation is one of grading and not of surfacing and usually provides a road which is good only in dry weather. If the material excavated from the side ditches happens to be gravel the road is a gravel road.

The cost varies with the size of ditch necessary to provide drainage and the range is from $1,000 to $4,000 per mile.

The above descriptions and costs apply only to the surfacing of roads. The construction of a highway involves other important and often costly operations, which may be described briefly as follows:—

1st. CLEARING.—In constructing a new road through wooded country the first operation is that of cutting down and disposing of the trees and underbrush to the limits of the right of way and grubbing out roots where shallow cuts and fills are to be made.

Clearing costs from $200 to $4,000 per mile, depending on the size and density of the timber.

2nd. GRADING.—This operation consists of forming the roadbed, which is to carry the finished surface. It involves the excavation of cuts and the filling of embankments, the protection of earth work from the action of rivers or lakes, the underdraining of wet places and the digging of ditches. The cost varies with the nature of the country, the nature of the material encountered, the allowable grade and the width of the roadbed to be constructed. The range is from $500 to $30,000 per mile.

3rd. BRIDGES.—This item covers the construction of all structures over 20 feet in clear span. The cost of such bridges may be anything from $500 to $500,000. Federal aid does not apply to such costs.

4th. CULVERTS.—The construction of all structures having a clear span of 20 feet or less, also pipes to carry streams across the roadway and under side entrance roads. Costs vary with the nature of the country, the number and size of streams and the type of culvert adopted. The range is from $500 to $10,000 per mile.

5th. FENCING.—Enclosing the right of way where necessary by fencing costs from $500 to $1,500 per mile.

6th. TREE PLANTING.—The growing shade of trees along the edge of the right of way protects the surface of the road from the extreme heat of the sun's rays in summer. This costs about $250 per mile.

7th. MISCELLANEOUS.—The erection of crossing, danger and direction signs, guard rails, snow fences, etc Such items cost from nothing to $200 per mile.

COST PER MILE

The average cost per mile of the Ottawa-Prescott Highway to date is $24,196.

The average costs per mile of the roads constructed in Wentworth County are,—

Proj.	Township	Sect.	Length	Total cost	Per Mile
Hamilton, Queenston Road	Barton	1	4·13	$ 298,516 00	$ 72,280
	Saltfleet	2			
8	Saltfleet	1	5·17	103,630 00	20,000
Hamilton-Brantford 9	Barton	01	11·55	586,324 00	50,800
	Ancaster	1			
Hamilton-Jarvis 17	Barton	1	3·13	98,127 94	31,400
	Glanford	H1	0·80	30,423 61	38,100
Hamilton-Chatsworth 18	E. & W. Flamboro.	Q1	3·07	116,831 01	38,100
Hamilton-Kitchener 12	W Flamboro	B1	2·80	151,502 95	54.000
	Beverly	D1	1·93	82,426 99	42,600
Dundas-Street 25	E. Flamboro	5	3·90	137,641 94	35,300
			36·48	$ 1,605,424 44	44,008

Average cost for the County, $44,008 per mile

The average costs per mile between Toronto and Barrie are,—

Township	Mileage	Cost	Per Mile
York	4·4	$ 110,889	$ 25,202
Markham-Vaughan	8·2	41,052	5,006
Whitchurch-King	9·4	35,447	3,771
East Gwillimbury	5·0	231,012	46,202
West Gwillimbury	6·6	136,222	20,639
Barrie & Oro	1·2	2,625	2,187
Oro & Vespra	1·6	9·153	5,720
Oro	10·0	103,777	10,378
Orillia	9·0	157,786	17·532
	55·4		

The most expensive bit of highway in the Province of Ontario, of which we have a record is between Hamilton and Binkleys Corners, a distance of 9,100 feet, paved 30 feet wide, with warrenite bitulithic concrete. This work cost $129,907.70.

PROVINCE OF ONTARIO

STATEMENT OF ROADS BEING BUILT UNDER THE CANADA HIGHWAYS ACT

Name of Road	Mileage	Expenditure to Dec. 31, 1922	Expenditure per mile	Type of Construction
		$ cts.	$ cts.	
York Co.-Whitby—				
Subsection A1—Pickering Twp....	3·54	233,200 00	65,875 70	*Asphaltic Concrete 20′
Whitby-Belleville.....	75·90	820,655 43	10,812 32	W.B. Macadam 30′x20′x10″ Gravel 30′x20′x9″
Belleville-Kingston.....	46·35	982,549 93	21,198 48	*Oiled Macadam 30′x20′ Gravel and Oiled Macadam 30′x20′x9″
Kingston-Brockville.....	45·23	1,311,904 55	29,005 18	Macadam 30′x20′x10″
Brockville-Prescott.....	11·2	168,161 73	15,014 44	*Macadam surface treated with tar 20′ *Gravel 30′x20′
Ottawa-Prescott.....	58·3	1,420,312 87	24,362 14	*W.B. Macadam with bituminous surface 20′ *Gravel with bituminous surface 20′x9″ *Asphaltic concrete 20′ *Cement concrete 20′
Hamilton-Queenston.....	36·33	940,516 41	25,888 15	W.B. Macadam 30′x20′x10″ *Bit. Macadam 30′x20′
Hamilton-Brantford.....	19·18	768,000 00	40,041 71	*Bitulithic 30′x30′ W.B. Macadam 30′x20′x10″ *Cement concrete 30′x30′
Brantford-Woodstock.....	24·35	395,407 28	16,238 50	Gravel 30′x20′x9″ Macadam 30′x20′x10″
Woodstock-Ingersoll.....	7·16	72,876 02	10,178 00	Gravel Macadam 30′x20′x9″ with bit. surfacing 20′
Ingersoll-London.....	15·57	207,025 90	13,296 46	*Gravel with bit. surface 20′x9 *Asphaltic Gravel 20′x9″
Windsor-St. Thomas—				
Section S—Aldborough Township	10·77	123,271 69	11,445 84	Gravel 30′x20′x9″
Subsec. B1—Twp. of Sandwich W.	2·0	68,428 89	34,214 44	*Cement Concrete 18′
Section C—Twp. Sandwich W. and So.....	6·7			" "
Subsec. D1—Sandwich South Twp		232,263 92	34,666 26	* " "
London-St. Thomas—				
Section A—London City and Westminster Township.....	5·8	269,755 35	24,748 19	*Cement Concrete 20′
Subsec. B1—Twp. of Westminster	5·1			
Subsec. B2—Twp. of Westminster	5·2	184,210 24	35,425 04	* " "
Subsec. C1—Twp. of Southwold..	3·9	149,525 66	38,339 91	* " "
Lambeth-Maidstone—				
Subsec. K1—From Chatham City to Centre of Lot 7.....	2·0	84,092 62	42,046 31	*Cement Concrete 18′
Subsec. A1—Twp. of Westminster	0·19	7,218 05	37,989 74	*Cement Concrete 20′
Subsec. M1—Twp. of Raleigh.....	2·70	89,152 05	33,019 28	*Cement Concrete 18′
St. Thomas-Niagara—				
Subsec. U1—North Cayuga Twp.	7·25	209,705 29	28,924 87	W.B. Macadam 30′x20′x10″
Section V—Canboro Twp.....	8·8	270,749 57	30,767 00	W.B. Macadam 30′x20′x10″
Subsec. BB1—Westerly side Stamford Twp. to Welland Canal.....	2·0	36,575 71	18,287 85	W.B. Macadam 30′x20′x10″
Subsec. CC—From westerly city lts. City of Niagara westerly to west side Stamford Twp.....	4·11	50,763 26	12,351 16	W.B. Macadam 30′x20′x10″
Subsec. Y1—From Crowland/Wainfleet Line westerly to road between Lots 19 and 20 Wainfleet Township.....	5·36	94,453 89	17,622 00	W.B. Macadam 30′x20′x10″
Section Z—Westerly limit City of Welland westerly to the Crowland/Wainfleet Line.....	1·74	9,057 67	5,205 56	W.B. Macadam 30′x20′x10″
Jarvis-Hamilton—				
Section H—Glanford Township—from (Subsec. 1) Cons. 1-2 northerly to north boundary.....	0·8	30,423 61	38,029 48	W.B. Macadam 30′x20′x10″
Section I—Barton Township.....	3·13	98,127 94	31,350 78	W.B. Macadam 30′x20′x10″

*The standard width of grade in the Province of Ontario is 30′. The depth of bituminous macadam 4″ on 6″ macadam base; the depth of waterbound macadam 4″ surface on 6″ base; the depth of gravel is 9″; the depth of cement concrete is 6″ to 8½″; and the depth of asphaltic concrete is 3 to 4″ on 6″ macadam base.

PROVINCE OF ONTARIO—*Continued*

STATEMENT OF ROADS BEING BUILT UNDER THE CANADA HIGHWAYS ACT—*Continued*

Name of Road	Mileage	Expenditure to Dec. 31, 1922	Expenditure per mile	Type of Construction
		$ cts.	$ cts.	
Clappison's Corner-Chatsworth—				
Subsec. L1—From City of Guelph	1·0	61,894 58	61,894 58	*Cement Concrete 30'x20'
Subsec. N1—From N. Boundary south of Lot line 6 and 7, Con. 8, Twp. of Puslinch	1·5	67,921 99	45,281 33	*Cement Concrete 30'x20'
Subsec. N2—Puslinch Township	1·0	50,871 37	50,871 37	*Cement Concrete 30'x20'
Subsec. Q1—Township of Flamboro	3·10	116,831 01	37,687 42	*Bit. Macadam 30'x20'
Elginfield-Sarnia—				
Subsec. B1—Easterly from City of Sarnia, Twp. of Sarnia	2·4	89,556 25	37,315 10	*Cement Concrete 20'
Hamilton-Kitchener—				
Subsec. B1—West Flamboro—top of escarpment westerly to west side of Township	2·8	151,502 95	54,108 20	*Asph. Concrete 30'x20'
Subsec. D1—Beverly Twp.—across Lots 31-36	1·93	82,426 99	42,708 29	*Asph. Concrete 30'x20'
Subsec. F1—From westerly lts Galt City westerly to west side N. Dumfries Twp	1·05	31,558 04	56,510 07	*Asph. Concrete 30'x20'
Section H—Adjoining F1 extending westerly to easterly lts. Town of Preston		27,777 53		*Asph. Concrete 30'x20'
London-Goderich	34·62	207,193 79	5,984 80	Gravel 30'x20'x9"
Stratford-Goderich—				
Section B—Downie and Ellice Twp. From Stratford westerly to Lot Line 15 and 16 Ellice Twp	2·6	139,487 14	53,648 90	*Asph. Concrete 30'x20'
Subsec. C1—From Lot Line 15 and 16 Ellice Twp. westerly to Lot Line 20 and 21 Ellice Twp	1·26	75,706 65	60,084 64	*Asph. Concrete 30'x20'
Toronto-Hamilton (Dundas Street)	30·57	1,009,324 19	33,016 82	*Bituminous Macadam 30' x 20'. Asphaltic Concrete on Cement Concrete—20'*
Toronto-Bradford	27·03	418,100 00	15,468 00	Bit. Macadam 30' x 20'
Bradford-Severn—				
Section B—Twp of Gwillimbury West	6·6	136,222 46	20,639 76	Macadam 30' x 20' x 10"
Section E—Barrie Town easterly	1·2	2,624 87	21,187 39	Gravel 30' x 20' x 9"
Section F—From Section E to Ora Bdy	1·6	9,153 30	5,720 81	Gravel 30' x 20' x 9"
Subsec. G1—From Vespra/Ora line easterly to Con. 4 and 5	3·6	45,071 08	12,519 74	Gravel 30' x 20' x 9"
Subsec. G2—From Con. 9 and 10 east to east Bdy. Ora Twp	6·4	58,706 12	9,172 83	Gravel 30' x 20' x 9"
Subsec. I1—From W. Bdy. Orillia Twp. northerly to Orillia Twp	4·2	61,390 82	14,616 86	Gravel 30' x 20' x 9"
Subsec. I2—Orillia Town northerly to Con. 8 and 9, Orillia North	4·8	96,396 37	20,082 57	Macadam 30' x 20' x 10"
Port Hope-Peterboro—				
Section J—Twp. of North Monoghan	5·57	108,475 55	19,199 21	*Oiled Macadam 30' x 20'
Section K—Twp. of North Monoghan—Peterboro	0·08			*Oiled Macadam 30' x 20'
Ottawa-Point Fortune	69·19	983,349 93	14,212 31	*Asph. Concrete 30' x 20' *Bit. Macadam 30' x 20' *Gravel 30' x 20' x 9"
St. David's-Niagara Falls	4·26	192,901 73	45,282 09	*Bit. Macadam 30' x 20' *Cement Concrete 30' x 20'
Port Credit-Cooksville	2·45	47,544 07	19,405 75	W.B. Macadam 30' x 20' x 10"
Belleville-Foxboro—				
Subsec. A1—Belleville northerly	2·0	46,102 73	23,051 36	W.B. Macadam 30' x 20' x 10"

*The standard width of grade in the Province of Ontario is 30'. The depth of bituminous macadam 4" on 6" base; the depth of waterbound macadam 4" surface on 6" base; the depth of gravel is 9"; the depth of cement concrete is 6" to 8½"; and the depth of asphaltic concrete is 3 to 4" on 6" macadam base.

[Mr. Graham.]

HAMILTON-BRANTFORD HIGHWAY—PROJECT NO. 9, ONTARIO—

Length—	
Sections—No. 1, Township of Ancaster	11·4 miles
2, Township of Brantford	7·78 "
Total length	19·18 "

CHARACTER OF CONSTRUCTION IN FIRST PROJECT STATEMENT—

Waterbound macadam, base throughout, cement concrete pavement for distance of 2·8 miles east from Brantford. and bithulithic pavement westerly from Hamilton, 1·7 mile.

COST OF WORK UNDER AGREEMENT APPROVED BY ENGINEER, $768,000.00, OR $40,041.71 PER MILE.
FEDERAL AID TO END OF 1921, $238,492.00, BALANCE DUE, $68,708.

DESCRIPTION OF THE WORK DONE UNDER AGREEMENT—

This project is built to the standard widths of 30-foot grade and 20-foot pavement, except the portion of the road westerly from Hamilton 1·7 mile, being the junction to the Hamilton-Kitchener road where the pavement was constructed at a width of thirty feet, and except 2·8 miles east from Brantford where the pavement was constructed to a width of 30 feet. However, in this case, all work over and above the standard 20-foot width was paid for jointly by the City of Brantford and the County of Brant.

SUPPLEMENTARY SURFACING PROJECT (Not under agreement)—

CHARACTER OF SURFACINGS—

Asphaltic concrete on macadam base, easterly part, 9·7 miles, and cement concrete pavement, westerly part, 4·98 miles.

The whole of the road is now completed, the surfacing being asphaltic concrete on macadam base from Hamilton westerly to the boundary between Ancaster and Brantford Townships, 11·4 miles; cement concrete from Ancaster-Brantford Township boundary to the City of Brantford, 7·78 miles.

The estimate of the cost not under agreement as given by the Provinces in its supplementary application for agreement is $723,701.41; this added to the cost of the work under agreement gives a total of $1,382,608.46, or $72,085.94 per mile.

Owing to the fact that this pavement must sustain a traffic equivalent to that found on the principal streets of a modern city, as it is located between two leading industrial cities, it was thought advisable to build the highway in the most substantial manner. The highway is located in undulating territory and, in order to reduce its grades to five per cent, it was necessary to do a great deal of heavy grading, especially over what is known as the Ancaster Mountain. This work is necessarily costly. Then a subway was required under the Toronto-Hamilton-Brantford railway at Station 91 to Station 105.

MEMORANDUM RE:—

HAMILTON TO QUEENSTON ROAD

Length—36·33 miles.

CHARACTER OF CONSTRUCTION IN APPROVED PROJECT STATEMENT:—

Width of grade—30′ throughout.
Cement concrete pavement 20′ wide, 8½″ thick in centre and 6″ at side, from Hamilton easterly 4·13 miles.
Bituminous macadam—20′ wide, 10″ thick 2 miles, Clinton Township.
Waterbound macadam on balance of road.

COST OF WORK UNDER AGREEMENT APPROVED BY ENGINEER:—

$940,516.41=$25,888.15 per mile.

FEDERAL AID EARNED:—

$376,206.56, being 40% of approved cost.

FEDERAL AID PAID: (On account)

$271,298.56,

CHARACTER OF SURFACING LAID UNDER SUPPLEMENTARY PROJECT FOR WHICH THERE IS NO AGREEMENT UNDER THE CANADA HIGHWAYS ACT:—

Bituminous macadam Township of Niagara	3 miles
Bituminous macadam Township of Grantham	2·5 "
Bituminous macadam Township of Louth	5·4 "
Bituminous macadam Township of Clinton	4·1 "
Bituminous macadam Township of North Grimsby	4·3 "
Bituminous macadam Township of Saltfleet	1·1 "
Asphaltic concrete Township of North Grimsby	1·3 "
Asphaltic concrete Township of Saltfleet	5·0 "
Cement concrete Township of Grantham (between City of St. Catharines and new Welland Canal)	1·25 "
Oiled macadam Township of Niagara	2·8 miles

COST OF ADDITIONAL SURFACING UNDER SUPPLEMENTARY PROJECT STATEMENT—(NOT UNDER AGREEMENT)

$909,535.22

COMBINED COST OF WORK UNDER ORIGINAL AND SUPPLEMENTARY PROJECTS:—

$1,850,051.63, or an average cost of $50,923.75 per mile.

PROVINCE OF QUEBEC

STATEMENT OF CONDITION OF FEDERAL AID WORK TO DECEMBER 31, 1922

Project No.	Section	Sub-section	Length	Surface		Location of Section or Subsection	Cost Approximately	Per Mile
				Kind	Width			
			Miles		Ft.		$ cts.	$
1-A	M	1	3·305	Gravel	22	St. Cesaire	71,100 00	21,513
	Q	1	1·253	W. B. M. Tar. B.	16	Rouville	14,000 00	11,173
	A	2	3·09	Gravel	22	Orford Township	48,200 00	15,599
	C	1	2·59	Gravel	22	Magog Township	35,400 00	13,668
	D	1	0·82	Gravel	22	Magog Town	2,200 00	2,683
	E	1	2·07	Gravel	22	Bolton East Twp.	41,000 00	19,807
	E	2	2·48	Gravel	22	Bolton East Twp.	41,300 00	16,653
	H	1	2·31	Gravel	22	Shefford Twp.	35,700 00	14,455
	G	.....	4·511	Gravel	22	S. Stukelye Twp.	82,500 00	18,289
	Q	3	1·765	Conc.	15	St. Marie de Monnoir	43,300 00	24,533
	S	.....	1·743	Conc.	15	N.D. de Bonsecours	42,500 00	24,383
	U	.....	1·01	As. Concrete	16	Chambly Canton V.	18,700 00	18,515
	V	.....	1·83	As. Concrete	16	Chambly Bassin V.	39,200 00	21,421
	W	.....	2·06	As. Concrete	16	St. Jos. Chambly	49,000 00	23,786
	X	.....	5·47	As. Concrete	16	St. Hubert Par.	120,700 00	22.066
	Y	.....	3·24	As. Concrete	16	St. Ant. Longueuil	66,700 00	20.586
	A	1	2·659	Gravel	22	Orford Twp.	25,200 00	9,477
	A	3	4·473	Gravel	22	Rock Forest	54,400 00	12,162
	B	.....	1·202	Gravel	22	Petit L. Magog Vil.	16,600 00	13,810
	C	2	3·50	Gravel	22	Magog Twp.	39,500 00	11,285
	F	.....	4·25	Gravel	22	Eastman Village	65,400 00	15,388
	H	2	7·584	Gravel	22	Shefford Twp.	88,600 00	11,682
	I	.....	0,452	Gravel	22	Waterloo Town	7,200 00	15,929
	M	2	0·797	Gravel	22	St. Cesaire Par.	11,700 00	14,680
	N	.....	1·12	Conc.	22	St. Cesaire Vill.	27,300 00	24,375
	P	.....	1·00	Conc.	15	Rougemont Village	27,700 00	27,700
3	D	3	1·148	Con. & Bt. Mac.	16	St. Romuald	37,400 00	32,578
	B	1 & 2	1·951	Concrete	16	St. David	35,900 00	18,401
	C	1 & 2	0·893	Concrete	16	St. Telesphore	11,000 00	12,318
	L	1 & 3	3·59	Concrete	14	St. J. Deschaillons	149,700 00	41,699
	WW	.....	2·813	Con. & Bt. Mac.	16	Longueuil Parish	99,400 00	35,336
	TT	1	1·032	Concrete	16	Boucherville	66,000 00	63,953
	TT	2	0·611	Bit. Mac.	16	Boucherville	16,400 00	26,841
	TT	3	1·041	Bit. Mac.	16	Boucherville	27,800 00	26,705
	I	.....	1·78	Bit. Macadam	16	Lotbiniere Vill.	60,500 00	33,989
	FF	.....	1·861	Gravel	22	St. Pierre de Soreil	24,200 00	13,004
	NN	.....	10·204	Gravel	22	Contrecoeur	195,000 00	19,110
	HH	.....	2·755	Gravel	22	Ste. Victoire	37,500 00	13,612
	II	.....	3·250	Gravel	22	St. Ours	45,300 00	13,938
	KK	.....	2·043	Gravel	22	St. Roch	27,400 00	13,412
	DD	Part	0·81	Gravel	22	Yamaska Village	11,200 00	13,827
	II	Part	1·00	Gravel	22	St. Ours Parish	18,600 00	18,600
	KK	Part	0·26	Gravel	22	St. Roch Parish	6,100 00	23,462
	QQ	Part	1·08	Bit. Mac.	14	Varennes Vill.	9,000 00	8,334
	JJ	Part	0·40	Gravel	22	St. Ours Town	6,200 00	15,500
	R	Part	0·41	Concrete	16	Laval Village	9,900 00	24,146
	U	Part	0·13	Concrete	16	Nicolet Town	4,800 00	36,923
4	A	.....	3·5	Bit. Mac.	16	Caughnawaga Reserve	131,600 00	37,600
	D	1	2·317	Bit. Mac.	16	Ste. Martine	88,000 00	20,623
	J	.....	0·531	W. B. Mac & oil.	16	Huntingdon Vill.	2,700 00	5,085
5	A	2	1·20	Gravel	22	L'Enfant Jesus	53,890 00	44,908
	B	1	1·138	Gravel	22	St. Frederic	48,600 00	11,390
	B	2	3·129	Gravel	22	St. Frederic		
	C	2	2·65	Gravel	22	S. C. de Jesus	6,100 00	2,302
	C	3	1·121	Gravel	22	S. C. de Jesus	11,200 00	9,991
	E	1 & 3	1·051	Gravel	22	S. C. de Marie	13,000 00	12,369
	E	2 & 4	3·39	Gravel	24	S. C. de Marie	12,200 00	3,599
	J	.....	2·40	Gravel	24	Black Lake Town	16,000 00	6,667
	JA	.....	0·60	Gravel	24	Ireland Township	10,000 00	16,667
	K	.....	5·77	Gravel	20	St. Jos. Coleraine	31,900 00	5,529
	L	1 & 3	0·722	Gravel	22	D'Israeli	15,400 00	21,330
	N	2-5 & 7	2·589	Gravel	22	Garthby	14,900 00	5,755
	P	1-2-4 6-8	2·348	Gravel	22	Weedon	22,900 00	9,755
	P	3-5 & 7	2·39	Gravel	24	Weedon	8,500 00	3,556
	Q	1-3-5-7	2·93	Gravel	24	Lac Weedon Vill.	6,600 00	2,253
	Q	2-4-6	2,386	Gravel	22	Lac Weedon Vill.	15,000 00	6,287
	R	1 & 3	0·945	Gravel	22	Weedon Centre	10,400 00	11,005
	R	2	0·29	Gravel	24	Weedon Centre	600 00	2,069
	T	2-3-4	6·704	Gravel	22	Dudswell	19,400 00	2,894
	V		0·32	Gravel	24	Westbury Township	8,600 00	26,875
6	B	.....	0·257	Concrete	21, 26	Bienville	16,800 00	65,370
7	I	.....	4·98	Gravel	24	Winslow North	53,600 00	10,763
	L	.....	7·60	Gravel	24	Bury Township	87,200 00	11,474
	N	1	3·56	Gravel	24	Eaton Township	70,200 00	6,654
	N	1	3·56	Gravel	24	Eaton Township		
	O	.....	3·10	Gravel	22	Ascot Township	49,700 00	16,032
	C	.....	0·39	Gravel	22	St. Victor de Tring	11,600 00	29,744

PROVINCE OF QUEBEC—*Continued*

STATEMENT OF CONDITION OF FEDERAL AID WORK TO DECEMBER 31, 1922—*Continued*

Project No.	Section	Sub-section	Length	Surface		Location of Section or Subsection	Cost Approximately	Per Mile
				Kind	Width			
			Miles		Ft.		$ cts.	$
8	A		0·25	B. W. M. & Oil	14			
			1·18	W. B. M. & Oil	16	Abord A. Plouffe	16,100 00	11,259
	B		2·89	W. B. M. & Oil	16	St. Martin Parish	27,200 00	9,411
	F	Pt.	2·56	W. B. Macadam	12	St. Eustache Parish	16,900 00	6,602
	H	Pt.	2·66	Gravel	20, 22	St. Scholastique	60,300 00	22,669
	J	Pt.	2·76	Gravel	18			
			1·48	W.B. Macadam & Oil	14	St. Jerusalem	40,700 00	9,599
	N	Pt.	1·18	Gravel	22	Calumet Village	11,000 00	9,322
	P		2·50	Gravel	22	N. D. du Bonsecours	28,400 00	11,360
	Q	Pt.	0·92	Gravel	18	Montebello Vill	3,900 00	4,239
	R	Pt.	0·43	Gravel	20, 24	Papineauville Vil	6,800 00	15,814
	T	Pt.	2·28	Gravel	22	Coeur Très pur de la B. Vierge Marie de P	28,700 00	12,588
	Y	Pt.	0·22	Gravel	20	Masson Village	2,100 00	9,545
	H	Pt.	1·06	W. B. Macadam & Oil	16	St. Scholastique P	22,500 00	18,293
			0·17	Gravel	20			
	I	Pt.	0·17	Gravel	20	St. Hermas Par	2,400 00	14,118
	J	Pt.	2·32	Gravel	20	St. Jerusalem Par	6,800 00	2,931
9	C	2	1·52	Miscel. Works		Laprairie Parish	43,500 00	28,618
	C	3	1·14	W. B. Macadam & Oil	16	Laprairie Parish	19,400 00	13,759
	D	2	0·27	W. B. Macadam & Oil	16	Laprairie Town		
10	N	1	3·878	Gravel	22	Stanfold	45,100 00	11,630
	O		4,858	Gravel	22	St. Victoire	38,000 00	7,822
	P	2	0·636	Concrete	16	Victoriaville Tn	13,100 00	20,599
	R		2,384	Gravel	22	St. Christophe	14,300 00	5,998
	T	1	3,748	Gravel	22	Warwick	19,600 00	5,229
	T	2	4,180	Gravel	22	Warwick	21,100 00	5,047
	CC		2·55	Gravel	22	Orford Township	20,400 00	8,000
	BB	Pt.	1·42	Gravel	22	Brompton Township	8,300 00	5,845
	U	Pt.	2·32	Gravel	22	Kingsey Falls P	14,200 00	6,121
	V	Pt.	3,60	Gravel	22	Shipton Township	36,400 00	10,111
11	C		4·19	Gravel	16	St. Therese	31,900 00	7,613
	E	1-3-5	0·76	Gravel	20	St. Janvier	3,500 00	4,605
	E	2-4-6	2·144	Gravel	24	St. Janvier	35,600 00	16,604
	F		0·132	Gravel	24	St. Monique	5,600 00	42,424
	G	1	0·638	Gravel	24	St. Jerome	10,000 00	15,674
	G	3	0·047	Gravel	24	St. Jerome	800 00	17,021
	G	4	0·378	Gravel	24	St. Jerome	21,600 00	57,143
	G	5	0·39	Gravel	24	St. Jerome	7,100 00	18,205
	G	7	6·175	Gravel	24	St. Jerome	124,500 00	20,162
	K		2·6	Gravel	18	St. J. de Mt. Rolland	53,000 00	20,385
12	C		2·707	Gravel	22	St. Michel	14,200 00	5,246
14	B	1	5·22	W. B. M.	16	St. Luc Parish	74,300 00	14,234
17	B		4·30	Oiled Mac	18	South Hull Twp	52,800 00	12,279
18	I		13·41	Gravel	18	St. Rose du Degele	56,400 00	4,206
19	A	Pt.	2·30	Concrete	16	Cap de la Madeleine	67,400 00	29,304
	B		4,709	W. B. M. & Oil	16	St. Louis de France	78,000 00	16,564
20	F		2·09	Bt. Mac. Pen	16	Maple Grove Town	29,500 00	14,115
	G		1·12	W. B. M.	16	Beauharnois Town	28,700 00	26,625
23	A	Pt.	0·85	W. B. M. & Oil	16	Levis City	14,513 81	17,075
	B		5·59	W. B. M. & Oil	16	St. Ls. Pintendre	79,196 86	14,167
	C	Pt.	2·30	W. B. M. & Oil	16	St. Henri Par	47,148 21	20,499
	D	Pt.	0·38	W. N. B. & Oil	16	St. Henri Vil	8,243 14	21,692
27	I	Pt.	2·26	W. B. M.	12	St. Jeanne de Chantel Ile Perrot	20,500 00	9,071
	K	Pt.	0·54	W. B. M.	12	St. Michel de Vaudreuil	4,200 00	7,778
	L	Pt.	0·12	W. B. M.	14	St. Jos. de Soulange	2,300 00	19,167
34	B	Pt.	0·284	Gravel	20	St. Christophe Par	2,000 00	7,042
38	D	Pt.	0·425	Gravel	20	St. Simon de Ramsay	3,000 00	7,059
41	B		1·185	Gravel	20	Ste. Victoire Par	13,200 00	11,139
	E		4,081	Gravel	20	Ste. Eulalie Par	14,400 00	3,529

Montreal-Longueuil-Sherbrooke, Length 85·25 miles.
Quebec-Montreal, Length 159 miles.
Levis-St. Lambert, 177 miles.
Caughnawaga-Malone, 45·38 miles.
Beauce Jct.-Sherbrooke, Length 95·581 miles

The standard width of grade in the Province of Quebec is 24 feet. The width of pavement as above.

The depth of cement concrete is 7½ to 8″ at centre on broken stone and gravel base. The depth of asphaltic concrete in the Province of Quebec is 2″ on 14″ broken stone base. The depth of bituminous macadam is 3 to 4″ on broken stone base 8″. The depth of waterbound macadam is 15″ loose or about 11½″ consolidated. The average depth of gravel is 10″.

PROVINCE OF NEW BRUNSWICK—STATEMENT SHOWING COST OF COMPLETED ROADS

Project No.	Location	Length	Type of surface	Width	Total cost	Cost per mile
		miles			$ cts.	$ cts.
1	MATAPEDIA-BATHURST—					
	Sec. H-Belledune Stn.-Green Pt.	3·0	Gravel	18′	13,300 00	4,433 33
3	NEWCASTLE-MONCTON—					
	Sec. A-Newcastle-Chatham	4·0	Bit.Macadam	16′	129,000 00	32,250 00
7	MONCTON-ST. JOHN—					
	Sec. I—Apohaqui-Norton	6·8	Gravel	18′	38,000 00	5,588 23
	N—Rothesay-St. John	8·6	Bit. macadam	16′	83,200 00	9,674 42
8	ST. JOHN-ST. STEPHEN—					
	Sec. N—Musquash-Ludgate Lake	4·0	Gravel	18′	35,300 00	8,825 00
	O—Ludgate Lake-Spruce Lake	3·0	"	18′	30,000 00	10,000 00
	P—Spruce Lake-St. John	5·5	"	18′	31,300 00	5,690 91
10	ST. JOHN-FREDERICTON—					
	Sec. A—St. John-Westfield Corner	11·3	"	18′	108,200 00	9,575 22
11	FREDERICTON-WOODSTOCK—					
	Sec. A—Fredericton-Indian Village	9·3	Gravel	18′	118,700 00	12,763 44
	B—Indian Village-Lake George Rd	10·9	"	18′	83,900 00	7,697 25
	C—Lake George Rd.—Pokiok	15·1	"	18′	145,000 00	9,602 65
	D—Pokiok-Shogomoc Woods	7·0	"	18′	76,800 00	10,971 43
	F—Eel River Br.-Woodstock	11·7	"	18′	94,500 00	8,076 92
13	PERTH-GRAND FALLS—					
	Sec. A—Andover-Aroostook	6·0	Gravel	18′	21,800 00	3,633 34
	C—South End Long Swamp-North End Swamp	3·6	"	18′	44,300 00	12,305 56
14	GRAND FALLS-QUEBEC BOUNDARY—					
	Sec. G—Edmundston-St. Jacques	4·7	Gravel	18′	24,400 00	5,191 49
16	WESTFIELD-OROMOCTO—					
	Sec. C—Queenstown-Otnabog	4·5	Gravel	18′	34,900 00	7,755 56

NOTE.—Width of grade—24 ft.—Width of surfacing as shown above. Depth of bituminous macadam, 3½″ on 4″ broken stone base. Gravel—8″.

NOVA SCOTIA

Statement Showing Cost of Completed Roads

Project No.	Location	Length	Type	Width	Total	Cost per mile	Remarks
					$ cts.	$ cts.	
1	Halifax-Bedford	6·3	Bit. Macadam	16′	243,397 28	38,634 48	
2	Halifax-Indian River	17·5	4·5 M. Gravel 13·0 M.W.B. Mac.	14′	340,228 72	19,441 65	Av. for both surf. combined.
3	Mt. Uniacke-Lakelands	7·6	W.B. Macadam	14′	99,357 45	13,073 34	
4	Pt. Joli-Sable River	6·3	Gravel	14′	123,759 28	19,644 33	
5	Aylesford-Middleton	12·1	Gravel	16′	118,542 50	9,796 90	
6	Elmsdale-Shubenacadie	7·1	Gravel	14′	95,707 80	13,479 92	
7	Liverpool-Caledonia	6·0	Gravel	14′	49,239 80	8,206 63	
8	Sydney-Glace Bay	8·2	Slag Macadam	12′	135,184 49	16,485 91	
9	Windsor-Hantsport	6·5	Gravel	14′	69,061 91	10,624 91	
10	Weymouth-Meteghan	10·0	Gravel	16′	55,297 22	5,529 72	
13	Bedford-Elmsdale	21·3	Gravel	14′	130,277 37	6,116 30	
14	Elmsdale-Shubenacadie	3·48	Gravel	14′	30,266 28	8,697 20	
15	Shubenacadie-Stewiacke	2·46	Gravel	14′	17,308 18	7,035 84	
16	Truro-Glenholme	12·12	Gravel	14′	85,407 86	7,046 85	
17	Amherst-N.B. Boundary	1·0	Gravel	16′	38,261 37	38,261 37	Diversion to eliminate 2 rly. X-ings.
18	Truro-New Glasgow	17·9	Gravel	14′	93,512 30	5,224 15	
19	New Glasgow-Antigonish	28·07	Gravel	14′	148,310 77	5,283 60	
20	Antigonish-Mulgrave	19·7	9·17 M. Gravel 10·53 M.W.B. Mac.	14′ 10′	210,360 87	10,678 21	Av. for both surf. combined.
21	Tracadie-Canso	34·91	Gravel	12′-14′	159,351 49	4,564 64	
22	Woods Harbour-Shag Hbr	5·21	Gravel	14′	41,890 18	8,040 34	
23	Halifax-Hants Co. Line—Mt. Uniacke Station	3·9	W.B. Macadam	14′	42,884 09	10,995 92	
24	Hawkesbury-St. Peters	20·0	Gravel	14′	84,439 60	4,221 98	
25	St. Peters-Sydney Road	30·39	Gravel	12′-14′	151,330 95	4,979 62	½ M. Slag. Mach. included.
26	Sydney-Baddeck	18·0	Gravel	12′	69,682 92	3,871 27	
29	Woods Hbr.-Co. Lines Yarmouth-Shelburne	6·0	Gravel	14′	27,187 58	4,531 26	
30	Parrsboro-Amherst	18·84	Gravel	14′	96,889 49	5,142 70	
31	Sackville Riv. Br.-Lucasville Road	5·15	Crushed Rock	14′	40,410 27	7,846 65	
32	Lucasville Rd.-Halifax Hants Co. Line	6·65	Crushed Rock	14′	56,869 59	8,551 81	
34	Sable River-Lockeport	8·04	Gravel	14′	33,590 11	4,177 87	
38	1 mile east Victoria Br. to 2·9 miles west of same	3·9	Gravel	16′	17,262 56	4,426 30	
		354·62					

Average cost per mile all types $8,192.62.
Width of grade—24 Ft.
Depth of surfacing as shown above.
Depth of bituminous macadam—3″ on 6″ broken stone base.
Depth of waterbound macadam—10″.
Gravel—8″ in depth.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND

STATEMENT SHOWING COST OF COMPLETED ROADS

Project No.	Location	Length	Type	Width	Total	Cost per mile
				Generally	$ cts.	$ cts.
1	10 Mile House-County Line	8·0	Improved Earth..	18′	19,485 37	2,435 68
2	New Haven-Queen's Arms	8·0	Improved Earth..	18′	12,327 58	1,540 95
3	Kensington-Bryenton's Corner	3·5	Improved Earth..	18′	7,252 07	2,072 02
4	O'Leary Rd.-Mt. Pleasant	12·0	Improved Earth..	18′	46,847 17	3,903 93
5	McMahon's Bridge-Elmira Road	8·5	Improved Earth..	18′	16,056 51	1,889 00
6	Dundas-Rollo Bay	8·5	Improved Earth..	18′	14,171 58	1,667 24
7	Bovyer's Brook Webster's Corner	9·0	Improved Earth..	18′	11,263 65	1,251 52
8	Montague-Cardigan Road	5·5	Improved Earth..	18′	14,835 47	2,697 35
12	Murray River-Montague	10·0	Improved Earth..	18′	19,290 01	1,929 00
13	Cardigan-St. Peters	13·0	Improved Earth..	18′	25,094 52	1,930 35
14	St. Peters-Charlottetown	8·5	Improved Earth..	18′	15,822 45	1,861 45
15	Union Road-Scotchfort	11·5	Improved Earth..	18′	21,754 86	1,891 72
16	Water Works Hill-Hunter River	11·5	Improved Earth..	18′	34,045 47	2,960 47
18	Bryenton's Cor.-Irishtown-French River	6·5	Improved Earth..	18′	14,041 71	2,160 26
19	Summerside-Borden	15·5	Improved Earth..	18′	30,950 32	1,996 79
20	Mt. Pleasant-Miscouche	14·5	Improved Earth..	18′	44,606 09	3,076 28
21	O'Leary-Bloomfield	6·0	Improved Earth..	18′	22,624 62	3,770 77
22	Charlottetown-Queen's Arms	3·00	Improved Earth..	18′	10,701 65	3,567 22
23	Charlottetown-Union Road	2·75	Improved Earth..	18′	9,625 35	3,500 13
		165·75				

Average cost of all roads $2,357.75.

PROVINCE OF MANITOBA

STATEMENT SHOWING COST OF COMPLETED SECTIONS OF ROADS

Project No.	Location	Length (Miles)	Type of Surface	Width of Grade	Total Cost	Cost per Mile
					$ cts.	$ cts.
7	Winnipeg-Portage— Sec. C.—Poplar Point-Portage la Prairie	18·7	Earth	18′	39,695 34	2,130 00
8	Winnipeg-Boundary (Centre Route)— Sec. A—Winnipeg to Trehern Road	52·8	Earth	22′	130,762 08	2,470 00
9	Winnipeg-Boundary (South Route)— Sec. A—Through MacDonald Municipality	28·0	Earth	20′-24′	77,004 54	3,020 00
	Sec. B—Through Morris & Dufferin Municipality	19·7	Earth	20′-18′	47,427 25	2,400 00
11	Winnipeg-Riverton— Sec. A—West Kildonan-St. Pauls.	6·5	Gravel	20′	9,126 35	1,410 00

NOTE.—Extract from the Engineer's Report to December 31, 1922 on Manitoba.

"The actual average cost of the 344 miles completed and the 142 miles 75% completed exclusive of surfacing is $2,265.00 per mile."

PROVINCE OF SASKATCHEWAN

STATEMENT SHOWING COST OF COMPLETED SECTIONS OF ROADS

Project No.	Location	Length	Type of Surface	Width of Grade	Total Cost	Cost per Mile
		Miles		Ft.	$ cts.	$ cts.
1.....	Cadillac-Battleford—					
	Sec. G—Battleford-N. Battleford.	2·30	Gravel.....	20	16,309 05	7,080 00
2.....	Assiniboia-Prince Albert—					
	Sec. B—Crestwynd-Moose Jaw....	25·90	Earth.....	20	90,033 34	3,480 00
	Sec. O—Tuxford-Chamberlain.....	9·30	Earth.....	20	36,607 34	3,840 00
	Sec. G—Dana-Colonsay.....	23·80	Earth.....	20	88,891 68	3,740 00
4.....	Fleming-Walsh—					
	Sec. B—Wapella-Broadview.....	32·30	Earth.....	20	73,050 30	2,260 00
	Sec. E—McLean-Regina.....	25·80	Earth.....	20	52,177 14	2,030 00
5.....	Togo-Lloydminster—					
	Sec. N—Maidstone-Waseca.....	10·20	Earth.....	20	18,028 16	1,780 00
7.....	Saskatoon-Alsask—					
	Sec. C—Harris-Rosetown.....	27·60	Earth.....	20	63,963 27	2,320 00
1.....	Cadillac-Battleford—					
	Sec. D—Elrose-Rosetown.....	24·30	Grading for gravel surface	20	76,578 29	3,150 00

NOTE.—Extract from Engineer's Report to December 31, 1922 on Saskatchewan.

"The actual average cost of the 615 miles of grading completed and the 160 miles which is 80% completed is $2,300 per mile.

The average cost of the 18 miles of one coat gravel surfacing is $1,800 per mile, making a total of $4,100 per mile for a one coat gravel surface.

The average cost of the 39 miles of clay surfacing is $3,100 per mile, making the average cost of a clay surfaced road $5,400.50 per mile."

Project No.	Location	Length	Type of surface	Width	Total	Cost per per mile	Remarks	Name of contractor
					$ cts.	$ cts.		
1	ALBERNI-VICTORIA—							
	Sec. A—Craigflower Br.-Parsons Br.	2·046	Cement concrete..	18′	76,617 61	37,447 51	.....	Palmer Bros.
	B—Colwood-Langford	1·35	" ..	16′	44,373 40	32,869 18	.....	Hodgson, King & Marble.
	C—Nanaimo-South	2·42	Asphaltic concrete..	16′	94,949 86	39,235 48	.....	M. P. Cotton Co.
4	VANCOUVER-LADNER—							
	Sec. A—No. 3 Road, Lulu Island..	2·65	Bituminous concrete	18′	55,417 05	20,912 09		
	B—No. 5 & 9, Lulu Island....	1·89	Cement bituminous	16′	64,780 42	34,275 35	Grading.....	M. P. Cotton Co., Harrison & Lamond, Lithia pav., Concrete pav.
	C—No. 3 & 9, Lulu Island.....	2·03	Asphaltic concrete..	18′	49,962 75	24,612 19	.....	Columbia Bith. Co.
5	LADNER-NEW WESTMINSTER—							
	Sec. A—Semiamo Road Delta....	2·97	Bitulithic.....	16′	(171,128 65	28·664 77)	.....	Palmer Bros., Columbia Bithulithic Co., Palmer Bros.
	C— "	3·00	"	16′			.....	
	B— "	2·026	Cement concrete....	16′	82,848 63	40,892 71	.....	
	D— "	0·49	Bitulithic.....	14′	6,526 22	13,318 82	.....	Columbia Bithulithic Co.
6	CAULFIELD-ROCHE POINT—							
	Sec. A—North Vancouver.....	1·00	Bitulithic.....	15′	20,952 20	20,952 20	.....	Columbia Bithulithic Co.
9	VANCOUVER-HOPE—							
	Sec. A—New Westminster Br. south.....	3·27	Cement concrete...	18′	175,455 23	53,656 03		
	B—Continuation to Johnson Rd.....	2·30	" ...	18′	119,911 48	52,135 43		
	C—Serpentine Flats.....	1·401	Gravel and crushed rock.....	24′	75,185 98	53,665 94	Heavy grading and embankment.....	Palmer Bros. Concrete.
	D—Cloverdale.....	1·629	Cement concrete....	18′	59,291 03	36,397 19		
	G—Chilliwack East.....	3·07	Bithulithic.....	16′	44,135 16	14,376 27	.....	Columbia Bithulithic Co.
	H—Johnson Road East.....	2·90	Cement concrete...	18′	107,516 76	37,074 74	.....	M. P. Cotton Co.
	I—Langley Paririe-Murrayville.....	1·90	" ...	16′	63,390 24	33,363 28	.....	A. B. Palmer Co.
13	SPENCE'S BRIDGE-PRINCETON—							
	Sec. A—Aspen Grove South.....	25·0	Grading and reconstruction.....	.....	46,783 71	1,871 35	.....	
15	KAMLOOPS-OSOYOOS—							
	Sec. B—Demonstration Farm—McIntyre Creek.....	8·82	Grading.....	16′	47,161 64	5,345 98	.....	Robertson & Partners, Ltd.

16	ASHCROFT-SUMMIT LAKE—							
	Sec. D—Dog Prairie-Quesnel (Mile 214-219)	5·0	Gravel	10′	23,590 10	4,718 02		Provincial Forces.
22	VERNON-REVELSTOKE—							
	Sec. A—Revelstoke West	3·3	Grading	14′	197,647 86	17,742 18		Angus McDonnell.
	B— "	7·84	"	14′				
	C—Mara Lake	3·22	"	16′	50,937 05	15,818 93		Clayton Bros. & Angelus
	D—Three Valley-Taft	10·07	"		153,182 33	15,211 75		Angus McDonnell.
23	OSOYOOS-CROWS NEST PASS—							
	Sec. A—Near Kitchener	1·28	Road diversion	12-18′	6,321 51	4,938 68		
	B—Thrums-Brilliant	4·0	Grading	16′	31,218 58	7,804 65		
	C—Osoyoos-Nine Mile	13·07	Impr. earth and gravel	10-16′	130,791 16	10,006 97	½ gravel and ½ earth	
	D—Rossland West	6·75	Impr. earth	16′	115,065 95	17,046 81		
	E—Kushanook-Creston	5·66	Mat'l. in situ	14′	22,070 11	3,899 31		A. W. Davis.
	F—Cascade Easterly	15·0	Impr. earth and gravel	16′	229,907 20	15,327 15	10·7 earth, 4·3 gravel	W. P. Tierney Co.
	G—Cascade-Rossland	13·25	Grading		113,763 17	5,987 38		W. P. Tierney Co.
	K— "	5·75	"					
	H—Near Moyie Lake	6·62	"		39,403 87	5,952 24		Provincial Forces.
	J—Near Creston	3·0	Macadamizing		22,217 67	7,405 89		"
24	NELSON-NEW DENVER—							
	Sec. A—Kaslo-Ainsworth	4·2	Impr. earth	12′	23,207 77	5,525 42		
	B—New Denver-Three Forks	5·17	"	10′	19,531 57	3,777 87		

The following projects are under construction and the following amounts are the amounts expended to end of 1922.

16	ASHCROFT-SUMMIT LAKE—							
	Sec. A—Fort George-Nixon's Creek	42·0	Clearing and grading		114,026 60	1,500 35		Bowles & Pickard and Caine & Brown.
	B—Nixon's Creek-Quesnel	34·0	Clearing and grading					
18	FORT GEORGE-HAZELTON—							
	Sec. F—Endako-Burns Lake	32·0	Grading		65,232 71	1,164 87		Provincial Forces.
	G—Burns Lake-Rose Lake	16·0	"					
	I—N. Bulkley-Houston	8·0	"					
19	BURNS LAKE-FRANCOIS LAKE	15·0	Grading		19,956 85	1,330 45		Provincial Forces.

NOTE.—Width of grade, 22 feet. Width of surfacing as shown above. Depth of asphaltic concrete or bithulithic, 2″ on 12″ broken stone base. Cement concrete 7″ centre, 6″ at side on 6″ broken stone base. Depth of gravel, 9″.

Mr. CALDWELL: What is the purport of the immense document? Cannot you give us a brief explanation of it?

Mr. GRAHAM: These documents really give the cost of highways by counties, in some instances by townships, in order to afford a comparison of what highways cost throughout the whole province of Ontario.

Mr. BOYS: One other thing. I remember the minister on a previous occasion informed the committee that the cost of planting trees, the cost of acquiring right of way, and I think he said the cost of fencing, do not form any part of the outlay to which his department contributes. I would like to ask him now if his department contributes to anything except the actual road construction?

Mr. GRAHAM: Nothing except the actual road construction. Anything that is on the road bed, I believe, is part of the road bed construction.

Item agreed to.

Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada—maintenance and operation of, $228,969.

Mr. BAXTER: What I was going to ask I fear has not very much relation to this item. When the railway estimates were up before I asked the minister a question about what we might expect with regard to the place which used to be occupied by the train shed at St. John. Can the minister hold out any hope of the speedy restoration of the train shed or the construction of the union station?

Mr. GRAHAM: I had intended getting some information about that for my railway estimates proper. I have no information concerning that at hand. This merely covers the Board of Railway Commissioners.

Mr. BAXTER: The minister will get it later?

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes.

Mr. COOTE: A year ago when this estimate was before the House I brought to the attention of the minister the statement which was reported to have been made by the present Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) regarding the Chairman of the Railway Commission. At that time the Minister of Agriculture said that he would read a statement in regard to this matter, but, acting, I have no doubt, on the suggestion of his superior officer, the Prime Minister when the House had re-assembled after dinner he declined to read the statement, and took refuge under the ruling given by the Chairman, I think, that matters that were being discussed before a standing committee should not be discussed in the House till after the committee had reported. That committee has reported, and I think the country would be very glad if the minister would now read that statement to the House. I think we are quite justified in asking the minister to make the statement now, because we had the statement of the Prime Minister himself that the matter of removing Mr. Carvell from the Board of Railway Commissioners, was under consideration by the government. On the 24th June, the right hon. leader of the Opposition, (Mr. Meighen) said:

On the 10th day of June, attention being called by the member for Macleod (Mr. Coote) to certain commitments of the present Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) as regards the removal of the Chairman of the Railway Commission, the Prime Minister stated, as reported on page 2872 of Unrevised Hansard, that the Minister of Agriculture had made certain representations to the government as regards such removal; that the same had been considered, but that no definite conclusion had been reached. May I ask if a definite decision has been reached, and if so, what is it?

Mr. Mackenzie King: No conclusion has been reached The mattter is still being considered.

I see that the Minister of Agriculture has left the House but I should like to know whether that matter is still under consideration and, if so, what decision has been arrived at. It seems to me the people of this country are entitled to an answer.

9 p.m.

Mr. GRAHAM: The act which provided for the appointment of the Board of Railway Commissioners also provided that the chairman could not be removed except by parliament. This government has not the power to remove the chairman if it wished. As far as I am concerned it does not wish. If my hon. friend wishes to move in any direction concerning the Chairman of the Board of Railway Commissioners, it is his duty to do so, as much as it is the duty of any other member of this House, and it cannot be done except by parliament. The Chairman of the Board of Railway Commissioners is in the same position as the Auditor General.

Mr. COOTE: I think the minister is evading the question. If he wants to evade it, he should say so. The Prime Minister stated quite frankly to the House that the matter was under consideration by the cabinet, and I think before this item passes we should have some definite answer from the government. The Minister of Agriculture certainly has pledged himself very strongly, and the Prime Minister certainly stated that the matter was being considered by the cabinet. Surely we are entitled to an answer as to what decision the cabinet has arrived at in this matter, if they

have arrived at any. If not, the minister should state frankly that they have not arrived at a decision.

Mr. MARTELL: The minister stated that he was perfectly satisfied with the Chairman of the Railway Commission and that he could only be removed by parliament, and if the hon. member for Macleod wants to have him removed, let him make a motion to that effect, and he will find how far he will get.

Mr. COOTE: I would like to remind the member that the Minister of Agriculture, whom he greatly admires, pledged himself publicly that if he were elected one of the first things he would do would be to put a resolution on the order paper to have the Chairman of the Railway Commission removed, and the Prime Minister came to the support of the Minister of Agriculture last year and said that the minister had made representations to the government and the government were considering them. When he was questioned by the hon. leader of the Opposition he said the matter was still under consideration. That is the last statement the government has made in this House about the matter, and I think I am not asking anything unreasonable when I ask, what is the decision of the government in this matter?

Mr. MARTELL: Let me ask the hon. member whether or not he thinks the Minister of Agriculture, when he made that pledge, did not take too much upon himself? A pledge made in an election is not a pledge for the government. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals says he is satisfied with the Chairman of the Railway Commission, and most of us on this side are satisfied. If my hon. friend wants to remove him, let him make a motion in that regard.

Mr. COOTE: I did not hear distinctly the hon. member's question; but I would like to ask the member, is political honour absolutely extinct in his party?

Mr. MARTELL: According to whom it comes from—like the hon. members opposite.

Mr. COOTE: I think the people of this country expect something better from the hon. member for Hants than the statement he has just made. I also desire to point out that the Minister of Agriculture, when he made this statement, had the idea in the back of his head no doubt that if the party which he supported were returned to power he would be made Minister of Agriculture. There was no reservation when he made that statement, and I think if the minister has any sense of political honour he should stand by the declaration he made. But I want to come back to this question, and I ask the minister once more, if he will be good enough to tell us, if he knows, whether the government has come to any final decision in regard to this matter or not.

Mr. GRAHAM: As far as the government is concerned I happen for the time being to be at the head of that department and I may say the government has come to no decision to ask or to suggest the retirement of the chairman of that commission.

Mr. MARTELL: Satisfied with him?

Mr. GRAHAM: I am.

Mr. COOTE: Might I ask the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals if he has perused carefully the letter which was received by the Prime Minister from the Vancouver Board of Trade in connection with this matter and given it the consideration which a letter coming from that important body should deserve?

Mr. GRAHAM: I must plead guilty to not having perused the correspondence of the Prime Minister. Now, my hon. friend should not evade the responsibility that is his in this matter. If he wants to move that the Chairman of the Board of Railway Commissioners be removed, if he is of the opinion that this should be done, then do not let him ask anyone else to assume any responsibility in the matter. It is the duty of parliament and not of the government to take action; and as an hon. member of this House he can move that such action be taken. He has a right to move that the Chairman of the Board of Railway Commissioners be removed.

Mr. COOTE: I can see that the government is anxious to shift the responsibility on to other shoulders. One of its own ministers made a certain statement in public and he has not yet gone back on it. I am sorry that the hon. gentleman cannot answer more definitely for his government.

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not know how much more definite you would like me to be.

Mr. COOTE: I am glad it is still under consideration, at any rate.

Mr. GRAHAM: The minister did not say so.

Mr. COOTE: No, the minister did not say so; nor did he say that it was not under consideration.

Mr. MARTELL: It has been put up to you.

Mr. COOTE: I have no doubt the Minister of Agriculture would be glad to pass the buck to someone else, but he is the responsible person. Have we responsible government in this country? Does a man renounce his election pledges in as few months as that, and still claim to have political honour? It is time that we had some plain speaking in this country with regard to the Railway Commission. The Minister of Agriculture made that statement in Regina, and it appealed very much to his hearers not only in that city but also in western Canada. I do not know how many people in eastern Canada it appealed to; but I was told by a prominent resident of the Maritime provinces a year ago, when talking about this particular question, that the present Chairman of the Board of Railway Commissioners should be hanged from a gallows as high as Haman's.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is plagiarism.

Mr. COOTE: He may have put it a little strong, but at any rate that is what he said. Now, I want to point out very briefly one or two reasons why the government should give very careful consideration to the representatations made to them by the Minister of Agriculture. The Hon. Mr. Langley, when he appeared before the special Railway Transportation Cost committee a year ago, made this statement:

> The impression is abroad among our farmers that the Board of Railway Commissioners has ceased to be a board of railway commissioners and has become a board of railway company commissioners.

That is a very serious statement, but I do not think it is at all too strong. I want to bring to the attention of the committee a few of the reasons why the people of western Canada feel just as Mr. Langley stated. On August 10, 1920, the Railway Commission commenced a hearing in Ottawa of an application of the railways for an increase in freight rates. That hearing was completed on August 21, and on September 9 there was put into effect the largest increase in rates that has ever been made in Canada,—an increase in the west of 35 per cent and in the east of 40 per cent. Now that was very quick work. There was no dissenting voice on the board, and certainly there was no delay. The increase was timed to catch the 1920 grain crop, and I believe that from my own station there were only seven carloads of grain shipped at the old rate. In my own particular town that increase took, I believe, out of the shippers of that one place a toll to the amount of $35,000. I would ask the government to compare the speedy methods adopted in connection with this increase with the methods in regard to the decrease which was supposed to follow when circumstances would warrant. The officials of the United Farmers of Alberta went to the commission at Calgary on April 18, 1921, and asked permission to place before them their case for a reduction of rates, and at Regina on April 22, the Hon. George Langley and others appeared before the commission as representing the farmers of Saskatchewan. Representatives were also heard at Brandon, and, I think, at Winnipeg. During the summer of 1921 the United States railways cut the wages of their employees 12½ per cent; and the Railway Commission of Canada of their own accord held an investigation to decide whether they could not now reduce these rates again. This investigation was carried on, I think, for a month and a half; but although the wages were reduced as I have said, some time previously,—in July, I think,—it was not until September 13 that Mr. Carvell issued a statement to the effect that all freight rates other than those on which reductions had already been made, should be decreased by 10 per cent from the increases given in 1920. This judgment was concurred in by Commissioner Nantel. Three of the commissioners dissented from the judgment because of the fact that the men had applied for a board of conciliation. I will not detain the House by reading anything in reference to this matter, but the fact remains that because these men had applied for a board three commissioners would not agree to the recommendation for a decrease in the rates which had been brought down by the Hon. Mr. Carvell on September 13. An agreement was arrived at between the Canadian Pacific Railway and their employees on October 8, by which the employees accepted a reduction. But these other gentlemen of the Railway Commission were so busy that they could not come to a decision in the matter at that time, and the reduction of this 10 per cent in the rates was not granted until November 23. Now, it does seem to the farmers of western Canada that the Railway Commission does not show any great desire to deal as quickly with an application for the lowering of rates as it does with any application for an increase. By November 23 the bulk of the grain had probably left the farmers' hands and the railways had got the increased rate.

One other thing I want to refer to, to show why the people of western Canada have lost all faith in the Board of Railway Commissioners as a fair judicial body. I might quote briefly from a report that appeared in the Calgary Herald of an address of the Hon. Mr

Carvell before the Canadian Club. Referring to the increase which had been granted in the railway rates Mr. Carvell is reported as follows:

Mr. Carvell said that the railways had made representations to the Board of Railway Commissioners asking for an increase in rates and he said that it meant that $22,000,000 was required to pay the retroactive wages. The railways were hard put to it to pay this big increase. Three presidents of the railway companies came before the board and stated that if the money was not forthcoming there would be serious consequences and they were asked what they meant, and their reply was, it would mean a general strike of railway workers in Canada if the award was not agreed to.

In the same address Mr. Carvell stated that the demands in many cases were unreasonable. But he gives this threat of a strike as sufficient justification for raising the railway rates. He also stated that the farmer could sell his product in any market while the railway company could do business only on its rails and could not charge one cent more than the board allowed. If the Canadian Pacific Railway could not earn dividends no one would buy its shares, and as far as the McAdoo award was concerned, in four years this would have eaten up all the reserves of the company. He went on to dwell on the fact that the Canadian Pacific railway must have sufficient rates to earn their usual dividends.

At a hearing in Calgary on the following day, Mr. J. E. Brownlee, appearing for the United Farmers of Alberta, stated the farmers' case. He said that the farmers were forced to pay war prices for their needs but received only pre-war prices for their products, and this being the case they would probably cut down production to a considerable extent, and in that event any curtailment of transportation facilities would eventually work a hardship on the railway companies. Chief Commissioner Carvell scoffed at Mr. Brownlee's prediction. He is reported as having said:

Do not worry about the future, he said. I do not believe the farmers' organizations in the West are such half-dead, half-alive affairs as you hint. I do not believe there will be any lessening in production. Have a little more faith.

I should like the members of the government to compare the attitude exhibited by the Chairman of the Commission towards what we call "capital" and his attitude towards the common people, the producers of the country. He says that capital must have its 7 per cent or we cannot get it to build railways. And he holds out the threat of a strike on the part of the employees as justification for an increase in rates. Then when the farmers threaten to curtail production, which is simply their method of striking, he says: "Have a little more faith; do not worry about the future".

Now, we have had a great deal of discussion in this House this session about emigration from this country, and we have been considering the problem of securing immigrants to take the places of those who leave. Well, I want to point out that just so long as we have men occupying high offices in this country—and I think that the Chairman of the Board of Railway Commissioners holds one of the most important posts in the gift of the government—so long, I say, as there are in these high and important positions men who place more value on the dollar than they do on human life, we shall have before us an exceedingly difficult problem to keep people in this country to produce the material for the railways to haul; and it certainly is high time that there was a showdown as to who are to be given the primary consideration in Canada,—the people of the country or the people who are designated in the term "capital". I have no objection to the Canadian Pacific Railway getting dividends, but I do object that the Board of Railway Commissioners should act in a manner so manifestly unfair to one section of this country as the present board is doing. I want to quote from the words of the Chairman of the Board of Railway Commissioners himself in a judgment given by him on September 15, 1920:

Allowing for the undoubted fact that a very large proportion of the traffic moved east and west is on a commodity basis, I am still forced to the conclusion that the rates in western Canada average considerably greater than in the East, possibly around 15 per cent to 18 per cent.

In the face of this remark from the chairman himself, I do not see why the people of western Canada cannot be granted an equalization of rates with the East. I think that the present chairman of the commission, in his refusal to grant such equalization, or at least to grant some redress to the people of the West is condemned by the words from his own mouth. I contend that there is nothing in the Railway Act by which it is intended that the Board of Railway Commissioners should maintain in western Canada rates 15 to 18 per cent higher than those that obtain in eastern Canada. If the Railway Commission want to maintain rates so that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company can continue to pay dividends in the future as they have in the past, their duty is to raise the rates in eastern Canada or lower them in

western Canada until both eastern and western rates are on a parity. The people of the West are going to be satisfied with nothing less. The present Chairman of the Railway Commission may be very efficient but unless he can show better judgment in the future than he has done in the past, he cannot convince even honest people in eastern Canada of the fairness of the present condition of affairs.

Before I sit down I want to ask the minister one other question: Does the government think it is fair, although the major part of the Canadian Pacific Railway dividends are earned in western Canada, and rates are from 15 to 18 per cent higher there than in the East, that on a board composed of six commissioners there should not be one representative of western Canada? I hope that when the government give due consideration to the representations of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) and possibly decide that the prseent chairman should be removed, they will give to western Canada one representative. I ask the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) will he be willing to go that far?

Mr. GRAHAM: As I understand, Dr. Rutherford was appointed as a western man to succeed a western man, and he is still a member of the Railway Board. I am not going to discuss the question of rates, it is too intricate, and, besides, I had something to do with perfecting the act under which the Board of Railway Commissioners was created. While this board may have made some mistakes at times—and I suppose even our judges are not entirely free from error—yet on the whole the work of the board has been excellent. Now, my hon. friend has mentioned the difference between eastern and western rates. I do not wish to make any comparisons in that way. It is the duty of the Board of Railway Commissioners to administer the Railway Act for the benefit of the whole Dominion, and I believe they are discharging this duty in a very able manner. Complaints regarding railway rates are not confined to the West; the people in the East complain that the rates from the Maritime provinces are very high and burdensome, and only to-day a question was brought up in the House as to a suggestion, I think, by some member of the government in New Brunswick, that the rates should be substantially reduced, and that unless something was done along this line the situation would be very serious indeed. The freight rate question is one of the disagreeable results of the war. No person can ever expect railway operation to be as cheap as it was before the war. There is a new condition, and rightly so, among the working men of the Dominion, and, indeed, among the working men of the world; consequently, the wages of railway men will never revert to what they were before the war, and I do not think we want them to. The process of getting back to as near normal as possible will be comparatively slow. My hon. friend has said something about capital. Does he realize that he himself is one of the capitalists? The people of Canada own the biggest railway system in the world, every dollar of deficit on which has to be met out of the pockets of the taxpayers. The subject should always be approached with that in view. I appreciate the situation as to the freight rates, and I have sympathy not for the West any more than for the East, because all Canada is paying a very high freight rate and a very high passenger rate. But it will take some time for these rates to get down to normal. The only way we can get them to normal is to get a greater volume of traffic, and the only way to get a greater volume of traffic is to have more people to produce. It ought to be the object of us all to make Canada so far as population is concerned a bigger country, and to induce men to come here—notwithstanding all that has been said—to make for themselves and their families a future. I believe that in the proper solution of that one problem of immigration lies the remedy for most of our difficulties. As I say, I have great sympathy for my hon. friend and for both East and West in this matter. I am strongly in favour of reducing the rates as rapidly as possible so that the people who produce on the land and elsewhere will have a chance to get a greater return for their labours.

Mr. COOTE: The minister says that Dr. Rutherford has been a representative of western Canada. I think it would have been more proper to say that Dr. Rutherford is a representative of the Canadian Pacific Railway, not of western Canada.

Mr. GRAHAM: If my hon. friend thinks that, he ought to move to have him put off.

Mr. COOTE: At the time of his appointment he was in the employ of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I was glad to hear the judicial tone of the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) with reference both to our railway problem and to our Railway Commission. I could not help but contrast it with the language of his partisans only a few months ago as they rushed behind the flaming threats of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr.

Motherwell). The Railway Commission was the creation of the Laurier government; I have always given them credit for that piece of work. But in order to excite prejudice against the late administration the high railway rates were by his followers ascribed to the government of the day, and the Railway Commission were held up to scorn and ridicule and vituperation in order that votes might be made against that government. In the flurry of that campaign the hon. gentleman who is now Minister of Agriculture, also in order to get votes, not only declared but bound himself to move in this House if elected for the removal of the Chairman of the Railway Commission. He understood as everyone did that the deposition of an existing railway commissioner by order in council was not within the power of a government but could only be effected by an address in parliament, in the same way that the position of a judge could be vacated. His words showed that he understood these things; he made the pledge fully understanding the effect of it and knowing the law. He was taken into this government by the Prime Minister knowing that he had made this pledge to his electors. When the matter was brought to the attention of the Prime Minister who so took him into his government and he was asked what his intention was with respect to the pledge made by the Minister of Agriculture, he stated to this House that the minister had presented his position to the government in relation to Mr. Carvell and that the government had it under consideration. These are the words of the Prime Minister of Canada: the government was considering the representations of its own Minister of Agriculture affecting the position of the Chairman of the Railway Board of this country. Several weeks afterwards, toward the end of the session, when the matter was again brought to his attention and he was asked what the result of the consideration by the government had been, he answered that no decision had yet been given as to the disposition of Mr. Carvell; the government had it "under consideration" still.

Now, these words mean just what they say; the government were reviewing Mr. Carvell's position to decide what would be the government's policy about it. No one assumed the government could remove him. We all knew they could not. The Prime Minister knew it; the Minister of Agriculture knew it and had always known it. But the government can have a policy as to something it cannot do by order in council; it can have a policy as to what it recommends parliament to do, and the Prime Minister told this House that the government was considering what its policy was to be.

Now, I just pause to call the attention of the House to the position in which the head of the Liberal government put the Railway Board, put the Chairman of the Railway Board. Knowing that the board and its chairman were exercising judicial functions, were in a judicial position, they proclaimed to the Dominion that through the whole session of parliament they held a sword over the head of the chairman of this judicial commission and that they were considering the question of bringing to parliament a resolution asking parliament to remove him. I am not pleading the cause of Mr. Carvell particularly; I do not suppose that any two contestants in parliament ever clashed more violently than Mr. Carvell when he was a member, and myself. But Mr. Carvell when he accepted the position of Chairman of the Railway Board was entitled to be treated with the respect due to that commission. Until the government believed it was in a position to bring in an address to this House, and were justified in doing so, asking for the removal of Mr. Carvell, it had no right in the world to intimate to parliament and to this country that it stood sword in hand, only meditating whether it would bring the sword down or not. I do not know that we ever heard in parliament language more unbecoming the head of a government than the words of the Prime Minister with respect to Mr. Carvell.

I agree with a great deal that the Minister of Railways says with regard to the Railway Commission. I know the Railway Commission was done a gross injustice. I know the people of western Canada were led to believe that this commission was prejudiced against the people and allied with the railways,—but I know they were led to believe it by hon. gentlemen opposite and their followers and for political purposes. I do not say, nor does the minister, that the commission made no mistakes, but I do believe the commission were animated by one desire and one only, that of doing even-handed justice to all interests in this country. I have confidence, not only in Mr. Carvell, that that is and was his desire, but I have the utmost confidence in the gentleman referred to by the hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Coote) in this debate. I do not believe that any interest or any previous association could ever deflect the rectitude of Mr. J. G. Rutherford. No better appointment to the Railway Commission was ever made: and because Mr. Rutherford sat in and considered every judgment, considered all these matters affecting rates, and gave his decision thereon—because

of that the judgment has added weight in my mind. I know that he came from the Canadian Pacific Railway. Other men have been there who came from other occupations, but once they divest themselves of their previous occupations and associations they become judges and sworn to do right as between all parties in this Dominion. I know of no man who is more likely at every moment of his life to have regard to his public obligations than Mr. Rutherford. And what I say of him I have no reason to deny of any member of that board, though the others I do not pretend to know so well.

It may not be popular to stand for a board which has felt it its duty to raise rates and has been unable to bring rates down to the point they formerly were. Perhaps it would be more of a vote catching scheme —I do not for a minute ascribe this intention to others—it might mean more votes to attack the commission, but if the habit of attacking the commission for their acts day by day is to grow in this House, then the usefulness of that commission is gone. I know the minister agrees. I absolve him from the slightest participation in the campaign that was carried on. I know he had no part in it. I do not believe he had the least sympathy with it, but there are other hon. gentlemen who had part in it, and those who helped to elect this government had a very great part in it, and they have done more to destroy the usefulness of that commission than had been done in the previous eighteen years of its existence.

It is true we have high rates. We have rates out of all proportion to the value of farm products. Of that there is no question at all, and how it is to be cured is a very difficult problem indeed. But while we admit that such is the case it is still more the case right across the border to the south. Right across the border the rates were higher before the war, higher during the war, and they are higher to-day on farm products, and very substantially higher. They are much higher in proportion to the value of farm products than are their farm products higher than ours. Of those facts there can be no dispute. That, of course, does not remove the truth that farming cannot pay as it did, farming cannot be made even a substantial success, until the carriage of goods gets to be on a basis of price closer in accord with the value of the goods themselves. It is very easy to believe that that can be done merely by a stroke of the pen upon the part of those in authority. I venture to say this, that if the stroke of the pen had come, as my hon. friend from Macleod thinks it should have come at the time he complains of, the loss to this country in what would have been precipitated by it would have been far greater, I almost said unspeakably greater than the loss we have had to bear. There are times, there are circumstances when you can effect things, and times when you cannot. I am not here to discuss just how we are going to bring about a lowering of railway rates to the level of the products the railways carry. I am inclined to the view that considerable time is going to elapse before that better time will come, but in the meantime do not let us destroy the good work of years, do not let us bring down the standing of a judicial tribunal until it becomes a mere football between the parties in the House of Commons; do not let us have members of parliament running on platforms to remove this man and that man from the Bench or any judicial position. If they do, let us have a government and a prime minister who will not take them into cabinets thereby placing the seal of the government and of the prime minister upon the commitments of the candidate.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I do not want to get into a discussion on the immigration question because once that starts we do not know when it will end, but before this item passes I should like to say that before we start growing more grain we must have a reduction in the rates on grain or an increase in the price. Those of us who are farming in the West to-day know that it is an absurdity to think of growing more grain unless there is an improvement in conditions in some way or other. I do not like to discuss this rate problem from a western standpoint or an eastern standpoint, but from the Canadian standpoint. I have as much sympathy with the people of the Maritime provinces in their desire for a reduction of rates as I have with my own people in the West. I know conditions in that part of the country, and I know the people there have suffered a great deal. I am told on very good authority that last season no less than a million bushels of potatoes were spoiled in Prince Edward Island largely because there was not a sufficiently low rate to ship them out.

I think when we are discussing the responsibilities of the Railway Commission one of the troubles at least is that the commission has no control over a reduction of rates. I was reading a few days ago a pamphlet published, I think, by Mr. S. J. McLean, one of the Railway Commissioners, in which he stated he was surprised in looking over a

number of tariffs to find that at least fifty per cent were apparently reductions in rates. That seems to tell us a good deal. We are demanding reductions on certain basic commodities—lumber, potatoes, grain, cattle and various other things—and yet all the time there are voluntary reductions taking place over which the commission has no control. That I say tells us a good deal. It seems to me there is a good deal of favouritism, that certain interests are getting special privileges in regard to freight rates, and the commission have no control over that whatever. Let me refer to just one product. Bar iron from Sydney, Nova Scotia, goes clean across the continent to Vancouver for sixty cents a hundred. I think that there is no hon. gentleman in this House who will say that the railway can carry that at a profit. It is patent that it must be carried at a distinct loss. That means that a railway company engaged in carrying that product for less than it costs must a short time afterwards come to the Railway Commission and ask for an increase in rates on something else, and that is precisely what is happening to-day.

I cannot agree with any suggestion of doing away with the Railway Commision or crippling its powers. I would rather be inclined to increase its powers. I think that the Commission should have control over the downward revision of rates. Why should a railway have authority to carry some product for less than it costs for some privileged interest, probably with some of its large shareholders interested in the railway, for that is practically what it is? I have been going over a lot of these figures, and I have found some of them illuminating. I have found some things that cannot possibly be justified.

Let me give another commodity. Rice from Vancouver is handled at seventy-five cents a hundred to Calgary, yet that same rice is carried twenty-four hundred miles from there to Montreal for the same price; that means it is carried twenty-four hundred miles free. Now if the railway company is carrying rice for a distributor in Montreal twenty-four hundred miles for nothing it means that our potatoes, our cattle, our grain, and everything else must pay more in order to make up for that loss. That is really one of the problems we are facing to-day, and action is required along that line.

The Railway Commission has a great deal of responsibility, and I am not one of those who would try to increase their difficulties in any way, but I think some of these things should be looked into very carefully. As far as the East and West are concerned we know that the western rates are higher. The Railway Commission admits they are higher, and justifies the increased rate on account of the water competition in the East. That is one of the things that we hope one day will be wiped out. But I think these other discriminations in giving favoured rates to certain industries is one of the first things we should look into.

Item agreed to.

Civil government—Railways and Canals—salaries, including the Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals and Government Director of Canadian National Railways at $10,000, $208,970; contingencies, $38,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: The increase in this department is practically due to the increase in the amount paid to the deputy minister. The deputy minister receives $6,000 in that capacity and $2,000 as a director of the Canadian National Railways. I am asking the House to make his salary $10,000 which will include everything. He will not receive any remuneration as a director after this increase becomes effective.

Mr. GOOD: How does the minister justify the increase of $2,000?

Mr. GRAHAM: It is easily justified. The deputy minister is remaining in the department when he could go to a position at nearly double the salary he now receives. He has been in the public service for a great many years. I have induced him to remain in the department because I have to confess to the committee, and to the country as well, that Major Bell's services in the department under present conditions are absolutely indispensable. We have no other man who has such a knowledge as he has of the intricate operations of the different railways composing the National system, or who is so extremely well qualified to act in the dual capacity of deputy minister of the department and director of the National Railways. Frankly I do not know how I could replace Major Bell.

Item agreed to.

Arbitration and awards and costs of litigation, $2,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: This is an item which is voted every year. Sometimes we use it and sometimes we do not.

Item agreed to.

To supplement pension allowances payable under the provisions of the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railway Employees' Provident Fund Act so as to make the minimum payment, during the current fiscal year, the sum of $30 per month instead of $20 as fixed by the said act, $50,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: If any explanation is required, I would like to say the provision made

for the men in the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Provident Fund was $20 per month. It has been raised to $30 per month which requires the government to make a little larger contribution than it did before.

Mr. CALDWELL: What pension is granted to men that are retired from the service?

Mr. GRAHAM: This is a fund created under an Act. To this fund the men contribute themselves and the government has always subscribed a certain amount. In this way provision is made for the retirement of the men; it is a regular pension fund.

Mr. CAMPBELL: May I ask the minister if any request has been received for pensions in connection with two Prince Edward Island men who were killed on the Prince Edward Island railway last winter? While snow shovelling these men were caught in a very awkward position in a tunnel and both were killed. They left families who were dependent on them, and I understood some recommendations had been made to the department for the granting of pensions to those dependents. I should like to ask the minister if he knows anything about the matter?

Mr. GRAHAM: I think no such recommendation has been made up to the present time. Any recommendations or suggestions of this kind would go to the Canadian National Railway Board. They may be in the hands of the board at the present time, but have not reached the department so far as I have been able to learn.

Mr. CALDWELL: Such recommendations would have to be dealt with by the department would they not? The directors of the National Railways would not have the power to pension these families would they, the recommendation would have to come to parliament?

Mr. GRAHAM: I imagine it would at the present time, but we are endeavouring to get a pensions system that will cover all the railways. The Canadian Northern, for example, has no pension system for its men. As to this particular case I will make inquiries. Does my hon. friend know the names of the men?

Mr. CAMPBELL: Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM: I should like my hon. friend to send them to me.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): What progress is being made in the unification of the several systems that comprise the National Railways? To-night I received the railway report and there seems to be still a division of our railways into several systems. What headway is really being made in the direction of the unification of all these systems into one—a unification of classification the according of the same treatment to the employees in the matter of retiring allowances and other matters? There are many other things in respect of which there should be unification. You still see the names of the old companies on the railways. I made the suggestion some time ago that the government send out without delay a corps of painters to paint out the names "Grand Trunk," "Canadian Northern," and "Intercolonial". Let the government get to work and unify these systems, and make them national railways in the real sense of the term. I know that cannot be done in a day and I observe that some progress has been made, but has there been sufficient progress, and when will there be a real unification? For instance in reading the report to which I refer I see that more than one firm of auditors is engaged in the work of checking the accounts. Surely such a condition as that ought to be remedied. It has taken a long while to get the annual statement of the Canadian Pacific Railway into the shape in which it is to-day. However, the company have got it in excellent shape now and I think the government ought to try and follow a model of that kind in presenting the railway statement to the people of Canada who are, as the minister said a few moments ago, the shareholders and the only shareholders in this National system. Let us see if we cannot at the next meeting have one report. In the report to which I have already referred, and which was put into the post office to-night for the use of members, there is still a reference to the Grand Trunk as if it were a separate railway. I repeat my question: Will the minister tell us what progress has been made in the work of unification, in the systematizing of the accounting and bookkeeping—in a word the unification of all the factors that go into the making up of the entire system?

Mr. GRAHAM: The report to which my hon. friend refers is for the year ending December 31, 1922. The Grand Trunk only became part of the National Railway system in October of that year so it is impossible to have a consolidation of the accounting of the different lines for the year 1922. The Grand Trunk was run under a separate board altogether. We hope by next year to report on the accounting of the entire system as one body. I may point out to my hon. friend that for certain reasons we will have to be able to tell always how much, for example,

the Grand Trunk proper earned as it previously existed. There are financial reasons for that, and I think the same thing applies to the other systems. They will all have to be able to tell what they did as separate entities although the report itself will deal with the system as one. In its consolidated form I think that report when presented will be satisfactory to my hon. friend.

Mr. BAXTER: I do not know whether I am in error or not but I was under the impression that all the lines under the control of the government amounted, speaking roughly, to about 22,000 miles.

Mr. GRAHAM: The number is 22,600.

Mr. BAXTER: This pamphlet to which the hon. minister referred shows something over 17,000 miles. What is the explanation? Is it that the mileage in the United States is not included? What causes the discrepancy?

Mr. GRAHAM: I think the hon. member will find that the Grand Trunk is not included in that.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Where is the account, so far as the annual statement made to parliament is concerned, in connection with lines in the United States owned by the Grand Trunk? This is rather a significant question for us, very far reaching legislation is probably under way and the question of the ownership of certain lines in that country by the people of Canada may come up.

The CHAIRMAN: This item is for the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railway Employees' Provident Fund.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): When will the minister answer the question regarding Grand Trunk lines in the United States?

Mr. GRAHAM: The account of the Grand Trunk lines in the United States is all in the Grand Trunk report. It will come up next year. I gave the figures for every line in the United States in the statement I made to the House a few weeks ago.

Item agreed to.

Printing and stationery outside service, $7,000.

Mr. CALDWELL: Is this printing done by the Printing bureau?

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes.

Mr. SALES: Where is this service carried on? I want some particulars about it. A few weeks ago I happened to be travelling west on the Canadian Pacific Railway, and I found gentlemen travelling across the continent who did not know that the Canadian National Railway existed. They were from England and they never heard of the Canadian National Railway. I want to know what kind of service we have in the Old Country when it is possible for well-to-do individuals, travelling across this continent on business and pleasure, to know nothing whatever of the Canadian National Railway.

Mr. GRAHAM: This item is for printing of forms, and the like of that, for our canals and outside service. It has nothing to do with the railways. I think my hon. friend will not have reason to complain of the Canadian National not being known on the continent of Europe, at least, in a few months.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I think we will hear something about it very soon. I notice by to-day's paper that the Canadian National has opened very extensive and ex-
10 p.m. pensive quarters in Paris, and spent over $1,000,000, for business. Does the minister know anything about that? Does he think such an expenditure would be justified?

Mr. GRAHAM: The hon. member has not read the item aright. It has nothing to do with the matters to which he refers. It is not for our railways.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I am quite aware of that.

Item agreed to.

MINES DEPARTMENT

Mines and Geological Survey—Mines Branch—for investigation of mineral resources or deposits, of the mining and metallurgical industries, and of mineral technology; wages, expenses of testing and research laboratories. Investigations by, including salaries and all other expenses of, Dominion Fuel Board.	$200,000
For publications: English and French. Purchase of books, laboratory supplies, intruments, miscellaneous assistance and contingencies..	40,000
	$240,000

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is the reason for the increase in that?

Hon. CHARLES STEWART (Argenteuil, Minister of Mines): This is an increase of $55,500 over the vote of 1922-23, accounted for by the item to cover the expenditure of the Dominion Fuel Board and the additional amounts required by the Fuel Testing and Ore Dressing divisions. I will give the items, if it is considered desirable. I may say for the information of the committee, that we had inaugurated a fuel board consisting of representatives from the Department of Mines

and the Interior Department, purely for investigational purposes, not to interfere with the Federal Advisory Fuel Committee appointed for the purpose of securing a fuel supply. A proportion of the increase is for the purpose of carrying on this work. The following are some of the items:

I. Division of mineral resources $35,000 made up as follows:	
a. Investigation and estimation of bituminous sands of Alberta..	$ 9,000
b. Investigation and estimation of saline lake deposits of Western Canada..	13,000
c. Investigations in mineral technology and obtaining information with respect to the mineral resources and the mining industry..	13,000
II. Division of Fuel Testing including expenses of Dominion Fuel Board $100,000 made up as follows:—	
a. Salaries and wages..	$23,500
b. Additional labour when required..	1,000
c. Chemical laboratory supplies..	5,000
d. Machine shop supplies..	2,500
e. New Apparatus..	9,000
f. Investigations..	6,000
g. General investigations including expenses of Dominion Fuel Board..	53,000

I have a rather lengthy explanation that I was prepared to place upon Hansard, in order that we might have it upon record, and save reading it to the committee.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think we should know what is being done with this.

Mr. McBRIDE: Could the minister state whether he will be able to investigate the coal possibilities up around Hudson's Hope? There has been a good deal of talk about that country. I was up there in September last, but not having the time to stay there as long as I should have liked, I was able to see only the outskirts. I think it is important that the minister should make a thorough investigation into the possibilities of coal in that district as I intend to ask the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) to look into the question of running a railway line in there. I think it would help him quite a bit if he knew exactly what coal did exist in that locality.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Under this item there is an amount for the Dominion Fuel Board. I think the committee would be very much interested to know whether the minister has anything to report in regard to the coal situation throughout Canada generally. I am aware, of course, that a committee of the Upper House and a committee of this House as well are both dealing with this question; but we have also a Dominion Fuel Board in connection with which we vote a considerable sum of money annually; and if the minister could give any report from that board as to the prospect of fuel and an adequate coal supply for Canada for the next winter, I think it would be of considerable interest to the people of the central portions of the Dominion. It is stated that the coal situation is much better at the present moment than it was this time last year, and the prospect of strikes or difficulties in the coal areas in the United States is more than it was then. If the minister has anything in the way of information that would prove reassuring to the people, I am sure that the committee and the country would be glad to hear it.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): There is in sight no shortage of coal in Quebec or Ontario at the moment.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): But at what price?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): It is very doubtful whether the Dominion government, or any government for that matter, can control prices. That is a question of supply.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): But that is the vital question.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I hope my hon. friends are not expecting the Dominion government to do impossible things.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): They are.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Well, if they are—

Mr. MACLEAN (York): At least, the opportunity is open to the government to do something.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): If hon. gentlemen are expecting the government to control prices they are expecting the impossible. I do not think that even my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) expects that. The question of supply has a certain bearing on prices, I think he will admit. As I pointed out a moment ago to the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton), the department is not endeavouring to provide a supply; it simply undertakes to investigate possible sources of supply in the treatment of fuels. An investigation has been carried on having in mind the conditions to be met, because they are most acute. It does seem probable that the supply of anthracite coal will in the future be cut off from Canada, although this is not an immediate possibility. But there is a very considerable supply of bituminous coal to be had from Nova Scotia, and its treatment ought to be encouraged so that the coke may be utilized for domestic and commercial purposes in the province of Quebec. There has been a considerable agitation for the bringing of fuel from Alberta. After a

fairly thorough investigation I may say, Mr. Chairman, that that has resolved itself into a question of transportation. If rates can be cut down to the point where the fuel can be delivered in eastern Canada at a reasonable price to meet competition from the other side of the line, it has been established beyond doubt that Alberta coal will meet all demands that may be made upon it. In the meantime the work of the Dominion Fuel Board will be in the direction of research. The work planned includes:

(1) Investigation of the coking of coal for domestic use. Several plants have been erected in the United States for the purpose of coking bituminous coals in by-product recovery coke ovens with a main objective of manufacturing a domestic fuel and a gas suitable for domestic purposes.. Valuable by-products other than gas are recovered in the coking of bituminous coal according to this process namely, ammonia or ammonium sulphate and tar oils. By-product oven coke has met with such success in those cities where householders have been instructed how to burn it, that the Fuel Board considers that this class of fuel may be introduced into Ontario and Quebec as a substitute for anthracite coal (Pennsylvania).

(2) Central heating plants.

The Dominion Fuel Board is concerned not only with the finding of a substitute for anthracite coal but with such economies as can be effected in the use of coals for heating purposes. It appears to the board that the introduction of central heating plants in highly populated centres will result in considerable economies in the use of fuel through the use of lower grade, and hence cheaper, fuel, and through the elimination of the costs entailed in delivering coal to private dwellings and the removal of the ashes from these dwellings. In a central heating plant, the delivery of coal may be made at one point, and all the ashes will be removed from this point. Certain municipalities in the United States and in Europe are heated by central heating plants.

(3) The adaptation of present domestic heaters to other fuels.

In order to solve satisfactorily the problem of the fuel supply of the acute fuel area (the provinces of Ontario and Quebec) it is necessary that householders be assured not only of the required supply of coal, but that they may obtain this coal at the lowest possible cost. It is necessary that an investigation be undertaken with the objective of determining what alterations should or can be made in existing heaters to adapt them for burning bituminous and other coals.

Those are the three principal matters to be investigated. Then the programme provides for an investigation pertaining to the use of pulverized fuel and proceeds:

(4) The burning of pulverized fuels for generating steam for power, heating and other purposes has met with such signal success both in the United States and in Europe that it is necessary that an investigation be undertaken to ascertain whether Canadian fuels can be advantageously used in the pulverized form. The burning of fuels in the pulverized form permits of the use of the lower grade, hence cheaper, coals, and it is probable that an investigation may reveal that the low grade western lignites may be successfully used, for various purposes when pulverized, without heat or other treatment.

Then, the question of freight rates is discussed, but this I will not take up the time of the committee to read. I have already discussed the question briefly. The programme continues:

(6) An investigation on the limitation in Nova Scotia coal resources and the maximum possible annual output.

The possibility of introducing Nova Scotia coals into the provinces of Quebec and Ontario to reduce the imports of domestic and industrial coals from the United States is of such great importance to the solution of the fuel problem existing in the acute fuel area, that it is essential that a detailed investigation be undertaken to determine the available coal resources of Nova Scotia and the maximum possible annual output which can be economically maintained in order that the extent to which Nova Scotia coals can be depended upon to help out the fuel supply of the provinces of Quebec and Ontario may be known.

(7) An investigation of the possibility of securing and using Welsh anthracite for portions of eastern Canada.

Welsh anthracite has been prominently mentioned as a substitute for a portion of the anthracite annually imported into the provinces of Quebec and Ontario. In order to determine to what extent Welsh coal can be depended upon for this purpose it is necessary to investigate the conditions governing the mining of Welsh anthracite, the freight rates from the Welsh coal mines to Canadian ports and the cost of distributing from ports to places of consumption. This investigation will also inquire into the preparation which the Welsh coals should undergo in order to suit them to Canadian conditions, also the probable markets throughout the provinces of Quebec and Ontario for this fuel.

(8) Continuation of the investigation of the possibility of utilizing peat as a partial substitute for coal.

In view of the successful results of the investigation concerning the manufacture of peat fuel which has just been completed by the Peat Committee, appointed jointly by the federal government and the government of the province of Ontario, and the fact that the peat resources of Quebec and Ontario are of large extent and that the bogs which have been examined in detail contain sufficient peat to permit of a large annual production for many years in those two provinces, it is of great importance that this investigation be continued in order to determine logical sites—

Mr. MACLEAN (York): After twenty years experimenting we have no tangible results yet. When will the people of Ontario get cheap peat?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The investigation carried on by the two governments at the Alfred bog has resulted in the perfecting of a machine that will successfully manufacture peat. Some time ago the Ontario government expressed a desire not to continue the experiments any further, as it was now a problem for commercial enterprise.

Mr. BOYS: When the minister says peat has been manufactured, does he mean it can be manufactured to sell at a price which will enable it to compete with coal?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The cost delivered on board car is estimated at $3.50 per ton.

Mr. BOYS: Was the drying process by nature or artificial?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): By nature.

Mr. BOYS: Early in my life I lost all the money I ever had by investing it in a peat industry, so I know something about the subject. I wonder whether any invention has been perfected to dry peat successfully, because that was the trouble in the early days.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Climatic conditions will play a very important part in the tonnage; that is, if we have a very wet summer the drying process will be very slow. We have an engineer in this city who thinks he can perfect a compression process, but his view does not seem to be shared by the engineers of the various countries with whom we have exchanged reports.

Mr. BOYS: What is the nature of the manufactured article which the department is now putting out? Is it to be sold as dried by the sun, or as manufactured under pressure?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No, it is spread on the ground and allowed to remain until it is thoroughly dry, and then it is picked up and shipped ready for use.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): I would suggest to the minister that the practical solution of this fuel problem is by the application of the principle of public ownership, but it must be applied in a big way, just as the power problem was solved in Ontario. For ten or fifteen years now a system has been perfected of erecting batteries of coking ovens in large centres of population and treating coal in such a way that not only the gas but certain valuable by-products are produced. The city of Toronto ought to give leadership in this respect, either in conjunction with the Consumers' Gas Company or by buying out that company and establishing a big coking plant. It has been proved beyond doubt that the most economical and effective method of heating cities like Montreal and Toronto is by means of these big coking plants. The real solution of cheap heating in our larger cities is for the government to give some kind of leadership, or, failing the federal government, for the government of Ontario or the municipal authorities of Toronto to approach this question right here and now and see what can be done. When I went along the Toronto esplanade last week the outstanding feature along that four miles of waterfront was a continuous line of great steel cars carrying from fifty to seventy tons of anthracite coal. This coal was being put into sacks, transferred to big motor trucks and delivered to private houses. I imagine people are paying anything from $15 to $20 a ton for this anthracite, but everybody who has money is getting it, for he fears the government will do nothing, and no one wants to go through the experience endured last winter. I regret to say that the minister in bringing forward his estimates has only promises to make that further investigations will be conducted into the fuel problem. I approve of all he is doing, but he is not doing it quick enough or in a large enough way. Somebody outside ought to get busy. The province of Ontario ought to have another Beck to deal with the coal problem as the power problem was dealt with and solved years ago, that is, by co-operation and the elimination of shareholders' profits, the sole aim of the enterprise being public service. In England many large cities are being heated by central plants where the coal is coked and many valuable by-products are recovered. What can be done in the way of a solution? Investigations and reports are all right in their way, but we want action. How are the people of the cities of Canada to secure a supply of coal for the coming winter at a reasonable price and so avoid the experience of former years, but especially of last year? If the minister has some plan of that kind let him give it to us, so that progress will be made in the direction of relief.

Mr. CHURCH: I do not desire to oppose this vote. I have no doubt the increase is necessary. The people are not worrying about the resources of this country; the resources are there, in any event. The Department of Mines has done very good work in this connection, and the money has been well expended. But what the people of Canada are worrying about is where the next winter's supply of coal is to come from. There has been a great deal of discussion on this subject in both Houses of parliament; two committees have met and considered it, but we seem to be going round in a circle; we are just where we were twelve months ago. It is not a matter of research at all; the deposits are there; the question is how to get the coal out; it is a transportation question solely. I am sorry that the Railway Commission has not stepped in and taken hold of the matter. The rate on Alberta coal to central Ontario has been quoted at $9 per ton in train lots, but there has been no actual demonstration of the feasibility of bringing the coal here in train lots; the only demonstration has been in connection with the carrying of grain to the head of the lakes. It would appear that

the head of the National Railways would rather quote a prohibitive figure of $9 and get no business than quote a price of $5 or $6 and get the cream of the business.

Mr. CARROLL: I do not think it is altogether fair for my hon. friend to discuss this matter, in view of the fact that the committee, of which my hon. friend himself is a very active member, will be bringing in a report on this subject in a few days' time.

Mr. CHURCH: I am not criticizing the committee; they have done a lot of good work and have procured a great deal of valuable information. I appreciate the fact that the government has done a great deal to try and reach a solution of the problem. That cannot be done in twenty-four hours, in six months or a year; it is a matter to be worked out in the days that are to come. But the average man is much disappointed, in view of the vast expenditure on the railways and canals of this country, in the failure to arrive at an arrangement which would enable these resources of western Canada and of the Maritime provinces to be brought to Ontario and Quebec. Where is the Railway Commission in this connection? They have not laid down a tariff for the carrying of coal to central Canada from east and west, although the commission was set up for the very purpose of regulating and fixing prices for transportation, especially of our basic products. I am sorry to see our merchant marine being sold, because I believe some of the smaller ships could bring coal from the Maritime provinces right up to the central provinces. In the early days the Canadian Pacific Railway had to carry many basic products at a loss; they did so with recurring deficits, and they struggled in those years until they made the business pay and had a surplus. I suggest that if nothing else can be done some bonus system should be worked out. The bonus system is not new in Canada; the railways were largely subsidized by bonuses. The railways to-day are carrying certain basic products to the head of the lakes at a cut rate and in my opinion they should do so with coal. Something should be done to get the coal out, because according to the coal commissioners of the province the same condition will exist next year and we will be as we were last year—people struggling round the coal offices trying to get half a ton of coal. If we bonused the transportation of this product for one winter or two or three winters we might find it to be best in the long run. The other day the Dominion Coal Company in Nova Scotia sent 30,000 tons of coal over to Holland; that coal was badly needed in central Canada. Let the coal be carried at $5 or $6 a ton and if necessary put an amount in the estimates to cover the difference. Let us have a fair trial of this thing; if there is a deficit one year I venture to say that in two or three years there would be a surplus in the transportation of that basic product, and we would be giving employment to our own workmen and doing something to solve the transportation problem. The government, the Railway Commission—all these different bodies should get together and see whether a price cannot be fixed, even if only as an emergency measure. The Interstate Commerce Commission of the United States had to take action along similar lines. The privately-owned railways over these were quoting prohibitive prices for the transport of coal, and people in places like Cincinnati, Pittsburgh, Cleveland, Erie, Pennsylvania, places quite near the coal mines, were paying high rates of transportation. The Interstate Commerce Commission had the various bodies before them and they fixed a rate. That is what the Railway Commission here should do. Formerly 55 per cent of the coal shipments were carried by boat to lake Erie and lake Ontario ports; to-day not three per cent of it is conveyed by water—and why? I do not say there is an arrangement in restraint of trade, but there is a business arrangement under which the rates are fixed and it is decided how the coal shall be carried from the mines in Pennsylvania and elsewhere to lake Erie and lake Ontario ports and solely by rail. It is arranged that all the coal must go through the Niagara district by train to the cities, towns and villages of western Ontario. I say there is no product that is more deserving of bonus than coal is, because it is an actual necessity the same as food. This is the most important problem that the people of Canada have before them at the present time, and I hope that the government will find it possible to take some action in the matter that will afford the necessary relief.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: It is very gratifying indeed to note that our friends from Toronto are beginning to realize what it means to pay the high freight rates from Alberta down to Ontario. I would remind them that some of us up there have been paying those rates for nearly forty years. Nobody ever suggested that we should get a bonus. As a matter of fact, last year when we were wanting to get what was coming to us under the Crowsnest pass agreement and seeking to have it restored, our friends from Toronto though that a heinous proposition. Coal for the province of Ontario

is dependent upon what the people there are prepared to pay for Alberta coal. If they are prepared to pay the freight rate, plus the cost of mining, there is an abundance of coal there for all kinds of time. Our friends are suggesting a freight rate, and I understand the railways have offered a minimum freight rate, the lowest rate they can make without losing money. There is no need of anybody freezing to death next winter if they are prepared to buy this coal from Alberta or any other part of the West, and there is all kinds of it. Do they expect the government to fill all their cellars with coal? For ten years I had in a small way the supervision of the forwarding of coal during the congestion periods in Saskatchewan when the grain rush was on, and I know something of the difficulties associated with the movement of coal by railways during the grain congestion period. There is a certain amount of assistance a government can give in the way of investigational work, but to undertake to supply the domestic requirements of coal for a people, when all they have to do is to make provision for themselves, that is out of the question. There is coal and an abundance of it if they are prepared to pay the price. So far as a bonus is concerned, if our friends down here require a bonus to haul their coal from Alberta, I do not know that I will object to it so much; I sympathize with them on this long haul, but when discussing freight rates again, and the whole Crowsnest agreement is not restored yet—we are paying for these long hauls and have been doing it for forty years, some of us—I would like to see the sympathy reciprocated a little more in the future than it has been in the past.

Mr. McBRIDE: I want to say a word in connection with the peat proposition. Before I came to Canada I had a good deal of experience in connection with peat, and any peat I have seen in Canada I would consider only third-rate quality. Two tons of dried peat are equal to about one ton of coal. I do not say I have seen the best of the peat in Canada but I would think that one ton of coal would equal three tons of it, and unless you can contrive some system of pressing it and making it different to anything I have ever seen the sooner you forget about it the better it will be for all concerned.

It has been said that the ships of the merchant marine could be used for bringing coal up the St. Lawrence river and up into the lakes. It would be small boats that would be used for that purpose, any of them that would be used, and those boats cannot be used successfully for that purpose. They are built for ocean-going purposes, not for canal work, and if you load those boats down they have too great a draft of water.

The question I rose to ask the minister, and I think he was going to answer when the hon. member for South York rose was this: Does he intend to make any investigation this year into the coal deposits at Hudson's Hope? I have been told by men who know a good deal about mining that the best prospects of anthracite coal in Canada are in that district.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York): In what province?

Mr. McBRIDE: In British Columbia at Hudson's Hope, in the Peace River country. According to reports that have been made it is the best anthracite coal in the world outside of Welsh coal. I do not say that is so but I would like to know whether it is or not and I would like the minister to say whether he can investigate that coal area this summer.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I personally was interested in the reports as to the quality of the coal my hon. friend speaks of. That country is away to the westward of the Grand Prairie country in the Rocky mountains. As my hon. friend knows, there is an arrangement between this government and the government of British Columbia for geological work, and usually the request as to areas to be investigated comes from the provincial government. Investigation has not been thorough in that area chiefly because it is so far removed from transportation facilities. I know that suggestions have been made for boring and tests of the coal he speaks of, but that would have to be undertaken by the British Columbia government, which owns the natural resources. Our work is simply investigational. We do not pursue our investigations to the point of making tests of the finds. I do not think we have a party in that area this year. I have not a list of the areas to be investigated in British Columbia before me, but I think I am safe in saying that no party will go into that area this year for investigational work. There has been a provincial party in there investigating for oil, and a Dominion party has been engaged the last year making a thorough investigation of the coal deposits.

Mr. BOYS: I note that there is an increase of $55,000 in this item over last year. What portion if any of this vote is set apart in connection with coal or a coal supply?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): As I tried to point out in the beginning of the discussion,

we do not consider it our duty to provide the supply. What we are endeavouring to do is to investigate the possibilities of using the lower grade bituminous coals that can be procured from Canada and the United States and treating them so that they will take the place of anthracite. Then there is the other vital question, that of freight rates. So far as the Alberta product is concerned that does not need investigation so far as the Mines department is concerned. It is a question of transportation pure and simple. There is no treatment of the Alberta product required. That has been demonstrated both in Toronto and this city so that the problem of using Alberta coal is simply one of transportation, and if the rate can be reduced to a level that will make it possible to bring that coal down here, that problem will be solved.

There seems to be on the part of the committee an intimation that the government should do something to secure a supply of coal. We have a committee, headed by Mr. Magrath, which has been working more or less on the question of distribution. We have not interfered in that field at all, but there is a bituminous field in the United States close to the city of Toronto that we are investigating. Perhaps that coal could be used in central heating plants or be coked, using the by-products, turning the gas, for instance, into the gas mains and utilizing it for heat and light if necessary. The other by-products would also find a ready market in Toronto. I am told that that coal can be delivered in Toronto for around $7 a ton to-day even at the high rates of transportation prevailing, and that it could be made into a product that could be sold reasonably at ten or eleven dollars a ton, and that it would be equal to anthracite. That is a problem of investigation that we are now working on. If the municipality of Toronto or the provincial government desires to undertake distribution or even to set up a coking plant, there is nothing in the world to prevent them.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York): That is practical politics.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): We are making that investigation, and we shall put that information in their hands. But to say that we should assure the people of Toronto of a supply of fuel next winter, that is scarcely the business of the government. I want to make that very clear. There is just one other problem. The Water Powers branch are working in connection with the Fuel Board as Mr. Challies, who is director of the Water Powers branch, is also a member of the Fuel Board.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Have you finished reading the memorandum? We shall not know all about it until it is finished.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil) (Reading):

(9) Canada possesses large undeveloped water powers and these have come to be considered by many people as a possible source of electric energy that might be used for heating houses and buildings. It is important that the physical and economic limitations of the use of electric energy for house heating purposes should be thoroughly investigated. The Dominion Fuel Board includes as one of its members the Director of the Water Powers branch, Department of the Interior, and can appropriately undertake a study of the subject.

And then there is (10) the question of house construction in order that better insulation be developed. That, of course, does not apply to buildings already constructed. That is the programme that the fuel committee have laid out for investigation and for which we are asking the sum of $53,000.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Is there any other survey of the water powers going on now independently of that conducted by the Mines department?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The Water Powers branch are making all the investigations as regards water powers generally in Canada.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Would that include the requirements of the National Railways? For instance I am told they are taking into consideration very seriously the development of electrical energy for traction purposes along the Transcontinental railway, and that they are actually negotiating with the provincial governments concerned for some kind of an arrangement as to the utilization of these water powers. Does that come under the Department of the Interior?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The Water Powers branch gathers available data of the possibilities of water powers generally throughout Canada. That work is not confined to any particular province but is carried on in all the provinces of Canada, so that it is possible to furnish data regarding the power to be developed at any given point where development could take place. That is the work of the Water Powers branch.

Mr. CARROLL: I do not think it hurts the various departments of the government to be criticized occasionally by the very faithful followers of the administration. Objection may not, perhaps, be raised to the passage of

this vote for ascertaining whether or not we may be able to treat American bituminous coal in the various cities of Ontario in order to get a supply of fuel from this source. I should rather think, however, that the Mines department of this country should exercise its intellect, and employ its knowledge in showing parliament and the country whether or not it is possible to bring the bituminous coal of eastern Canada and the bituminous coal of western Canada into the central cities of the provinces of Quebec and Ontario, there to be manufactured into coke and so take the place of the anthracite which we have been importing from the United States.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): May I interrupt the hon. gentleman to say that is exactly what we propose to do. The same treatment will be applied to the bituminous coal of the Maritime provinces as to the bituminous coal of the West. Let me say to my hon. friend that I have no desire to encourage the use of United States fuel at the expense of the Canadian fuel.

Mr. CARROLL: Then I misunderstood the minister. I should rather think the first thing this government, or any Canadian government, would do would be to investigate the possibilities of a Canadian supply. If, as the result of future investigations, they find that they are unable to obtain a supply of fuel in this country, then they might turn their thoughts to the United States. When I spoke as I did a few minutes ago of my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Church) who has been a live wire in our committee and who has taken more interest in the committee on Mines and Minerals—which is now holding sittings for the first time I think in twenty years—than any other member I can now point my finger at, I thought perhaps we had better leave the discussion of this question until the report of that committee was brought down. However, the minister has brought in an estimate with respect to fuel which affords us an opportunity of discussing this question. I still think I must have misunderstood the minister, or he did not make the matter quite plain to me. In his answer to my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Church) I understood him to say that this $53,000 was for the purpose of treating United States coal in order to obtain a supply of fuel for Canada. Now, this whole matter has been fully investigated by both the Senate committee and the House of Commons committee. I am not suggesting that the minister hold this vote over, but I would ask him to consider very seriously the spending of any money in an investigation looking to the United States for a supply of coal. The very purpose of the inquiry of both committees has been, as I understand it, to ascertain whether or not Canada is to-day in a position to supply the fuel demands of this country. I for one would rather object to spending our money for any other purpose than to ascertain whether we may entertain the hope in the near future of being able to supply the national demands from domestic sources. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that this is a most serious question. I agree with my hon. friend, the member for North Toronto, that it is the most serious question that has arisen in Canada for some time. If we had a thousand war ships on the Great Lakes in the event of a war with the United States—which God forbid may ever become a fact—that would avail us nothing under present conditions in Canada, because the United States could cut off our fuel supply in twenty-four hours. In that short period of time we would have to capitulate to every demand that might be made upon us to the great republic to the south. Therefore in that respect the fuel question is of national importance and demands the serious consideration of parliament and the country.

The Minister of Agriculture said a moment ago that we have been labouring under the difficulty of freight rates for years. I would like to show him a few telegrams which were sent a few days ago to our committee by the coal operators of the West. Perhaps the minister has seen those telegrams. When Sir Henry Thornton made his railway rate of $9 a ton for the transportation of fuel from the coal fields of Alberta to the various centres in the East, he suggested that the coal operators, and others interested, might join in cutting down their profits.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Hear, hear.

Mr. CARROLL: I want to tell the Minister of Agriculture that we got very little encouragement from the coal operators of the West in that respect. They simply said that it was impossible for them to get coal into Ontario at a freight rate of $9 a ton, but they made no comment as to whether or not they would contribute in reducing the cost in order that coal might be brought to the people who needed it. That is one of the things, I think, Sir Henry Thornton intended to bring very forcibly to the coal operators of this country. Therefore, when you talk

about freight and lake rates, and similar charges, do not lay the whole blame for existing conditions on the railroads of Canada. If this is becoming a national question, as it undoubtedly is, I think a conference should be held in the immediate future between representatives of the Dominion government and the various local governments so that the whole matter may be gone into in a very searching manner.

No company in this country owns the coal deposits. In the prairie provinces I presume they are owned by the Dominion government. In the Maritime and older provinces they are owned by the local governments, and while I do not wish to make any accusations against operators or persons who are carrying coal, I would say the time has come, Mr. Chairman, when the cards of the various provinces should be laid on the table, and when there should be an open conference with the coal operators of the country, and they should be brought to a realization of the fact that the coal industry of Canada is a national asset, not owned by any company, not owned by any man, but owned by the people at large. I am in hopes that will be one of the things our committee will recommend to the members of this House. I do not wish to criticize the item, but I say, in view of the treatment which has been accorded to Canada in the last year, that I, as a humble member and faithful follower of this government, would suggest that they should go slowly in spending any part of this $53,000 towards advertising American wares in the shape of coal shipped into this country. Perhaps I misunderstood the minister. I know he is just as true a Canadian as I am, and perhaps better, but, in view of all the circumstances, I would think the energies of his department should be directed more closely towards a very sincere investigation of the possibilities of a home supply for Canada than the probabilities of our demand being satisfied from a foreign country.

Mr. MILLAR: I wish to press a certain matter on the minister briefly. I had a conversation with a mining engineer a week ago, and I had intended to get my information in better shape before the item came up; still I think I can give him the kernel of the conversation. This conversation showed the necessity of getting accurate reports in regard to our natural resources. This gentleman did not mention this matter by way of criticism of the department, and yet the conversation developed a weak spot. He stated that on one occasion the engineer representing the department brought in some samples from mines located away out in the extreme north that tested out very good indeed. He and some friends had some interests near at hand, and sent out representatives to get samples of ore, and found the samples tested very poorly. They wondered that there was such a discrepancy and where the fault lay. They sent out a second group of prospectors, with the same result. His explanation was that the samples that had been taken by the representative of the department had been salted, if hon. members are familiar with that term, and he remarked that if one were going to be entirely accurate it was necessary almost to lock up his samples after he had taken them, lest some sharper might drop something into them in order to give an entirely false report. He and his friends had been put to the expense of some thousands of dollars just because the report was not accurate. This shows the necessity of obtaining accurate information.

In regard to coal, it strikes me it would be most difficult—and I would be glad to think it would be possible—to bring Alberta coal to Ontario and sell it for ten or eleven dollars per ton. Some hon. members do not seem to wish to continue this
11 p.m. discussion, but I have not taken very much time and I did not introduce it. The question has been introduced and discussed at considerable length. Some people have thought that the coal we have been discussing is not going to give satisfaction, and that it will slack. I have used this coal entirely for two years. I have found no difficulty with the coal slacking. Sometimes I have had tons left over in the spring of the year, and have used them in the fall and found no difficulty from slacking. It is simply a question of freight rates, as to whether it is going to be possible to bring coal from Alberta to Toronto and sell it for $9 or $10 a ton. I and others in my town paid last winter $13 a ton on the car. Either it is a case of paying very exorbitant freight rates, or else it will be impossible to bring it to Ontario and sell it in Toronto for $10 or $11 a ton. I would be glad to think it could be done, and that we could save the $60,000,000 that goes to the United States annually for coal. I can see one of our difficulties that has not yet been touched on in the debate. Perhaps some hon. gentlemen who have a lot of labour people in their constituencies are a little reluctant about touching on it. One of the great difficulties is the problem presented by labour. I believe a great many in the ranks of labour are not

receiving too much. A great many who are serving on railways are not receiving too much, but I am convinced there are a goodly number receiving far too much. Here is the way it works out. I had a talk with a friend last fall who stated he had stayed over in the north country with a repairer of engines who, in the course of conversation had said, "I have been able to count 25 hours a day for the last three months". "Well" my friend "when do you sleep?" "Oh" he said, "you doubt it. I will show you by my book. If I work half an hour I am paid for half a day, and if I work after hours I am paid time and a half." And he went on to say further that the engineer helped him out some. He said, "If an engineer comes in at five in the afternoon the engine is not reported till after six. In that way I get paid time and a half for repairing, but if an engine arrives in the morning, say at five o'clock, that engine is reported at once. It may be too warm so that I cannot repair it at once, but it is reported, and being reported at once I get paid time and a half for repairing it." You may say this is just hearsay but it did not pass through very many mouths—just one—before it reached me. From other sources, from men in the offices, I have gathered the same information. In that way some men are able to draw far more pay than they have a right to.

Mr CARROLL: Do you get your information from railway employees who are drawing the overtime?

Mr. MILLAR: Yes.

Mr. CARROLL: Then, it is perfectly correct?

Mr. MILLAR: A conference was mentioned a few moments ago by the member who has asked me the question. It seems to me something might be done by a conference between labour, capital and representatives of the government. In many cases unemployed workmen are not only anxious but willing to work for a fair wage but they are unable to secure employment because others in the ranks of labour are demanding more than they are entitled to, and are thereby stifling industry. There would be a great deal more employment if these high wages were not demanded. The railways would be able to carry freight for much less and that would give an impetus to mining and make it possible to bring coal from Alberta to Ontario and sell it at a reasonable price. That is one way in which a conference could accomplish a great deal of good. I do not wish to prolong the discussion, but I would offer the same suggestion put forward by an hon. gentleman from Toronto; I should be sorry to see the ships belonging to the Merchant Marine sold. I think they should be kept, in view of the combine which we have seen on the lakes. I think it might be well to keep them in use.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): The minister gave some fragmentary information with respect to the experiments in connection with peat. I did not gather how much it was proposed to expend during the coming year or whether in the minister's opinion the very large amount spent in the past along this line with the comparatively meagre results obtained justifies any further experiments.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I thought I had made it clear that it was the opinion of both governments, who were joint participants in the experiment, that the machinery had been developed up to that point where they could say that the experiment was completed. They were not in the business of manufacturing any large amount of fuel but were simply developing the machinery up to the point where it could be established that it could produce fuel economically. There is no expenditure in connection with that work for the coming year.

Mr. GOULD: We are trying to believe that it is the policy of the government to economise this year, and in this regard I must call the attention of the minister to the fact that he is commencing with Assiniboia. Last year we had a vote for the briquetting plant at Bienfait, which is in the electoral district of Assiniboia; that vote is absent this year. Can the minister give us any information concerning the condition of affairs in that locality to-day?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The briquetting plant at Bienfait has been carried on under the supervision of a separate board and not under the department at all. The endeavour to carbonize coal, I may say, has not been successful. A great deal of money has been spent on the experiment, which I think has proved a failure, that is to say, in the direction in which it has been carried on. We did investigate last winter the use of a carbonizer which was developed at an American university by the American Bureau of Mines, and, to test that carbonizer, they are now building a unit at an expense of $1,600. That is all we propose to do in this direction.

Mr. GOULD: I understand that the appropriation last year was not all expended and that the minister is now going to use the

balance of it. I do not wish unduly to delay the passing of the item, but I did think that this was an opportune time to secure some information concerning the plant at Bienfait. I have been receiving reports all along giving much the same information that the minister has submitted to the committee. It seems to me that when we are expending so much money for laboratory and other investigational work, something should be done to see whether the vast deposits of lignite in that district might not be rendered of some use to the people, to provide either energy of some nature or an auxiliary heating power. Has this question been given any consideration at all?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Item agreed to.

Mines—salaries and contingencies, $539,890.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Like other items, this shows a large increase. How is the minister expecting to pay off the national debt this way?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The statutory increases amount to $14,755. The new positions are three; there were 228 last year as against 231 this year. These three new positions are to be filled by officers who will be in the Fuel Testing division, engaged in the very work we have been discussing; that is to say, an engineer grade No. 3, at $2,700, an assistant chemist at $2,100, and a junior chemist at $1,680, making a total of $6,480. Reclassification accounts for $3,792.50. These, together with the statutory increases of $14,755, make up the total increase of $25,027.50.

Mr. MEIGHEN: You can always make up an increase if you employ a sufficient number of new men and do not get any extra services from the men you already have, while their salaries are moving up. The increase of salaries implies that extra services are being obtained for it. Every few days we get an advertisement from the Civil Service Commission wanting to appoint this, that, and the other man at large or comparatively large salaries, for some new positions that are created. If this goes on, where are we going to land? If we look for reductions we find them only in connection with help given by the Dominion to provinces or municipalities, thereby saving the taxpayers' money paid to those authorities. The increases come in the civil government estimates in the various departments one after the other; they are going on apparently recklessly. This relatively is an enormous increase—$25,000. At this rate of increase per year the department is going to reach the dimensions of the Interior department. Why all these chemists? I was only in charge of the Mines department a very short time, and the department ended with fewer chemists while I was there.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I am advised that during the period of the war the department was almost denuded of chemists, they being attracted from the service by various commercial enterprises. The same applies to the engineers in this particular department. If there is an excuse for an expenditure in any department of government, I do think it is in the Mines department in which an attempt is made to ascertain the amount of our natural resources and their utilization, and of course chemists play a very important part in any development of this character. The three additional chemists that I am asking for this year will be utilized, as I pointed out a few minutes ago, in carrying on the fuel investigation.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There was some reduction all right, and there was a very considerable censure upon us for not reducing the staff still more; but the process is now in operation. It is true we need chemists, but I do think if you have a limited number of good, faithful men, and they are made to understand that they must concentrate their work upon purely practical ends, we will get as good results at far less cost to the country. The temptation of the permanent heads to enlarge the operations under them is very great, and the pressure from those heads is always upon the minister to accede to their demands, but I would warn the minister not to be too easily impressed even by the best of deputies—and I think he has one of the best in that department.

Item agreed to.

Dominion of Canada Assay Office—for maintenance of assay office, Vancouver, B.C., $26,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is this for the assaying of minerals?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The assay office was created to provide a place where Canadian producers might dispose of their gold.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They took the whole amount voted last year?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Any Governor General's warrants besides?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No.

Item agreed to.

Progress reported.

Mr. FIELDING: Number 27.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the minister intend to go on with more business to-night? What has become of the new clock reforms of the government? We are now twenty minutes after eleven. A lot of business has been put through without any delay except on the part of the faithful supporters of the government behind him.

Mr. FIELDING: I am not complaining at all. I think we have had a very pleasant evening, but it is so pleasant I thought the Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin) might be permitted to finish up his Bankruptcy Bill to-night.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is no chance of that to-night.

Mr. FIELDING: In that case we will have to move that the House do now adjourn.

On motion of Mr. Fielding the House adjourned at 11:20 p.m.

Tuesday, May 29, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—PARIS OFFICES

On the Orders of the Day:

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, in the press of yesterday an announcement appears that Sir Henry Thornton, on behalf of the Canadian National Railways, has bought a large block of real estate in the city of Paris, France, at a cost approaching two milion dollars. Has the government any information on the subject?

Hon. George P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways): Mr. Speaker, the Canadian National Railway board is doing something towards securing suitable quarters for the system in Paris, which, I believe, if brought to a conclusion, would afford accommodation for other departments of government as well. I have not the particulars, I will ask for them.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This undoubtedly would be a capital investment, and therefore would require the previous consent of the government. Has the government given its consent to the purchase of real estate in the city of Paris?

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. GRAHAM: No, not up to the present time.

SIR HENRY THORNTON

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. MEIGHEN: Some days ago it was brought to the attention of the government that Sir Henry Thornton was reported to have become a director of Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, and the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) promised an investigation. Has the investigation been made, and is the report correct?

Mr. GRAHAM: The minister did not promise an investigation; no such word was used. Sir Henry Thornton—as did his predecessor—has accepted a place on the board of the Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, for reasons which are apparent to men engaged in the transportation business.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What are they?

Mr. GRAHAM: There are traffic arrangements between Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, and the Canadian National Railways, and it is thought expedient that some member of the Canadian National Railway Board should be on the directorate of Canada Steamship Lines, Limited.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister should remember that the fact that the Canada Steamship Company was doing business with the Canadian National was urged very strongly by his Prime Minister as a reason why Mr. Hanna should not be on that board rather than as a reason why he should be.

ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAYS

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (North Toronto) Mr. Speaker, some time ago I asked the government if it was its intention to continue negotiations with the United States in regard to the St. Lawrence deep waterways. The reply I got was not very satisfactory; it was simply to the effect that the time was not opportune for dealing with the matter. Would it not be possible during the recess for the government to obtain reports as to the engineering and financial features of the project and continue these negotiations? I should like to know how the matter stands.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I would not say, Mr. Speaker, that negotiations have been discontinued. A certain question was asked us by the American government, to which we replied. No further communication has been received from Washington, and that is where

the matter stands at present. Whenever it is re-opened the government will be pleased to consider any further representations that may be made.

Mr. CHURCH: Have negotiations been broken off altogether?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think it would be more correct to say they are being continued to the extent I have indicated. That is assuming the term negotiations may be correctly applied to what has already taken place.

BANKRUPTCY ACT AMENDMENT

House again in committee on Bill No. 139, to amend the Bankruptcy Act, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

On section 13—Composition, extension or scheme of arrangement.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: We had a good deal of discussion on this section, and the minister rather agreed with some of the arguments made by the hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Clark) as to the advisability of continuing a scheme which enabled businesses to carry on which otherwise would be ruined.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: The original clause has given rise to more abuses than any other part of the act. Many debtors have made offers of composition which were duly approved by the creditors on the condition that the payment of debt should be made in instalments. The debtors retained possession of their assets and continued their business, but failed to pay the instalments and subsequently assigned when there was nothing left for the creditors. After the first reading of this bill a number of commercial associations met in Toronto and they united in recommending, in effect, that this amendment be adopted. I can mention the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, the Canadian Credit Men's Association, Retail Merchants' Association, Wholesale Grocers' Association, Dominion Loan Companies' Association. In view of these representations we do not see how we could reasonably withdraw an amendment which is of so great importance.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend gives me the names of some very estimable organizations that may or may not have really studied this subject. I would be more concerned in knowing what the real troubles are. This whole matter of a voluntary arrangement rests with the creditors; it is for them to say whether or not it shall be entered into. I realize there may be default in the payment of instalments; there are broken promises everywhere, and that is why it is necessary to have a bankruptcy law. But after all, is it not a matter for the creditors to say, whether or not it would be a good thing to enable a particular concern to carry on a little longer?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: An informal arrangement or composition can at any time be made with creditors. The fact is that this amendment was suggested to meet the wish of the creditors, or of the traders who are the creditors of to-morrow. In England there is no such composition or asignment as we have it; such arrangement can be made only after a receiving order or an assignment. And there is good reason for that. Under the English law, when there is an assignment the debtor does not remain in possession of his assets, but in our case he continues in business, disposes of the goods, and in seventy-five cases out of one hundred subsequently assigns, leaving nothing for his creditors. My hon. friend suggests that the present arrangement may be very advantageous both to debtor and to creditors. That may have been the case in one or two instances, but our information is that in a great number of cases it has been to the disadvantage of the creditors, and that is why we offer the amendment.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I still do not see the necessity for the amendment. The creditors, after all, have to agree to the whole thing if any order is made in bankruptcy. And there is this to be remembered: so soon as a bankruptcy order is made, just so soon is the firm or partnership in question put in a very difficult position as to carrying on business again. I really do not see why the creditors should want to have the matter taken out of their hands and have it provided that there must be court proceedings before a binding composition can be made.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: The amendment was asked for last year, and we thought we should not immediately adopt it; they have asked for it again this year. I do not see why we should not proceed according to that request.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend hears only from a certain number of them. I would remind him again that he is legislating, that parliament is legislating, not the people who are making these representations. If he has evidence that it is a bad thing to allow people to make these arrangements or to let them have the right to make them, that is another matter.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: There have been a great number of abuses. The first objection

we ever heard to the amendment was made in this House.

Section agreed to.

On section 15—Appointment of trustee.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: In order to meet the objection offered by the hon. member for St. John City (Mr. Baxter) we might add after the word "creditors" in the third line of subsection 2 the following words: "at which two-thirds of the proved creditors are represented." That is to say, no removal can take place unless two-thirds of the creditors are represented at the meeting where such a proposal is made.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I suppose if my hon. friend takes the same position that he did before, that position being that he has determined upon changing the form of the appointment of the trustees—

Sir LOMER GOUIN: That was adopted by the House, I understand.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I understood that the main question had not been adopted by the House, that the form was to be changed. This is the section which says that the creditors at the first meeting shall appoint by ordinary resolution any person but the official receiver as trustee for the administration of the estate. So we are dealing with that now. I want to reiterate very briefly the position we have taken, so that there shall be no doubt that the House recognizes what we are doing in doing this. I have had only one complaint from Ontario against the present law, and that complaint had to do with the same company of whom complaints were made in the province of Quebec, a credit association making itself too busy and going around practically trying to push people into bankruptcy. Apart from that I have heard no complaints whatever as to the method in which the appointments work out in Ontario. I have heard of nothing from other provinces, and my friend from St. John tells us that it is working very, very well down there. I do not think the hon. minister has heard of many complaints from anywhere except the province of Quebec, where both of us appointed too many people. My plea to the minister before was this: Would it not be better, rather than changing the whole system that is working well in every province of this Dominion except Quebec, to undo what was done wrong in Quebec and start Quebec aright? I again point out that we shall have delays, we are bound to have delays, that we have gentlemen made official receivers who know absolutely nothing about ordinary commercial business and are very ill-fitted to discharge those duties. Then we have the custodian. I again point out that we have opportunities for three different sets of costs, that we have opportunities for delay, and so far as I have heard there is only one reason why all these things are to be done, and that is because too many trustees were appointed in the province of Quebec. I do not know whether my hon. friend has reasons other than what we have heard in the House, but if he has not, it does appear to me that a great mistake is being made.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: The complaints did not come only from Quebec. Some came from the province of Ontario also. But even supposing that such complaints should come only from one province we are here legislating for the whole country, and we are trying to make this a permanent law. As I have had occasion to say before, we have had many bankruptcy laws and all of them have had to be repealed.

My hon. friend says that all the provinces except Quebec are satisfied with the present system. Now if by changing the mode of appointment of the trustees and adopting the system that is in existence in some other countries in place of this one which is not known anywhere in the world except in Canada, we can satisfy one or two provinces and make it so that there will be no more complaints against the system, and have a law of bankruptcy that will be accepted by the whole Dominion, I think we shall have accomplished something. From what I know of the province of Quebec, even if the number of trustees was less than it is to-day, even if it were reduced by fifty per cent or more, I sincerely believe that the system of to-day would never work, and that we should adopt the system that they have in England and the United States, leaving it to the creditors to choose the trustee. After all, they are the most interested parties, and I cannot understand why we should leave it to the debtor to choose the liquidator. It seems to me the creditor should have that choice. In all sincerity I think that we should adopt the system that we now propose, and if we do so, I trust that not only Quebec but all the provinces will accept permanently this bankruptcy law.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Mr. Chairman, I do not think the matter stands quite in the way my hon. friend puts it. All that the present Bankruptcy Act did, having regard

to the point we are now discussing, was to continue what always was the law under assignments. The debtor always made the assignment, and he always made it to whom he wanted to make it.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: No.

Mr. JACOBS: No.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend says, "No." If he will wait a moment I think perhaps he will find that I am stating the fact. The debtor makes the assignment. He has to make it. It has to be the debtor because his assignment is a voluntary act. It is not anything that can be forced, and it is idle to say the debtor did not pick the man to whom he made the assignment. He did pick him and as soon as he had done it the creditors at their first meeting put in any assignee they liked. That is why we had all over the province people dickering for proxies, one group pulling in this direction and another pulling in that. That is why we used to have the carpet-bagger assignee, with his bag packed ready to be picked up at any minute to catch the first train at the first symptom, the very first sniff, of trouble—yes, and lawyers doing the same thing. We had all these abuses, and we can have the same thing here because what we are doing here will bring about a result which will put us exactly in that position. When you have an official trustee he ought to be a man of standing, one whom the creditors will accept. In Ontario they have been men of standing that the creditors have accepted. There have been no undignified fights, that I know of, for the purpose of trying to catch this estate for that man or that estate for the other. But my hon. friend makes it inevitable that these troubles shall take place now in the case of any and every assignment. In the one instance you have a select body of men to any one of whom the debtor may assign his bankruptcy papers, with only a remote chance that the creditors at their meeting will change the trustee—a very remote chance, I am instructed at least from Ontario. But under my hon. friend's plan what happens is this: Perforce there has to be an election by the creditors; perforce there has to be this wire-pulling and log-rolling. We do not think that is a good thing. We thought we had got away from that. We are now perpetuating it. Frankly, Mr. Chairman, we thought it was a good thing that we should not only get away from that but keep away from it.

I quite agree with my hon. friend that we must consider the province of Quebec. We have every right to consider their troubles, and we ought to consider them just as much as the troubles of any other five or six provinces, but so far I have not heard anything which would give us the idea that there was a constitutional trouble among the business people of Quebec that did not apply to the other provinces. I always got the idea from what has been said that we have appointed altogether too many men in Quebec, that not only were the good men continued but a lot of unqualified men were put on, and there was a scramble for the work. I did think, therefore, that in the absence of some fundamental distinction which does not exist between the business people of Quebec on the one hand and the business people of the Maritime provinces on the other, if my hon. friend would get a list of authorized receivers for Quebec such as he has appointed in other places where this act is working properly, the difficulties in the province of Quebec would be overcome. Therefore, in the absence of some fine distinction, which does not exist, between the business people of Quebec on the one hand and the business people of the Maritime provinces on the other, if my hon. friend got authorized receivers such as are to be found in other places where the act is working properly these difficulties would be overcome. They ought to be overcome in the case of Quebec just as much as in the case of any other province. But, if it can be done in any other way—and I do not see why it cannot—why should it be done at the expense of throwing out the machinery in every other province where it is working all right?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I understand that all the other provinces are willing to accept the change in this respect; they think it is preferable. I cannot add any further argument to what I have already said. I have given considerable time to the study of these amendments in which I was helped by the officers of my department, and I have acted according to the representations which were sent to us.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The hon. member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton) suggested a moment ago that this Bankruptcy Act met with general approval throughout Canada except in the province of Quebec. May I suggest that, so far as I can see, neither the amendment proposed by the Minister of Justice nor the Bankruptcy Act itself does suit all the industries in all the provinces. We in the farming industry find neither the act nor these amendments at all adapted to that

industry. We find, for example, that the first part of the act dealing with involuntary bankruptcy does not apply to agricultural people; we can only get redress under the voluntary assignment. Then, under the general interpretation that is placed upon the Bankruptcy Act, the intention seems to be that as soon as the debtor makes an assignment in bankruptcy it is possible to secure the documents and the keys, lock up the business, and take care of it in that way. But that cannot be done in the case of a farmer where there are standing crops to be taken care of, stock to be fed, and other matters to be attended to. Another difficulty that arises in connection with insolvent farmers is that practically all the assets of the farmer are already absorbed in the form of mortgages and so on. Usually he will not have anything left. Yet we find the ordinary statement of a trustee in bankruptcy is something to the following effect: "Before we could undertake to handle an assignment in bankruptcy in this matter, we would have to have advanced to us the sum of $50 for the payment of preparation of documents, registration and advertising notices, mailing of notices to creditors, and the drawing of statutory declaration. If you are prepared to forward us this amount we shall, upon hearing from you, send you the papers duly prepared for signature." And may I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the difficulty is that most trustees do not ask $50 but considerably more; I have heard of many cases where they demand as much as $200. I can assure you that there are many hundreds, if not thousands, of the farmers in western Canada who might take advantage of this act but are unable to do so because of this necessary cash payment. I would suggest that perhaps we could get round the difficulty by creating a new part of the act that would apply especially to agriculture. We could introduce a new part to the act without amending the old clauses, a new part intended to meet agricultural conditions, and leave the old clauses applicable to business men. I may say that I have in my hand a letter from Mr. Fream, of Edmonton, Alberta, in which he states:

> I would not like to state how many farmers would take advantage of the act if they were able to raise the deposit required by the trustees, but am satisfied that this figure would run well into the hundreds if not the thousands. The desire to get a new start by making a clean-up through bankruptcy is steadily growing and more requests for information on this question are being received all the time.

I would ask the minister to take into consideration the addition of a new part to the act that would meet agricultural conditions.

[Mr. E. J Garland.]

Sir LOMER GOUIN: It is true that under the present law no one can force a farmer to assign but the farmer has a right to assign; the law is not changed in that regard. It is also a fact that in case of an assignment in future a custodian will be appointed by the receiver who will take charge of the assets of the farm. As to the matter of a deposit, there will be no necessity for such a deposit in future. The farmer will go to the receiver, he will make an assignment, and he will pay for the ordinary stamp which cannot amount to very much. I do not see what more we could do to help the farmer.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I would like to ask the minister if there is not a discrimination against the farmer in the act itself to-day. If I am informed correctly a farmer can only get a clearance after he has paid fifty cents on the dollar, but that does not apply to business men.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: There is no difference between a farmer and a trader as to that.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The real thing in connection with the farmers is this: I do not think the farmers, as a whole, want to use the act as it now stands and I believe they have a reason for their attitude. In so far as the act itself is concerned, the farmer is in a better position than the trader is because the latter can be forced out of business through bankruptcy proceedings and the former cannot.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Some would like to be.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That may be but there is a cheaper way of meeting the situation than that—they can always stop. As the hon. gentleman has said there is no way of forcing them into bankruptcy. There is absolutely no remedy along the lines advanced by the hon. member for Bow River. Still, I am inclined to think that something ought to be done for the farmers on another line under this bankruptcy bill. After all, the farmer is in a different position from that of the ordinary trader. The farmer cannot continue paying anything if he loses his farm and his implements—he cannot do anything at all. If he goes into bankruptcy to-day he loses all equity in his farm, he loses his implements—in fact everything goes. We might well consider the framing of a separate section dealing with farmers which would enable the farmers, on a proper case being made out, —that is a case showing absolute good faith, showing that there was no room for chicanery or anything of that sort—to obtain a dis-

charge as bankrupts and still hold what they would be entitled to hold under the usual provisions as to exemptions from seizure. It may be that that is a very novel idea. I know it is, but in my opinion it is a good idea although it is a novel one. The farmer, after all, is not usually in the same position, as to asking credits, as the man of business; he is really better off without them half the time. A bankruptcy law of this kind would place the farmers in districts of the country where they are to-day loaded down with debts —debts that I do not believe they will get away from for a good many years—in a position where they could no longer be sued; they could get their discharge; and they would still be left with the modicum of property which the exemptions to-day leave to them under ordinary proceedings. And how are the creditors hurt? I do not think the creditors are hurt at all. The creditors to-day have their hands held by the exemption clauses under the sheriff's sales; they cannot get this property anyway. On the other hand it is helping them, because, after all, it is better to have a man that is functioning in the community, a man who is not tied up with debts and costs, and all that sort of thing, going on ad infinitum. It would enable the farmers to get another start without really hurting their creditors at all, because their creditors cannot sell except to the extent that the local laws allow. They are held to the exemptions, and those exemptions, in the Northwest, are sufficient to enable a man to continue working his small farm and leave with him his necessary implements and thus enable him to go ahead. I think if we were to make some provision of that kind, it would prevent a tremendous lot of writs that are issued, particularly in the northwest country every year when there is not a good harvest. At such a time men cannot pay, but each creditor thinks the other creditor is going to get ahead of him. No one is getting anything out of it and everybody is losing. It seems to me this would give these farmers a new start and enable them to go ahead with some hope.

Mr. FORKE: I have no doubt the hon. member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton) has very good intentions, but I would hesitate a long time before I would take advantage of any such legislation. I think perhaps the hon. member is beginning at the wrong end of the business to help the farmer.

Mr. JACOBS: He wants him to get a decent burial.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have not very much confidence in reviving agriculture by amendments to the Bankruptcy Act, but at the same time I am sorry to see the suggestion of the member for West York received in the way it has been by the leader of the Progressive party (Mr. Forke).

Mr. GAUVREAU: A bad reward.

Mr. MEIGHEN: A very bad reward. The fact to-day is—and it is worse now than it has ever been in my knowledge—that what the farmer of the country is able to earn and save is absorbed by the almost infinite processes of the law. There is no reason in the world why a succession of law suits, with accompanying costs, should pile up, score by score, on top of the farmer, when there is no immediate chance of realization, and all in the chase for priority. Our jurisdiction comes because of our bankruptcy powers alone. There should certainly be a process by which some official trustee would acquire the custody of such portion of the farmer's assets as go beyond the exemptions allowed by the provincial law, and at the same time enable the farmer to proceed, claims being merely continued with the trustee, without the necessary deed or process, and if accepted by the farmer as right, then no costs at all attach to it. In the meantime, the farmer is proceeding with his work, being faced with the necessity of paying his debts, but not with the necessity of paying mountains of costs besides. That the idea is practical there is no doubt at all. I have heard most fabulous tales of the numbers of writs issuing in our western courts to-day. Even allowing for a measure of exaggeration—though the number is undoubtedly very large —I do not question for one moment that there are lawyers' costs being piled upon the back of farmers in western Canada to the extent of millions which they cannot avoid, which the lawyers are not responsible for, but which the bankruptcy laws in large degree are responsible for.

Mr. JACOBS: May I suggest that as soon as the assignment is made no writs shall be issued.

Mr MEIGHEN: How can a farmer proceed after assignment? That is the whole trouble. He cannot do a thing. Once he assigns he is done. It is different with a merchant. When a farmer assigns as the hon member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton) says, his farm and his implements and the like are gone.

Mr. JACOBS: I think the hon. member is mistaken.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, when he is in bankruptcy he cannot proceed.

Mr. JACOBS: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He cannot proceed under the present law. I have never seen a case, in the practice of law, under the bankruptcy law of a farmer proceeding to operate his land. He cannot retain his land under the present law and go ahead. That is simply what we are pleading for. I do not say that I have studied the matter as thoroughly as I should have in order to frame legislation, but I have surveyed the field sufficiently to convince myself that there is an opportunity for legislation that will remedy the present condition.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: We were discussing the appointment of trustees, and not a change in the law to protect the farmers. My hon. friend from West York speaks of exempting for the farmer all that is exempted under the provincial law under an assignment. We have such a thing in the law now. If the hon. member will read clause 25 of the Bankruptcy Act, he will find the following provision:

> The property of the debtor divisible amongst his creditors (in this act referred to as the property of the debtor) shall not comprise the following particulars:
>
> (i) Property held by the debtor in trust for any other person;
>
> (ii) Any property which as against the debtor is exempt from execution or seizure under legal process in accordance with the laws of the province within which the property is situate and within which the debtor resides.

So that all the provincial exemptions are there.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think the minister will agree that it would be absolutely idle to expect a discharge to be given, in the way in which the act is administered, which would leave the farmer with his farm, and if the minister knows of any case—

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Does the hon. member want to exempt the farm?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I want to have it so that farming operations can be continued.

Mr. JACOBS: You might as well exempt the trader and leave him in possession of all the merchandise in his warehouse.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not think the hon. member is quite right in that statement. There is the farm, without which the farmer can do nothing. My idea was to leave him with a comparatively small farm so that he could continue farming operations.

Mr. JACOBS: What is he to assign to his creditors if you are going to leave him his farm? There is nothing to assign and no necessity to assign.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It may be it would be idle, as far as the creditors are concerned, but it would not hurt them very much. It may be the farmer is insolvent and unable to pay his debts, he has nothing but land.

Mr. JACOBS: He may have too much land, and that may be the reason for his trouble.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: If he had too much land he would lose the excess land, and be left with just enough to continue farming.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: There is no exception in this section 25. It is general. Any property which is exempted in the provincial law is exempted under the Bankruptcy Act.

Section agreed to.

On section 26—Priority of claim.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: We have to read sections 26 and 27 together. I would ask to be allowed to make a change. The principle is the same, but it is a difference in drafting.

The CRAIRMAN: Section 26, as it is proposed to amend it, reads:

> Subsection 1 of section 51 is amended by inserting after the word "firstly" in the fifth line thereof the following words "costs and expenses of the custodian and".

And section 27, as it is proposed to amend it, reads:

> Section 52 of the said act is amended as follows:
>
> Chapter 17 of the statutes of 1921 is repealed and the following is substituted therefor:
>
> "52. When a receiving order or an assignment is made against or by any lessee under this act, the same consequences shall ensue as to the rights and priorities of his landlord as would have ensued under the laws of the province in which the debtor has his locality for the purposes of this act if the lessee at the time of such receiving order had been a person entitled to make and had made an abandonment or a voluntary assignment of his property for the benefit of his creditors pursuant to the laws of the province; and nothing in this act shall be deemed to suspend, limit or affect the legislative authority of any province to enact any law provided for or regulating the rights and priorities of landlords consequent upon any such abandonment or voluntary assignment; nor shall anything in this act be deemed to interfere or conflict with the operation of any such provincial law heretofore or hereafter enacted in so far as it provides for or regulates the rights and priorities of landlords in such an event."

Mr. JACOBS: I am not very clear as to the meaning of the last clause:

> Nor shall anything in this act be deemed to interfere or conflict with the operation of any such provincial law heretofore or hereafter enacted in so far as it provides for or regulates the rights and priorities of landlords in such an event.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: This means that we wish to have the privileges, which are now enjoyed by landlords in any of the provinces, continued under this legislation. We say that the provinces will be free to amend any of their existing legislation.

Mr. JACOBS: It does not seek to make that retroactive.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: No retroactivity. This is the principle that is to be found in the law of 1875. We have reason to believe that with this last amendment nearly all the provinces will be satisfied.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Some time ago my hon. friend's chief interest was that of the creditors. I am afraid he is turning sharply right about face this time.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: How?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: His interest is now what the provincial legislature is going to say, not the interest of the creditor at all. This is a clause which is absolutely against the interests of creditors; it is a clause which makes entirely for additional support to landlords, which, in the great majority of cases, they do not require, and in many cases ought not to get.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: The landlord is a creditor.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That is quite true, but he is a creditor who is so secured that his claim against the estate is not, as a rule, very serious. The trouble with what my hon. friend is doing is that, not only does it secure landlords, but it enables landlords to make extra money, extra penalties, because their tenants go into liquidation. This is going back to the old law of forfeiture, which, I know, is still practised in many countries. It is really taking advantage of the penalties of forfeiture and making them apply to creditors generally. My hon. friend will not try to support this claim on the ground of fairness. On the mere question of equity, we cannot very well contrast the claim of the landlord, who still has his property, with the claim of the creditor, unsecured, who may have

4 p.m.

advanced goods or may have personal claims which, to a large extent, he loses. Under this amendment, the landlord holds his own, and he also gets something of somebody else's. It seems to me that we are now running violently back; that it is a retrograde step to extend the powers of these forfeitures and premiums on forfeitures —for this is what this amounts to. The hon. member for George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs) the other day illustrated how this worked out in Quebec. He showed, in the case of an insolvent in Quebec, that insolvency breaking the lease, the landlord had a claim which ran up to something like sixteen months' rent—I think that was what the hon. gentleman said.

Mr. JACOBS: Twenty-eight months was what I really said.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Past due rent accounted for twelve months of that.

Mr. JACOBS: Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am not complaining so much about past due rent. There the landlord is not really in a better position than the ordinary creditor. The thing I so strenuously object to is that simply because a man fails, simply because his general creditors are losing money, the landlord receives an extra bonus of sixteen months' rent in advance, to be taken out of the general fund. It is not on the ground of equity that the minister will seek to uphold this clause, there is no equity in it. He will seek to uphold it on the ground that if he does not insert this provision, he will be interfering with provincial rights. Of course, there is an interference, I will not say with provincial rights, because the question is not one of provincial rights when we are dealing with bankruptcy, which is directly given to this House to deal with. We had a question of provincial rights under consideration when we were discussing the Nova Scotia legislation. This is a question of provincial law, not of provincial rights. It is not only the laws of the province of Quebec that are antagonistic to the bankruptcy sections. Under the Ontario law as to voluntary assignments, the landlord has a prior claim for a year's past rent and for three months' rent to come, and other provinces have practically similar provisions. But the minister will say: "Is it not very much beter to have a law that no one is going to attack, and this one has been attacked?" You will always have those who may attack any laws. But if he takes the position as minister of the Crown in charge of the law department of the country, that there is any question about this, he ought to withdraw his whole act, for the whole act offends against provincial law; it is worth nothing except when it does interfere with such law. This act does something which ordinary laws do not do and is in conflict with the laws of debtor and creditor as they are expressed in the statute boks of every province. So, if that stand be taken, and my hon. friend's position is to be logical, the

whole act should go. But he will not take that course because, in so many words, bankruptcy comes within the jurisdiction of this parliament.

Now, over and above that, can my hon. friend point out any distinction under section 92 in favour of the landlord, as against the ordinary creditor, founded on provincial law? He knows just as well as I do—yes, better than I do—that the ordinary law here must apply, that all the rights given under section 92 are subject to those conferred by section 91. One cannot argue to-day with any hope of success that there is merit in giving the landlord a sixteen months' bonus at the expense of the ordinary creditors of the insolvent's estate. Yet that is being done. I would ask my hon. friend really to consider the advisability of dropping this section; it has no merit. It is idle to say that we any more offend provincial law in connection with the one item of real estate than we do in connection with any other property.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I do not suppose my hon. friend is satisfied with the law as we have it to-day giving the trustee power to dispose of the property occupied by the insolvent debtor, to sublet it if he likes, without any remedy being left to the landlord once his claim for three months' rent has been satisfied? My hon. friend says he sees no difference between the claim of a landlord and the claim of a merchant, and he pretends that under this amendment the landlord is left in a better position than the ordinary creditor. Well, in every province a privilege is always given to the landlord. Some provinces make the privilege twelve months, others six months, some three months. In England the privilege is six months. It is admitted that this feature of the bankruptcy law which we propose to amend is not satisfactory to the people of Canada. All the provinces have been complaining about it—creditors, landlords and the people generally are all dissatisfied. The provinces have the right to legislate on civil rights in this particular and to say what shall be the privilege allowed to a landlord. We have to amend our law. We have considered the point very carefully and after reading all the representations which came to us we have reached the conclusion that the best suggestion to offer this House is to restore to the landlords the privileges which they enjoyed under provincial laws. This is nothing new; we find it in the law of 1875, as I said before. If any provincial legislation is not satisfactory the people of the province can amend it through their representatives in the legislature. If they find that the privilege given to the landlord is too large they can reduce it; if they find it is not sufficient they can enlarge it.

But I really do not understand why my hon. friend from West York (Sir Henry Drayton) should so strongly oppose the amendment that we offer. There is no doubt that such a privilege is a civil right. My hon. friend says, "Well, the Minister of Justice is going to invoke that civil right question to justify the amendment." I do not need to invoke it. I am told that in a case now pending before one of our superior courts the judge will decide that this law is unconstitutional in so far as it affects the rights of landlords. If this is so, when we have at our disposal a means of giving to the landlords their rights and privileges, that is, by accepting the provincial laws in this respect, why not make the necessary amendment? As I say, it was done before and worked very smoothly, while under the present law we have complaints from all over the Dominion.

After all, Mr. Chairman, this is not of such great importance to creditors. My hon. friend mentioned the case of Quebec, where under certain extraordinary circumstances the privilege might extend to twenty-four or twenty-eight months. Well, to find such a case my hon. friend would probably have to go back one hundred years in the history of that province. We have never heard of a case where the landlord had a privilege for twenty-eight months, or for twenty months, or even for twelve months; it is generally six or nine months, never more. Under the present law the only privilege allowed to the landlord is three months as an ordinary creditor, with no recourse of any kind against the trustee of the estate. We are told by all the provinces that this is not just, and they ask us to change the law. Therefore we propose to change it as indicated by the amendment, that is, by restoring to landlords their rights under the laws of the various provinces. What insuperable objection can my hon. friend urge to the acceptation of the provincial laws? Is it because the privilege under them is too large? As I have said, it is very, very seldom that the privilege would extend to more than six months. You have twelve months in Ontario, you have six months in England, and in most of the provinces you have between nine and twelve months. This is the law which was accepted by the provinces. Why should we change it? Why should we limit it to three months and

say that after that period the landlords are deprived of any further claim against the debtor's estate? I submit that such a limitation is not fair, and that the least my hon. friend could do when opposing this amendment is himself to offer a suggestion to overcome the present difficulty. But on the whole, if my hon. friend had to consider the drafting of a substitutive amendment, I really believe that after due reflection he would come to the same conclusion which I have arrived at myself and accept the provincial law. This was done, I repeat, in 1875, and it worked satisfactorily.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Mr. Chairman, I have no very good recollection of the law which was passed in 1875, but I have heard that one of the objections to that law, and one which brought about its repeal, was the superior rights which were allowed to the landlord over the other creditors of the insolvent debtor. That was one of the statements made in this House when the act to repeal the act of 1875 was up for consideration. The other great charge was in regard to the expense of winding up estates and the lack of responsibility on the part of trustees who were authorized under the act of 1875. When the present act was brought before parliament I happened to be Solicitor General and had a good deal to do with its passage through the House, and I can tell the hon. Minister of Justice that very careful consideration was given to the clauses in respect to landlords and the rights of landlords before the special committee which drafted the Bankruptcy Act felt satisfied that we were on solid ground. One objection to the law prior to 1920 was that in every province of Canada there was a difference in regard to the rights of landlords: Ontario had one law, Quebec had another; the western provinces had different laws to suit the people or the landlords of those parts of the country. One object to be achieved by the passage of the Dominion act was to get a uniform law so that creditors seeking to collect their claims would know where they stood no matter whether the debtor lived in Nova Scotia or in British Columbia. We wanted a uniform law, and after much consideration, after hearing representations from members of the bar of the various provinces, from chambers of commerce, from bankers' associations, accountants' associations, retail merchants' associations, we drafted the clause practically as it stands in the statute to-day —I think it has been varied since, but not to any considerable extent. We adopted it as a fair clause as between the landlord, the debtor, and the ordinary creditor. It must be borne in mind in considering the rights of landlords in this country that in the English-speaking provinces, where the common law of England was adopted, the law in respect to landlord and tenant was a law made by the landlord, in connection with which the tenants had not one word to say. We adopted that law, made as it was by the landlords of England, when we became a confederation, and the common law of England applies in this respect in all the provinces save in the province of Quebec. It was a one-sided law; it is a one-sided law to-day. It has been very much modified in the Imperial parliament during the last forty or fifty years and has been considerably modified by the various legislatures of the provinces of Canada. But why should a landlord be placed on a higher plane than any ordinary creditor? He is, in the act as it now stands: He is entitled to three months' rent in respect of past-due rent, above all other creditors; he can take that no matter what the estate is. Then he can get three months' future rent ahead of all other creditors; so that his rights are pretty well protected. But as I say, why should a landlord be on a different plane from any other creditor? His building is there; if his tenant leaves or is closed out by bankruptcy, his property remains and he can re-let it. So he is still protected under the present law, a law which has the advantage of being applied precisely in the same way in every province. When this question was before the House earlier in the present session on the resolution of an hon. member opposite calling for its repeal, I think, the Minister of Justice took occasion then to say he believed that a uniform law was essential respecting bankruptcy in Canada. Well, we have uniformity now, but instead of a single clause applying to landlords, instead of having a clause which' I submit with a good deal of confidence, reasonably protects the landlords of Canada, we propose to have nine laws, so that ordinary people dealing interprovincially will not know what their rights are in the various provinces. Chambers of commerce in Great Britain made representations to the committee of this parliament which sat on the question saying that the differences in the various laws of Canada respecting bankruptcy and insolvency very much hindered international trade. Creditors in Great Britain of debtors residing in Canada did not know just what was to become of their claims, on account of the varying laws respecting insolvency in the different parts of Canada. That was a further reason for having uniform law. Uniformity was what was aimed at—on fair and equitable grounds,

of course; and we thought we had obtained a reasonably fair and uniform measure. Even before the act was passed intimations came to me as chairman of that committee and as Solicitor General in charge of the bill that the law would not be more than a few months old before it would be held to be unconstitutional in the courts of Quebec and afterwards by the Privy Council. It was not merely on one occasion that these intimations were made to me; two or three times at least the suggestion was offered, and it was always from some source in the province of Quebec that the attack on the Bankruptcy Act came. I have heard this statement repeated since. Now, the Minister of Justice has to-day intimated that a judge in the province of Quebec has held, or is about to hold, that the clause is unconstitutional in respect to the rights of landlords. I doubt very much whether such a judgment would stand; I would like to see it appealed to the highest tribunal in this country and subsequently to the judicial committee of the Privy Council. When we get a final pronouncement on that point it will be time enough to change our law; until then, I submit the present law should stand. It is uniform; it is fair; it is reasonable. Landlords from time immemorial have been noted for grasping everything in sight. The law as between landlord and tenant has never been favourable to the tenant; it has been a one-sided law made by the landlords in their own interest. If we are trying to get a little away from that; if we are trying to make a law fairer as between the parties, fairer as between the creditors, I think upon every reasonable ground we should be assisted in doing so. Other provinces may have objections; other provinces may have sent communications to the Department of Justice objecting to the present landlord and tenant clauses in the Bankruptcy Act. But that does not change my opinion of them; my opinion is that they are fair and reasonable on the one hand and uniform on the other, and I for one would be very slow indeed to change them.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: My hon. friend seems to have a very poor opinion of the landlords. He thinks that the law we have to-day in that respect should be continued. It is strange that he has never been scandalized at the law in his own province, where the privilege is given to the landlord to get twelve months' rent.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I have been scandalized, and I made representations to the legislative assembly in respect to it long before this bankruptcy matter came before the House.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I think we may leave it to the legislative assembly to decide that point. My hon. friend says that we will have nine laws and that there will be no more uniformity in the act. But this does not change the uniformity of the act as a whole. There is no change in any essential part of the law; it is only a question of limiting the amount of the landlord's claim. If the landlord has the privilege for twelve months' rent as against three months, it makes a difference in the amount of his claim, but it involves no change in the law. I repeat, when from all the provinces we have complaints with regard to that clause, when we are told that the landlords should be treated more favourably, that the privileges which they enjoy under provincial legislation should be accepted in this Bankruptcy Act, it seems to me that we should give them under our law what they have under the provincial law. My hon. friend says that we have been told by English traders and manufacturers that the fact that we have had many bankruptcy laws in this country was injurious to trade generally. That is true. But what is more important I think, Mr. Chairman, is that we should make our law such that it would be satisfactory to the people of Canada; and, if to-day we can satisfy the provinces by giving to the landlords that privilege which they have been claiming, we will make sure that our law which has been in existence now for over three years will be made permanent. Is this point of such importance, that when it is a question of choosing between a permanent law and a certain privilege, which you are not granting to the landlords but simply continuing to them, you should hesitate? For my part I do not think so. I have had a little experience in legislation; I know something of the mentality of the people of my province and perhaps of the other provinces; and I say without any hesitation that we should grant to the provinces or to those who represent the provinces this privilege which the landlords have always enjoyed.

Mr. Chairman, this is the last amendment I have to offer. I have brought down this bill only for the good of trade generally. I wanted to protect the creditors and protect at the same time the debtors. The House has been kind enough to accept nearly all the amendments which I have offered, and I would ask them to accept this last one. If it does not work properly and to the advantage of creditors and debtors it will be

time, another year, to amend it; but I feel sure that if it is accepted to-day it will be kept on the statute books.

Mr. CLARK: May I ask a couple of questions? First of all I would like to know the nature of the complaints in regard to the old section received from the province of British Columbia, and the names of any organizations that have submitted these complaints.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I have not the names of any organizations in British Columbia, but from what we heard from traders and manufacturers generally this clause never was satisfactory in any of the provinces.

Mr. CLARK: Do I understand the minister to say that he has received complaints only from individuals in the province of British Columbia, or has he not received any complaints from that province?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I have been given to understand, from representations from all the provinces, that we should amend this clause.

Mr. CLARK: If the amended section is passed will the creditors, in the event of the assignor holding a very valuable lease, receive any advantage from that lease? In other words, will the trustee in any circumstances be able, under this amendment, to enter into possession of the property on behalf of the creditors?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: It depends in what province the trustee will be. If it is in the province of Quebec, I know that the trustee will have the right to keep the property and use it to the very end of the lease; there is no doubt about that.

Mr. JACOBS: Does it not all depend on the terms of the lease?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Certainly.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think they nearly always call for forfeiture. My hon. friend asked me what I thought would be fair. May I read what a very experienced man in this line of business says on this very point?

> Until the Bankruptcy Act was put in force and the present sections regarding landlords' rights were made effective a debtor might be the owner of a very valuable lease and the return to be recovered from his assets for the benefit of his creditors very largely depend upon the ability of the estate to retain such lease. Leases between landlords and tenants invariably contain clauses that in the event of an assignment the lease shall terminate, and enforcing these rights landlords were able to cancel valuable leases to the detriment of the creditors of a debtor. When the Bankruptcy Act was passed provisions were inserted which allowed the trustee to continue and dispose of the lease under terms which protected the landlord but saved the value of the lease to the creditors. No harm was done to the landlord but the creditors' and debtor's interests were protected.
>
> It is now proposed to do away with the provisions of the Bankruptcy Act and place creditors back in the position where with a valuable lease belonging to an estate, the landlord will be permitted to cancel the lease. Thus the landlord will reap a benefit from an assignment to which he would not otherwise be entitled, while the return to creditors will be reduced.
>
> It is difficult to see what good reason can be adduced for granting such an advantage to the landlord at the expense of the other creditors, particularly when the sections presently in force in the Bankruptcy Act do not cause him any monetary or other loss but merely deprive him of an advantage which he would not otherwise be entitled to—except with the making of an assignment by the debtor for the benefit of his creditors.

So my hon. friend will see that it is really a very large question so far as the creditors are concerned. I do not hold with forfeitures. I think one of the chief and best functions of a court is that it can, and generally does, give relief against forfeitures. One of the worst kind of forfeiture is the forfeiture of leases on grounds which are not based on absolute harm and damage to the landlord. This is one of them. We have no room for relief in these proceedings at all. We are relegated to a standing general law, which means that we are relegated to the terms of these leases plus the disabilities of the general law. My hon. friend asks, what do I think is fair? I know there has been trouble with some landlords in Ontario. They were accustomed to have a prior claim for twelve months arrears. That has been cut down to three months and I know cases where these landlords have objected bitterly, and I dare say the minister has received representations on that point. But I do not see why the landlord sleeping on his rights, working up preferred claims against the creditors of an insolvent, should be in a position to demand very much consideration. It does seem to me that the three months of arrears that he now gets is a very reasonable period, and I would leave him just where he is under this act. How is he hurt under the act so long as he acts with fair promptness? And if he does not act with fair promptness why should his delay affect creditors?—they are not to blame. My hon. friend has made out a splendid case for a very bad section, and he asks the House to pass it. We have passed a whole lot of other amendments, and I think he should be willing to make not a fifty-fifty, but a hundred-to-one break on this, and let us hold this one section, which after all will help the small unsecured creditor, and report the rest of his bill.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I have great respect for the legislators who will pass this bill. I have also great respect for the provincial legislators. I think we should give some consideration to the legislatures of the different provinces who have given some special privilege to the landlord. I think that by accepting their views, and the laws they have given to the people of each province, we are on the safe side. That is why, if the House is satisfied, I ask for the adoption of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Marcil, Bonaventure): Shall the clause as amended carry?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Carried on division.

On section 31—Officer to be assigned to duty by Chief Justice.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Marcil, Bonaventure): The following is added as section 65 (a). It is new:

65 (a) There shall be one official receiver in each bankruptcy district or division who shall have and perform such duties and responsibilities as are prescribed by this act and rules and who shall be appointed by the Governor in Council.

Section as amended agreed to.

On the preamble:

Mr. JACOBS: I should like to move the following amendment to be known as 32 (a):

32 (a) The said act is amended by inserting the following section immediately after section 88 (a) thereof:

88 (b) Any notarial copy of any deed, assignment, transfer, composition or retrocession executed in the province of Quebec before a notary public shall be accepted throughout Canada as prima facie evidence of the original deed without the production of such original deed.

Mr. BAXTER: Why not make that apply to the notaries public in all the provinces?

Mr. JACOBS: The notary public in the other provinces is not the same functionary as a notary public in the province of Quebec. In that province, when he affixes the signature to a document it gives it authenticity, that is, makes it prima facie evidence.

Mr. MARTELL: It is the same in the other provinces.

Mr. BAXTER: There is not very much difference between a notary in Quebec and a notary in the Maritime provinces. In my province a notary public certifies to a document and in some cases his certificate is accepted in certain courts in other parts of the Empire although not necessarily in New Brunswick. But his signature is always authenticated by his seal and his act always obtains credit. In marine matters, for example, my hon. friends will realize the efficacy of a notarial protest. There will be no difficulty if my suggestion is carried out. In the province of New Brunswick notaries must be members of the bar, or are subject to certain training and examination. I think that is also true of the other provinces and there can be no good reason why the certificate of one of these notaries cannot be accepted.

Mr. MARTELL: I agree with the hon. member who has just spoken. It is true that in the province of Quebec the legal profession and the notarial profession are separate, that is to say, a man who is a notary is not necessarily a barrister, but in the province of Nova Scotia every man who is a barrister is a notary. At any rate it is true in ninety cases out of a hundred. My hon. friend is seeking to give to notaries public in the province of Quebec rights that would not be given to notaries public in any other province of the Dominion. He can accomplish the whole effect of what he wants by simply obliterating the idea that this should be confined to any particular province. All that my hon. friend (Mr. Baxter) is asking is that the certificate of the notary in other provinces be accepted in the same way as the certificate of the notary public in the province of Quebec. The only difference between us, as I understand it,—although I am not conversant with the law of the province of Quebec —is that a notary in that province is the custodian of the document which he draws, and he gives the certified copy. Now in the province of Nova Scotia—I think the same thing obtains in the province of New Brunswick—we file our documents in the office of the registrar of deeds who records them there. If they have to go outside the province they have to be certified before a notary public. That is all my hon. friend wants as regards the province of Quebec. Why, then, make any exception?

Mr. CLARK: Under the proposed amendment it would be necessary for the notary public in each case to compare the copies with the original. I personally know notaries public, and many of them are not even competent to do that. I would hesitate to see the amendment apply to the provinces generally.

Mr. JACOBS: As I understand, in the other provinces outside of Quebec practically any office boy who is twenty-one years of age may be a notary public.

Mr. CLARK: I know provinces where the provincial government has made a habit of

raising a revenue by charging $2.50, or some such small fee, and authorizing a man to become a notary public. We do not want that class of men making evidence for the courts.

Mr. JACOBS: In Quebec it is entirely different.

Mr. MARTELL: I defy my hon. friend from Burrard (Mr. Clark) to show me any person in the province of Nova Scotia who has been appointed a notary public and has not qualified.

Mr. CLARK: I said nothing about Nova Scotia.

Mr. MARTELL: In the province of Nova Scotia it has always been urged that a barrister should be made a notary public. Now the whole question of a notarial seal is to make it prima facie evidence in a court of justice. I claim it is grossly unfair to give to any one province of the Dominion the right to have the notarial seal of their notaries public accepted in any court of this Dominion, and so make the status of a notary public in that province superior to that of any other notary public. All that is asked by this amendment and all that we are urging on behalf of the English-speaking provinces, is that the seal of a duly constituted notary public shall be accepted as prima facie evidence. That is fair because we have not a notarial profession in the Maritime provinces separate and distinct from the legal profession as is the case in the province of Quebec. That is no reason, however, why legal men should not be regarded as qualified to give a notarial certificate that certain documents are true copies. Even though you have not a distinct notarial profession, why should not his seal be accepted as prima facie evidence in any court in the land? This profession in the province of Quebec is a distinct profession compared with the other provinces of Canada. It is an old French custom, and it is an ideal custom; I am not criticizing it; I admire everything that pertains to the French custom; but I object absolutely to saying that a French notary public seal in the province of Quebec is superior in the courts of this land to my notary public seal as a barrister and notary public in the province of Nova Scotia. If this act is going to be a general act, the minister should be prepared to say that when a notary public, no matter from what province he comes, gives his seal, that seal has a right to the same consideration in every court in this country. That is all I have to say in that regard, and I will oppose the motion of my hon. friend from George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs), if his seal is going to be better than mine. I am from the province of Nova Scotia, a notary public of that province, appointed on the recommendation of the government of the day led by Mr. G. H. Murray. When he had sufficient confidence in me to make me a notary public, my seal as a notary public of that province should be accepted as equal to the seal of any notary public in the Dominion of Canada.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Perhaps my hon. friend will agree to withdraw his amendment?

Mr. JACOBS: Yes.

Mr. MORIN: I wish to say a word in regard to the comparison that has been made between the notaries public of the province of Quebec and those of other provinces. There is considerable difference between the functions of and the work done by, notaries in different parts of the country. In the English provinces any one, even a shoemaker, can become a notary. He does not need to be a lawyer.

Mr. MARTELL: We do not appoint them in Nova Scotia.

Mr. MORIN: In the province of Quebec only persons who have gone through legal studies, graduates from universities, who have gone through the same studies as a lawyer, are entitled to practise the notarial profession. The great difference between the two systems is that under the English law the document is signed by the parties, and, after being attested or authenticated by the notary, is handed to the parties, and is the original document between the parties, and the one that has to be accepted. In the province of Quebec, under the notarial system, the document is drafted and signed by the parties, but not handed to them; it is kept in the hands of a notary and the parties only get certified copies of it. If the original must, according to law, be deposited with the notary and remain in his hands, it is an impossibility that it be handed to the parties to be utilized in the other provinces or anywhere else. Therefore, on account of the fact that only copies of these notarial documents are accepted and can be forwarded to other provinces, it is only just that they should be accepted in the other provinces and have the same force as the original.

Mr. MARTELL: That is quite true. I am not objecting to the notarial copy taken in Quebec being accepted. I have every admiration for that system. But why not accept the copy of a notarial document from the

other provinces, when it is duly certified with the hand and seal of the notary?

Mr. MORIN: We have justices of the peace in the province of Quebec who are entitled to certify.

Mr. MARTELL: Have they seals?

Mr. MORIN: They can have seals, but it adds nothing to their capacity.

Mr. MARTELL: It is the whole thing.

Mr. MORIN: It adds nothing to their capacity, and they can attest documents as well as notaries. We do not ask the privilege for a justice of the peace, we simply ask it for the notaries.

Mr. MARTELL: With all due deference to what the hon. member has said, I am not advocating that the notary should give up the original. I am not opposing the provision that his copy should be taken as duly certified. Where documents are filed in the province of Nova Scotia they are recorded in the office of the registrar of deeds, and if the notary wishes to give out a copy he certifies to it, and it is accepted in the courts when it is certified by the notary public. Now with respect to the status of a notary public, I admit that in Quebec the profession of notary public is practically on an equality with the legal profession. In the province of Nova Scotia the majority of notaries are lawyers, and all we are asking for is that when the notaries of the province of Quebec are given the right to certify to documents, we should have equal rights to certify to documents in the province of Nova Scotia, or in any other province.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is it not all really covered by the Canada Evidence Act? That is where it ought to be. We have a whole lot of these provisions there. Now the hon. member is bringing in papers and documents into the discussion. Exemplifications and documents are quite common in other provinces, and I should have thought that when you go to an official in the province of Quebec an exemplification from a prothonotary would be the proper thing.

Amendment (Mr. Jacobs) withdrawn.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

WAYS AND MEANS

ISSUANCE OF FIATS: HOPPE LEASES—FRANCHISE—PRIME MINISTER'S PROPOSED VISIT—CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS DIRECTORS' REPORT

On motion of Hon. W. S. Fielding for the House to go into Committee of Ways and Means.

[Mr. Martell.]

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York): I desire, on this motion, to call the attention of the House to one or two matters: First, the question of granting fiats in connection with claims against the government, as representing the Crown. The other day, when I had opportunity, I asked the Prime Minister to make a statement as to how the public might be made aware of the issuing of these fiats. Sometimes they come to the notice of the public only after a fiat has been issued and the action started in the Exchequer Court. This proceeding is getting rather on the public's nerves, inasmuch as they only hear of the matter incidentally. I think provision should be made for the registration and for a public announcement of the issue of all fiats. It came out the other day—and it took some time to bring it out—that a fiat was issued before the public had heard anything about it in regard to coal leases, the most valuable coal leases in the country. The public should know when a fiat is issued so that parties concerned, individuals or communities, might guard themselves. Fiats are being issued, and the cases go to trial, and the public have no early knowledge of the matter. I think the Minitser of Justice ought to make some arrangement, not a law but some practice, by which the public would be cognizant of the issuing of these fiats. This practice of granting fiats is a very old one; it has prevailed for years; that you cannot sue the Crown without first getting the consent of the Crown to a trial of the issue raised. That law may be all right; but abuses may grow up, and they have grown up, and it is obvious that a number of other actions of the same kind are likely to occur.

Mr. VIEN: Supposing my hon. friend had received notice that a fiat had been granted. what remedy would be in his hands against it?

Mr. MACLEAN (York): I want the public to know that a fiat has been issued. At present there is no publicity in the matter.

Mr. VIEN: Is the case not then brought before a public court of justice, in the open?

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Yes; but the public is not informed when a fiat is issued, and there is no reason why they should not be informed at once of the issue of a fiat and particularly as to the importance of the interest involved. Take the case of the coal lease, the most valuable coal lease that was ever heard of before in the world, if we can believe the evidence that came out recently. A fiat was issued in that case, and it is now

being cancelled by legislation. There is no reason why some record should not be made so as to inform the public thereof.

Mr. MARTELL: Suposing the public receive notice that a fiat has been issued, what right have the public to come in unless they are an interested party? It is simply a case of expense.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): The public has a right to know if a fiat is issued especially if it concerns a public right. If anybody is concerned, if a province is concerned, there should be publicity. Also there should be a clearing up of the law and practice in regard to the issuing of fiats.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): It could be announced in the Canada Gazette.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Certainly. The moment a fiat is issued. there should be an announcement to that effect in the Canada Gazette. The minister is the custodian of the King's honour, and these fiats are issued so that the claim may be tried in the courts. I should like the Minister of Justice to bring down—not to-day, but as soon as he can—a list of the fiats that have been issued within the last ten years, with a memorandum showing what has been done in each case; how many fiats are now outstanding that have not yet been tried; and a little statement from the department clearing up this subject which has come up in our legislation, which is being discussed more or less in public, but of which the public are not fully informed.

Mr. MARTELL: Would it not be more in the interest of the public to know why fiats are refused, and to have some way whereby there could be an appeal to some body to say whether the government was right or wrong in issuing a fiat, because if the government does issue a fiat, even if notice is given, who can come in except those parties who are interested in the action?

Mr. MACLEAN (York): My hon. friend is arguing my case that there ought to be publicity to these things. The situation should be cleared up. If the law officers of the Crown would prepare a little memorandum not like a judgment, but giving a good deal of information on the subject, it would be of value. I know of a case in which a certain portion of the community of this country is very much interested, and yet no announcement of the granting of the fiat has been made. Those who are trying to strengthen their claim and to recover against the government are active all the time, but some of the parties who might be interested have no notice. They should have that notice, and I leave it to the minister whether he will bring down in a few days a list of the fiats and what has occurred in connection with each.

Another matter which I should like to bring to the attention of the House at this time is this: Will the government inform the House whether they intend to introduce a measure this session dealing with the franchise? We know we are to have a redistribution measure, but the redistribution of seats in this House is not the important thing to the people of this country. They want to know what is to be the franchise under which the next election is to be held. An election may occur any day in this country; we very nearly saw one last week, but we have only a somewhat ancient Franchise Act, and I see no reason why an announcement should not be made to the country at this session whether, and when, we are to have a Franchise Act. Such an announcement might facilitate the conduct of the business of the session.

Before this House closes, I should like to see a debate as to the proposed visit of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) to England some time this year in connection with imperial matters. We ought to have a full discussion in this House whether there can be made at that conference commitments which would bind this parliament in any way. A discussion of some account has already occurred in England as to commitments that were made by visiting prime ministers over there that involved enormous expenditures, for instance, the Singapore case, although I am not going into that. With all due respect to the Prime Minister, I think he would be in a much better position if before he went overseas we had a discussion in this House as to the views of the people. He is a young Prime Minister and Shakespeare says something about the temptation of "silken dalliance." There is a silken dalliance in the drawing rooms of the duchesses of London, and a Prime Minister may come within, I will not say that temptation, but that presentation. Again I say that it would be highly desirable that we have a discussion in this House on this very question.

5 p.m.

Just one other thing to which I wish to draw attention, and I will conclude. I refer to the excellent report that was presented to this House last night by the new Board of National Railway Directors. It is an excellent report, and it discusses several things that are creditable to the board. For one thing, it shows that they are now trying to consolidate all these different lines and sys-

tems into one, and they announce a very much needed connection, between the old Canadian Northern and the Transcontinental, at Long Lake. The same kind of work must and ought to be done immediately in Toronto. where there are some very pressing questions in regard to connecting up the different lines. There has been a discussion and many people in Toronto are interested in having a central ticket office for the Canadian National railways in that city. I find also that Montreal seems to be interested in the Canadian National railways having as good a ticket office as the Canadian Pacific has on the opposite corner in Toronto. Why has the National Railways not as good right to have the same accommodation as the Canadian Pacific?

Mr. CHAPLIN: What about the office at Paris?

Mr. MACLEAN (York) I leave that where it was left to-day by the leader of the Opposition. There is no reason why the National railways should not have a ticket office in Toronto, and when they build that office, they should build up a fairly good one, so that the company might have general offices in the same building. Of course Toronto has for a time lost the headquarters of the National railways, but I think Toronto and Ontario some day will be so much convinced of the superiority of public ownership as applied to railways that the government will be very glad to recognize Toronto as the centre—

Mr. FIELDING: Of the universe.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): —of that organization. The Board of Railway Directors are making headway; the road is being co-ordinated, straightened out and greatly improved. Nevertheless, some of the newspapers say that "the new railway chief sees a lean year ahead of the Canadian National railways." I do not see any lean year ahead of the National railways. They are working out; they are being co-ordinated, improved and accepted by the country. I wish to take this opportunity of saying that as a friend of public ownership I am very much pleased with this report, and, following up what I said last night, I believe when the next report comes in it will embody a financial and mileage statement covering all the roads. In that way the people will realize that they have a real national system. As the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) said last night—and it cannot be said too often—the shareholders of the Canadian National Railway System to-day are the people of Canada and are in competition with a company-owned system. And as far as I can gather, the verdict of public opinion in America is that national railways have more in them for service to the people than have the company-owned roads.

Mr. L. H. MARTELL (Hants): As we know, under the practice that now obtains, if a person feels that he has a cause of action against the government he applies for a fiat, his application goes to the Department of Justice, where the law officers of the Crown consider it and advise whether or not a fiat should issue. Now, it seems to me most absurd that any department of government should have the right to decide whether or not an action should be permitted to be brought against another department. I am not saying this in derogation of the present government, because I believe it is the best that Canada could have at the present time. And I speak as a partisan; I do not deny that I am a Liberal partisan.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: You have to be.

Mr. MARTELL: I do not deny it. I am not a Progressive, I am not a Conservative, I am not a hedger; I am a Liberal. I repeat, no department of government should have the right to say whether or not a person who believes he has a cause of action against the government should be permitted to bring it before the courts of the country. I submit, with all deference to the opinion of a great lawyer like my hon. friend, the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton), for whom I have a warm regard, and to the opinion of my other legal friends in this House, that it is only fair and just that a person who has a claim against the government should be allowed to bring an action in the proper courts for the enforcement of his claim. As the law stands to-day, an aggrieved person must first file a petition of right, and the officials of the department are called upon to consider the petition and advise whether or not a fiat should be issued.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Is it not the Department of Justice?

Mr. MARTELL: That is one of the departments of government which is usually best administered; always the best men are to be found in that department. The department of the government immediately concerned presents its side of the question, and the Department of Justice naturally is inclined to favour another department in reaching a conclusion on the merits. I say that is a wrong principle. If a question of con-

stitutionality arises we do not decide it in this House. For instance, when the Wheat Board legislation was questioned on the ground that it was ultra vires of parliament, it was submitted to the law officers of the Crown for their opinion. If a dispute takes place regarding the relative rights of the federal and the provincial authorities, the dispute is referred to the Supreme Court of Canada under the provisions of the British North America Act, and in case of disagreement we go to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. Where a humble citizen of this country wishes to bring an action against the Crown I submit he should have the right to go before an independent body, such as the Supreme Court of Canada, to decide whether or not a fiat should issue in order that right may be done. If we are to have the dispensation of justice beyond suspicion there should be no room for contaminating influences in any shape or form. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that as the law stands at the present time it is absolutely not in accordance with the democratic spirit of this country. I do not think this government is capable of any wrong-doing, being a Liberal government, but on the principle of giving everyone the benefit of the doubt, I think this government could not do better than let the question of issuing fiats go before the highest court of judicature of the Dominion for decision. I am strongly of this opinion because I claim—and it is a claim which I shall always advocate—that where a man feels he has a just cause of action against the federal authority he should be at liberty to go before the Supreme Court of Canada or any other independent tribunal in order that it may be determined whether or not in the circumstances a fiat should issue in order that right may be done.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Mr. Speaker, in answer to my hon. friend from South York (Mr. Maclean) I may say there is no objection to our giving him the number of fiats granted during the last ten years. If he would be kind enough to put a question on the order paper, he could make it clear to us if he wishes to be informed how many of these fiats were disposed of, how many are still pending, and in what way judgment was given.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): No, I do not want that information. I will put a question on the order paper. If I may be pardoned, Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend made an argument on somewhat different lines from my own. I wanted to state that the public should know as to the issue of these fiats and, as my hon. friend from Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) says, they should be published in the Canada Gazette.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: That is another question. There is no mystery about fiats, Mr. Speaker. They are granted for the prosecution of claims against the Crown when it is shown to the satisfaction of the Department of Justice that the person aggrieved has, prima facie, a good cause of action. My hon. friend says that publicity should be given to such fiats. Well, publicity is already given by the fact that every one of these cases has to be tried before the Exchequer Court, one of the supreme tribunals of Canada. I do not see what better publicity we could give than what we have now.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): I would point out that one party has the advantage. He knows that he has the fiat; he prepares his case, but others who may be interested know nothing about it and have no chance to prepare their case. The general public should have knowledge of it, and by mere publication of the fiat, when issued, in the Canada Gazette, such notice would be given.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Anyone who is interested in the case has the right at any stage to intervene, and his rights are always protected. I do not see what would be the advantage of publishing in the Canada Gazette or in any other paper the granting of the fiat, but if it is the wish of the House that a procedure of that nature be followed, I would personally have no objection to it.

Now, as to the question raised by the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Martell) he is of the opinion that if a fiat is refused an appeal should be granted to the applicant. But I may say that very few petitions for fiats are refused. Since I have had the honour of presiding over the Department of Justice I do not think we have refused one. Every time a fiat is refused the government is responsible to the people. The provision to prevent action being taken against the Crown is a necessary protection—

Mr. MACLEAN (York): I do not say it is not.

Sir LOMER GOUIN:—otherwise no one could count the number of actions that would be taken against the Crown. But it is only when there is any reasonable doubt in the matter that a fiat is refused; and it can be said that if a government did refuse it without justification, the people have a method

of redress. I do not see how we could justify the method proposed by the hon. member for Hants, namely, that decisions of the Governor in Council on petitions for fiat should be submitted to the judgment of the Exchequer Court or of the Supreme Court. If you are to revise or reverse the decisions of the Governor in Council respecting the granting or refusing of petitions of right, my view is that it would be preferable for the good government of this country to say that in future anyone shall be free to take action against the Crown whenever he wishes. I might change that view after further argument, but just now I think it would be preferable to adhere to the practice that we have always followed.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have not heard all the remarks of the Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin). He will not misunderstand me when I say that I quite approve of the legislation enabling the government to reverse its action of last year and to withdraw the fiat, which, unwittingly or otherwise, it granted to the Hoppe interests. I believe in the fiat system; I do not believe that the Crown should be placed at the mercy of any litigant, foreign or domestic, who merely chooses to enter action and place expense upon the state. The Crown has exercised the right to refuse a fiat in cases where, in the judgment of the law officers of the Crown, there was not a case reasonably actionable, that is to say, where there was not evidence of a reasonable belief of substantial merit; but it has refused also in cases where the applicant's case rested upon purely—not debatable—technical grounds. In the case of the Hoppe application, the fiat never should have been granted, because the grounds were ostensibly and obviously technical. There was a cancellation; they claimed it was not valid because of some technical defect of service or some technical defect of wording. Nothing could have been more purely technical than the whole ground upon which the application rested. In my judgment, the fiat should have been refused from the beginning; indeed, the granting of it was a variation from the established practice in such cases. It appears to have subsequently developed after the fiat was granted—

Mr. MARTELL: Will the right hon. gentleman permit a question? Suppose he regards the whole thing as technical; the Crown being one of the parties to the litigation, does he think the Crown should have the right to say whether or not an action should be brought against it?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Undoubtedly; that is just what I have been asserting. I am quite sure that the Department of Justice and the government would get into interminable difficulties if any other course prevailed. In this case, after the fiat had been, in my judgment, wrongly, granted, it developed that the parties granted the fiat had made some agreement with one Murdock whereby Murdock was to litigate the claim and seek to re-establish the Hoppe interests on the flimsy foundation of these technical allegations. An investigation took place before a Senate committee, where it was brought out that once the interested parties felt sure of the fiat, and after it had been granted—in some instances, indeed before the granting of it—speculative sales took place. Murdock had secured from the Isenberg interests—another name for the Hoppe interests, the two, Isenberg and Hoppe, having been originally associated in the lease,—some agreement whereby he was to take over the litigation. He was to pay the Isenberg interests a considerable sum of money in the event of success; then, after the success, if the leases were sold he was to pay some more, depending upon the amount he obtained for them, until a maximum of, if I remember correctly, a million dollars was reached, beyond which he was not to pay anything to the Isenberg interests. This was the first agreement—all the outcome of the stand taken by the government last session. Shortly after making it—perhaps before, I do not know; very probably contemporaneously with it—Murdock entered into another agreement for the sale of the entire interests, dependent, of course, upon his success in the litigation. This agreement is to a party in Ottawa, Mr. Church, and the sale price is two millions of dollars. This figure, had the transaction gone on—the agreement was actually made and subsisted—would have netted a million dollars to these speculators all out of the government and out of the lands of this country. But not content with that, negotiations proceeded for a third sale. I do not know how far they succeeded, but I do know that the parties were confident of success of a sale to interests in the Old Land for something in the neighbourhood of three million dollars. This is the speculative structure erected on the champertous agreement entered into by Murdock with the Isenberg estate after the government, having adopted an attitude of sympathy last session, finally yielded, reversed the policy of the former government and

granted the fiat. Well, what a structure! Sales at a million, then two million, then sales all but concluded, if not finally concluded indeed, at something beyond that! The Isenberg-Hoppe interests were originally cancelled because the parties were in default, and as well in the presence of the fact that the holders of those leases were not acting as holders of leases should act in relation to this country when they were holders of the same, and at a time when we had a right to demand from those in possession of government lands in this country fidelity to the cause of the state. But at all events the legal basis of the cancellations was default, and that default existed there was no doubt whatever. Default had existed in dozens of other cases, and default had been followed by cancellation and by the same form of cancellation as was applied in the case of the Hoppe-Isenberg leases. Default is reported to the minister time after time in the Interior department. Very often, I know, a longer time is given than was given in the Hoppe case, but there is no obligation in the world to give any longer time. It is entirely a question of what is the interest of the state in the circumstances, and the legal basis for cancellation was just as strong in the case of the Hoppe-Isenberg leases as in the case of any of the others.

The government last session brought in legislation to validate the former cancellations, some opinion having been given, based on a court decision, that a cancellation which read that the leases would be cancelled after such a date instead of reading that the leases were cancelled, was not in strict compliance with the technical law, and consequently might be upset on application to the court. The government brought in a bill to validate such cancellations, to validate the services, but through one manoeuvre and another in the Upper House and here a clause was inserted which had the practical effect of enabling the Isenberg interests to escape and of enabling the government to grant a fiat in such a case. Opening the door, of course, led to someone entering, and the Isenberg interests were not slow to enter, and the government granted a fiat. This was followed by the investigation of the Senate with the revelations to which I have just briefly referred, and as a consequence the government comes this session and asks for power to reverse the stand it took.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): My right hon. friend has made a statement about the legislation of last session with respect to cancellation. I did not understand that there was any distinction made as between the Hoppe leases and any other leases.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The history was this, to be more detailed. I have not looked into it recently, but I ask my hon. friend to correct me if I am wrong. The bill was introduced first of all in the Senate. That bill contained two clauses. The first clause provided for the validation of the cancellations, a perfectly proper clause. It was a government bill.

The second clause provided for the saving of the right of action in respect of all cancellations not a year old. There was a great deal to be said for that, and no exception was taken to that because all were treated alike. Where there was not a year-old cancellation the right of application for fiat was reserved. Such was the bill as introduced. In the Senate clause 3 was added on the motion of an hon. member there. Clause 3 provided that notwithstanding anything herein contained certain lands should no longer be leased—and the lands were described; they were the Hoppe lands—by the minister and could not be leased unless parliament subsequently passed an act enabling the minister to do so. Parenthetically I might say that the Hoppe lands on my recommendation had been withdrawn by the late government from the regulations of the department, so they could no longer be leased by the minister. They could have been leased, of course, by the Governor in Council. This clause would have provided that they could not be leased except on the authority of a subsequently enacted statute. Such was clause 3, added in the Senate.

Then clause 4 provided for reports to this House of all cancellations within so many days after the opening of the succeeding session. It was a harmless clause.

Clause 5, however, is the one to which I draw special attention. That was the third clause added in the Senate. Clause 5 provided that nothing herein contained should affect any case in which litigation had been commenced, legal proceedings instituted, before, if I remember correctly, the 20th of May, 1922. My date may not be exactly correct. In such form the bill passed the Senate and came to this House. Clauses 1 and 2 passed without question. Clause 3 was supported by hon. gentlemen of the opposition and by, I think, most hon. gentlemen to my left, but was stoutly resisted by the minister on the ground that to subsequently enact that certain lands were without the regulations and beyond the scope of the government's unrestrained power and could only be disposed of by parliament evidenced a lack of trust in himself as minister,

and he called on his followers to vote it down. After a tie vote in committee the Chairman gave the casting vote in favour of the minister, and clause 3 was deleted by this House. No objection was taken to clause 4, but a perusal of Hansard will show, and I feel certain this is correct, that it really never was taken up in the committee at all. No words of the members of the committee relate to clause 4, nor does it appear to have been called by the Chair. However, that is immaterial because clause 4 was unobjectionable.

Coming to clause 5, a motion was made by the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) to alter that clause, to strike it out and substitute in its place a much more liberal clause, that is to say, a much more wide-open clause. The motion proposed by the hon. member for Brome provided, not that in cases where litigation had been commenced, legal proceedings instituted, but in cases where application by petition of right had been entered prior to a certain date in July, in such cases the provisions of the act should not apply. Clearly, should the motion proposed by the hon. member have passed both Houses, then anyone at all could have come along before that date in July and by commencing proceedings have saved all his rights as against the bill. This did pass the Commons, and in such form the bill went to the Senate, with clauses 1 and 2 passed, clause 3 deleted, clause 4 ignored but appearing in the bill, and clause 5 as amended by the motion of the hon. member for Brome.

In the Senate objection was taken to the amendments of the House of Commons. Objection was taken to the deletion of clause 3. Objection was taken to clause 5, and very strong objection, and as a consequence at the close of the session managers of both Houses were appointed, the government refusing to agree to the Senate amendments, and while the House waited here until after midnight these managers wrestled over the problem, and finally the Prime Minister came to parliament and said that it had been decided to drop clauses 3 and 5. He meant, no doubt—at least I am willing to concede that he meant —to drop the House's alterations in respect of clause 5. What he meant in respect of clause 3 I really do not know, because we had already dropped clause 3 in this House, and the Senate was objecting to our deletion. I am not worrying about clause 3 now, so I do not debate just where the misunderstanding arose in that regard, but I would draw particular attention to clause 5. The effect of the government intimation to this House in respect of clause 5 was that it was to go, there was to be no clause 5 Consequently, I rose in the House myself and complimented the government upon dropping clause 5, fully understanding that the bill was to stand then as introduced by the government in the Senate in the first place. In such form the bill should have passed. Such a bill treated everybody the same, citizens of another country or citizens of our own, and no citizen of another country has any right to ask to be given better access to the courts of this country than we grant the citizens of our own land. Therefore, I complimented the government on its decision to yield to the requisition of the Senate and leave out clauses 3 and 5. But to my amazement when the bill came out clause 5 appeared in the form in which it had originally passed the Senate, not in the form in which it was amended by the motion of the hon. member for Brome. Clause 4 appeared also, and that was inserted in the statutes of last year as one of the laws passed by the parliament of Canada. Coming then under this clause 5, as it appears in the statutes, application was made for the fiat, it evidently being considered that legal proceedings were taken within the time fixed in the original amendment in the Senate, and the fiat was granted by this government.

Mr. VIEN: Did I understand my right hon. friend to say that this fiat was asked under clause 5 of the statute?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No it was not asked under clause 5, but the power to grant it was reserved by clause 5.

Mr. VIEN: I may point out to my right hon. friend that the statute has no clause 5.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It would not have because clause 3 was omitted and clause 5 I presume, therefore became clause 4. But the number of the clause does not matter although I can carry the House with me better by calling this clause, clause 5. Very well, on the basis of the granting of the fiat and the attitude of the government that led thereto, all this superstructure of speculation arose, but the government then addressing itself to the subject once more discovered champerty in the first agreement. It was not hard to discover it. There was undoubtedly champerty. There was undoubtedly an agreement to foster that litigation in proportion as the litigation succeeded, and having seen champerty in the agreement the government seized upon that as a reason for bringing in legislation empowering them to withdraw the fiat. Well, if the legislation has no other foundation than to enable the gov rn-

ment to get out of the position it put this country in, that is foundation enough. I am glad to see it. Let that fiat be withdrawn. Let us not draw lines between the methods of treatment of various lessees of our public resources. Treat one class the same as the other. The Hoppe lease was four years old and should have come under the very same form of cancellation as the leases of Canadians that had been cancelled four years ago. On that ground a fiat should have been refused. Why the champerty is a cause for refusing it I am not very clear, but inasmuch as without champerty there was ample ground for refusal, certainly the proper thing to do is to carry through the legislation enabling the government at least to safeguard the interests of the country in this respect.

Now, I believe the Minister of the Interior has repented too, and he came to the House the other day with a bill to re-insert clause 3 in the legislation of this country. I do not know just what has reformed his attitude to clause 3. I never regarded clause 3 as any reflection whatever on the respect or confidence the House had in the Minister of the Interior. I told him so during the discussion of last session. Last session, however, his dignity would not stand the enacting of clause 3 at all. But this session, such is the chastening effect of another year of office that he makes clause 3 his own bill and goes into the Senate and says "Protect me against the foes of the country. I have been weak in the past and I have yielded. Make the law such that I can yield no more."

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Oh, no.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is not that the effect of the return to clause 3? Surely my hon. friend yielded, when the fiat was granted he was one of the government who yielded. He did not lease the land, it is true. Why? Because he had granted a fiat to enable the old lessee to establish his claim, and while the fiat was out he could not lease the land. Anyway he is right in asking for protection. He is asking for the insertion of clause 3 as a statute of Canada. In that I commend him as well. The only suggestion I have to make to the government is that in future, when excellent suggestions are made from this side of the House, the government accept them in the spirit in which they are made, and at the time at which they are made, and do not let the country suffer and the hope of the speculator be enlivened by your procrastination and delay.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): I would ask the leader of the Opposition whether he heard the proposal I suggested that the issuing of all fiats should be made public as soon as they are issued, and the same thing in the case of the denial of fiats, and what his opinion is with respect to it?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think I can say that I agree with that.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): I also said that if the government would provide for the public being made cognizant of the granting or refusal of a fiat, it would save me moving an amendment to that effect on a subsequent motion to go into Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to and the House went into Committee of Ways and Means, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

WAYS AND MEANS

EXCISE TARIFF

Mr. FIELDING: I direct the attention of the committee to the resolution concerning inland revenue. This resolution repeals the additional cigarette tax of last session and also the tax on beet sugar. These two items which, as announced in the budget, we propose to repeal are covered by this resolution.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Another case of repenting.

Mr. FIELDING: Yes; oh, yes.

1. Resolved, that it is expedient to amend The Inland Revenue Act, chapter fifty-one of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, as amended by chapter six of the Statutes of 1914, chapter twenty-eight of the statutes of 1918, and chapter twenty-seven of the statutes of 1922, by repealing paragraphs (g) and (h) of section two hundred and seventy-nine thereof and substituting therefor the following:

(h) On cigarettes made from raw leaf tobacco or any substitute therefor, weighing not more than three pounds per thousand, six dollars per thousand;

(h) On cigarettes made from raw leaf tobacco or any substitute therefor, weighing more than three pounds per thousand, eleven dollars per thousand.

2. Resolved, that any enactment founded on the preceding resolution shall be deemed to have come into force on the twelfth day of May, one thousand nine hundred and twenty-three.

3. Resolved, that it is expedient to amend The Inland Revenue Act, chapter fifty-one of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, as amended by chapter twenty-seven of the statutes of 1922, by repealing section 378 thereof.

4. Resolved, That any enactment founded on the preceding resolution shall be deemed to have come into force on the first day of January, one thousand nine hundred and twenty-three.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: This is entirely a tobacco section.

Mr. FIELDING: This deals entirely with the cigarette and beet sugar. It repeals the section of last year.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Not only is this not another case of repentance and conversion, as pointed out a moment ago, but it is one of great importance.

Mr. FIELDING: Well, all right.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think in this connection we should just place a little emphasis on what the right hon. leader of the Opposition was saying as to the fact that sometimes it is well worth while to take counsel and listen to suggestion. Last year, on this very question of cigarettes, he pointed out—and I remember doing it myself very distinctly—that great loss would occur and that the limit had been reached. I think 50 per cent of the advice was taken, and the proposed increase of $3, making the rate $9, was cut in half, and the new rate made $7.50. The minister has caused a loss of $1,232,000 to the country, because we were right and he was wrong. I think the net loss of inland revenue on the tobacco section, which largely depends upon this item, was at least $1,250,000. Then again, in connection with the sugar beet question, the minister is doing the right thing this time, because he is doing what we told him last year to do. I do not think it has cost us anything in this particular case, because we were not collecting under it. The only thing that would have happened last year, if this provision had been put into effect, would have been an injury to the sugar beet grower, and I congratulate my hon. friend on his change of heart.

Mr. FIELDING: So long as we agree upon the motion, we are not going to quarrel about the figures. The hon. member is somewhat inaccurate in his statement. We collected in 1922 excise duties on this item of $14,710,869, and in 1923 we collected $14,079,062. The difference is much smaller than he suggested. There is no doubt our judgment in that respect was erroneous. We tell the House so and ask it to make the correction.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister does not take into account the harm he has done, much of it to Canadian business. If he takes his increase in the raw leaf tobacco he may reduce his figures to what he says, in so far as our revenue is concerned, but if he takes what we objected to, the increase on cigarettes, he will find that he has lost over $1,250,000, as I will have the figures very shortly to show. He has had some increased revenue due to the tax on raw leaf tobacco to reduce his losses to the figures he gives, but he is forgetting all about the harm to the business of Canada, and he has reduced the Canadian tobacco business by over a fifth, just by this provision. What is worse, he has caused a system of bootlegging as between the United States and Canada, an operation which once commenced and got under way, as it has done, will be very hard to stop. That practice is now established, and to stop the practice of bootlegging in regard to cigarettes would be more difficult than in the case of liquor. I think the minister is going to find that the bootlegging business in cigarettes has increased. The current of trade has increased. Men have taken to it as an occupation. They have a return cargo back to this country, after taking no cargo over there. It is going to be hard, if not impossible, to undo the injury the minister did by simply going beyond the limit, destroying or impairing or depleting his revenue, injuring the business and establishing a practice which will be injurious to the whole country for years to come.

Mr. FIELDING: I am afraid there has always been, and always will be, some degree of smuggling in the case of cigarettes, and I have frankly to admit that under the act of last year the amount of smuggling was increased, but I do not think my hon. friend's description of the dreadful conditions is warranted. I have no doubt we encouraged smuggling to a degree and we have tried to correct it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have not exaggerated. The minister has stated himself that in our border cities there was a lot of cigarette smuggling going on. The best evidence that can be procured shows that in the border cities, and most of our cities are near the border, just about one-half of the cigarettes consumed are American cigarettes, and unquestionably those cigarettes are smuggled in, to a very great degree, and the impetus given to it last year brought the business to the size it is at present. With regard to what went on before, while there would be smuggling, it would be the same as in other goods, trifling and negligible as compared with the whole. But now smuggling is the substantial part of the whole importation. I have figures before me to show what revenue had been lost, and the aggregate is a trifle over the figures mentioned by the hon. member for West York, a million and a quarter. However, I shall not read the figures because they are of great length. The minister does not dispute the statement, and I think he appreciates the fact that in this respect it has been a very expensive luxury to have the hon. minister in his position and the present government in power.

Mr. FORKE: Just before the item passes, I cannot help making the remark that when the right hon. leader of the Opposition makes a thrust, he cannot help turning it round and round afterwards.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The thrusts I made last year, which I turned round once or twice, did not have any effect. It took twelve months of remorse and of penalty, which we suffered as well as the government, to get the real results. Now I am trying to have a little more prompt action. I am trying, as it were, to drive things home in such form that in some of these matters something will be saved to the country, and I would like very much, and appreciate very highly, the co-operation of the leader of the Progressive party.

Mr. CALDWELL: It is possible that I have appreciated the remarks of the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) more than my leader has. I appreciate the fact that he realizes that when you make the duty on an article too high, you cut down the revenue and you also encourage smuggling. I hope he will be as frank at all times as he has been on this question.

Resolution agreed to.

Mr. FIELDING: There are one or two other resolutions which we will take up after eight o'clock. We can report them all together.

At six o'cclock the Speaker resumed the chair and the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILL

SECOND READING

Bill No. 181 (from the Senate), for the relief of James Dunnett.—Mr. Gordon.

WAYS AND MEANS

CUSTOMS TARIFF

The House in Committee of Ways and Means, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

1. Resolved, that it is expedient to repeal the act respecting Bounties on manufactures from Manila Fibre in Canada, being chapter five of the statutes of 1903, the act to amend the act respecting the manufacture of binder twine in Canada, being chapter five of the statutes of 1907, and regulations made thereunder.

Mr. FIELDING: This bounty, granted some years ago, Mr. Chairman, has now become inoperative, no bounty having been paid under it for some time, and we think it very desirable to repeal the act.

Mr. CLARK: This has no reference to copper?

Mr. FIELDING: No, it is coming on next.

Resolution agreed to.

Mr. FIELDING: Now I desire to direct the attention of the committee to the resolution respecting copper bounties. It is on page 11 of the Ways and Means Resolution printed to-day. At the proper stage I have an amendment to suggest.

Resolved, that it is expedient to bring in a measure to provide:

1. That the Governor in Council may authorize the payment out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of the following bounties on copper bars or rods manufactured in Canada and sold for consumption therein, from copper produced in Canada from ore mined in Canada, during the periods and at the rates following, that is to say:

From the twelfth day of May, 1923, to the thirtieth day of June, 1924, both inclusive, one and one-half cents per pound;

From the first day of July, 1924, to the thirtieth day of June, 1925, both inclusive, one and one-fourth cents per pound;

From the first day of July, 1925, to the thirtieth day of June, 1926, both inclusive, one cent per pound;

From the first day of July, 1926, to the thirtieth day of June, 1927, both inclusive, three-fourths of one cent per pound;

From the first day of July, 1927, to the thirtieth day of June, 1928, both inclusive, one-half of one cent per pound;

2. That the sum to be paid as such bounty shall not exceed two hundred thousand dollars in any one of the said periods;

3. That the said bounty shall not be paid on copper bars or rods exported from Canada;

4. That the Governor in Council may make regulations to carry out the intention of this resolution; and

5. That the Minister of Trade and Commerce shall be charged with the administration of the foregoing provisions.

Mr. FIELDING: Mr. Chairman, I should like to call attention to an amendment which I desire to make to the third section providing:

That the said bounty shall not be paid on copper bars or rods exported from Canada.

I move that the following words be added:

nor on copper rods made from copper bars on which a bounty has already been paid.

Mr. CLARK: While I am in sympathy with the principle of giving this industry encouragement, I have to object to the method by which the encouragement is extended. In the first place, I think it should be by way of protective duty rather than by bounty. I do not propose to enlarge upon that at the moment, but I have another objection; and it is that this particular industry should be singled out while other industries equally deserving are excluded. I brought to the attention of the minister some

time ago an industry in the city of North Vancouver, namely, the Vancouver Creosoting Company, Limited, which produces creosoted pile for wharves, and railway ties and similar material. Some $500,000 is invested in the plant, which employs large numbers of our citizens, and particularly has made an effort to employ returned men of my province. I do not know what the figures are to-day, but it has had the enviable record of having fifty per cent of its pay-roll consist of returned men. Now, for some reason this industry, which, as I say, requires a plant worth $500,000 to produce its product, has been given no protection. I do not know that there is another plant in this country of just the same nature, but similar plants in Seattle have, at least during the past year, been shipping into British Columbia creosoted pile which has actually been used in the construction of government wharves in our country. One of the reasons why they have been able to do that is, of course, the fact that the goods come in free of customs duty. Another reason is that the Vancouver Creosoting Company has had to pay a sales tax of 3¾ per cent on every gallon of creosote used by it in its industry, whereas the Americans treat their product, ship it into this country free of duty, and do not even pay the sales tax on the creosote. That, I believe, will be cured by the present budget so far as sales tax is concerned, but after all, that phase of it is more or less insignificant and does not affect the future of the industry. Another reason why this company cannot compete with the Americans is that they have imported $200,000 worth of machinery which they are using for the purpose of treating this pile, and on that machinery they have paid an average duty of 18½ per cent. Thus the Americans get their plant and equipment very much cheaper than our own people do, and their cost of manufacture is much less. Furthermore, the people to the south have a much larger market. Our industry has been running at cost in order to try to preserve the capital invested, but I am informed that the American plants are underbidding us and just avoiding liability to dumping act penalties. That, of course, is exactly what the Americans, with their tremendous capital reserves, will do to any industry established in Canada that has absolutely no protection. Now, it is a matter of life or death for this company, and what I submit is that on the principle which the minister has applied to the copper industry, he should apply in connection with this industry. He should put this industry in the same category with the silk industry—which does not exist—with the copper industry, and others on which bounties are to apply; only I say it should be in the way of a reasonable protection. If this is not done our people will continue to flow from British Columbia; our returned soldiers, now employed there, will be thrown out of employment, that plant will have to close its doors, and when it does so our government will pay whatever the Americans demand for the piling they must buy for the piers there. The Americans are now selling it cheaper in our market than they can sell it in their own, and they have this further advantage: the piling is transported from Seattle to Vancouver—a very short distance after all,—on scows which, were it not for this return cargo, would come back from Seattle empty. The transport, therefore, is provided by means of these scows at practically no cost. I note that the minister says in his budget:

> A new industry is promised us for the manufacture of artificial silk. It is represented to us that this industry will employ a large amount of labour and we have every reason to believe that if we can make encouraging terms a great industry will be established.

And I believe a duty of 37½ per cent is to be applied on that promised industry. Now here is an industry which is not promised; it is actually in existence, and $500,000 of our peoples' money is invested in it. I have pointed out as well that it is employing our returned soldiers, who, as we all know, need employment. It is proposed to allow that industry to go out of existence, to allow the capital that has thus been invested to become wasted. I note other words used by the minister in his budget speech, in reference to the British preferential tariff. He says:

> To these reductions we attach two qualifications, the first of which is that they shall not apply in the case of any article where the duty is not above 15 per cent. A duty of 15 per cent will not be regarded as a high one, and it will hardly be expected that we ought to apply these reductions to items which stand at 15 per cent or less.

I say unhesitatingly that a duty of 15 per cent would be reasonable. I think it would be satisfactory to this industry and would not largely increase the price of the product to our people.

In addition to that, the minister has laid great emphasis upon the necessity for revenue. So far as the copper industry is concerned, the bounty is not going to be a revenue producer. On the other hand, if the minister applied that reasonable 15 per cent duty to this industry, we would have revenue produced. On any imports of that material into this country we would get the 15 per cent duty, but though revenue does appeal to me there is something far

more important than revenue involved in this particular case. A 15 per cent duty would mean that that plant would be enabled to carry on. It would be given an opportunity of attaining success, and it would be enabled to employ our labour and our returned soldiers who need the employment.

Further than that, if the minister is looking for revenue, this industry has not paid income tax or any taxes to the Dominion government since its existence, but if it is allowed to earn a reasonable profit it will pay some income tax, and there is an opportunity for revenue. The minister in his budget speech also used words to this effect, that it is an axiom with people of all classes in Canada that it is desirable to develop industries based upon our natural resources. Now I know of no natural resources in the province of British Columbia that are greater than our timber. Why should we not encourage our people to develop those resources? Why should we not give some reasonable encouragement, some reasonable protection to such an enterprise? During the war years this was considered a most essential industry. We shipped large quantities of creosoted railway ties to India and other countries, but as hon. members know, railway construction has fallen off and that market no longer exists. A protection which the industry had during the war and until, I think, about a year ago, was the application of the war revenue tax amounting to 7½ per cent. That meant that all American shipments of this material into Canada actually paid in duty 7½ per cent, and there were other similar applications of taxes which brought the total protection of the industry up to a point around 10 per cent.

I see that in his budget speech the Minister of Finance also said:

> An industry based upon the natural resources of the Dominion which wants a helping hand at the beginning and is prepared later to rely on its own strength and character is worthy of consideration. We propose to afford a measure of help to the copper industry of Canada—

What is the difference between these two industries? The copper industry in British Columbia is just as old as the timber industry and much older than this particular industry, which is a brand-new one, a struggling, infant enterprise that wants a helping hand, and in a country where it is recognized by the two great parties certainly that some protection must exist or otherwise our manufacturers go out of business. Then is it not reasonable to give that protection to this industry in its infancy? Is it not reasonable to place these two industries, both of which are based on our natural resources, upon the same footing?

The minister says that there will be inequalities discovered in the tariff which should be corrected. I sincerely hope that this is one of the inequalities which he will discover exists, and that he will take the necessary steps to correct it. I sincerely hope that he will not apply the principle referred to on page 2650 of Hansard, where he says:

> I asked a friend who is a careful observer of these things on what he thought the American people found ground for their present activity. His answer was, "By faith in themselves." It really seems that this is the case. It is a sort of "Coueism." They resolve that things are going to get better, and they believed that they are better.

I hope that that industry will not have to apply that principle. I recognize the merit of applying such a principle, or rather I will put it this way: It is a determination to succeed. Now I believe that that company has that determination. It has struggled and is making every effort to succeed, but I am equally convinced that it cannot succeed unless it is given reasonable encouragement, and I ask the minister seriously to consider giving this particular industry the encouragement he has given to the copper and silk and other industries.

Mr. FIELDING: I am afraid that readers of my hon. friend's observations will draw from them an entirely erroneous impression. They will receive the impression that this budget has in some way or other assailed the particular industry to which he refers.

Mr. CLARK: Not at all.

Mr. FIELDING: I say that is the inference to be drawn. I do not say he so intends it, because it is obviously not correct. This industry is not a new one. It is not even an infant industry. It has been in operation for many years.

Mr. CLARK: May I ask the minister in what year it was established?

Mr. FIELDING: If my hon. friend will let me finish—this particular industry of creosoting, or rather this particular item, has been on the free list, for that is what it is, for many years. The particular year in which that industry was established I do not know, but it was established evidently, unless it existed before that, when the item was on the free list. Now there are in the tariff a number of items where there is no duty at all, and we have been asked in a number of cases to take them from the free list and make them dutiable. This is one of them. Reluctantly, for we do not want to do any harm to any industry, we have felt disinclined to take the item from the free list that has

been there for many years and now make it dutiable. My hon. friend has given us a statement as to that particular industry which if true shows it to be in a deplorable condition, but I hope it is not correct. This item has been on the free list for many years, and we have not felt able to take it from the free list and put it on the dutiable list. That is the whole story.

Mr. CLARK: I can give my hon. friend the year in which this company was established. I think it was in 1919. I may be wrong within two years but no more, and when it was established it had protection through special war taxation to the extent of about 10 per cent, 7½ per cent war revenue tax and some other taxes which brought its protection up to approximately 10 per cent. This is a new industry nevertheless, and I maintain that the same principle should be applied to it. No industry in British Columbia can be called an old industry, much less this one. I think my hon. friend will find that it is the only industry of its kind in the whole Dominion of Canada that is actually operating. There is another on the north arm of Burrard Inlet near Vancouver, which has been closed for several years, in which several hundreds of thousands of dollars have also been invested but it cannot carry on because of this continued state of affairs.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not know that I quite appreciate the distinction made by the Minister of Finance. He is anxious that the matter shall be fairly represented. Am I to understand that because this company started doing business under the free list, even although it is handling an output indigenous to the country, it is something he ought not to consider? Because, I think that was the result of his remarks. I do not think this industry is a very old one. The tariff item itself is old. You have the two different classes of tariff. One class covers goods not yet made in the country. But when they are made there is a change from the free list. Why was not the change made in this case? Is this regarded as an industry that cannot be helped, or is the trouble due to the fact that it foolishly continued while the product was in the free list, and cannot now expect help?

Mr. FIELDING: No, I would not like to put it that way. May I pay my hon. friend the compliment of saying that according to the statement of the hon. member for Burrard this industry has been running for some years and my hon. friend, when he had an opportunity of looking after it, did not think it worthy of taking its products from the free list and putting them on the dutiable list. The result is we can be accused of following, shall I call it, his bad example?—no, following his example.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I should like to say to my hon. friend that I always take for granted that argument and that answer; we have had it so frequently in connection with tariff matters as well as in connection with other matters. When we argue that there should be a change we are told "You did not do it" and it is considered by hon. gentlemen opposite that should end the matter. In all seriousness I would like to know why on earth hon. gentlemen across the aisles are holding office if they are not to do anything that their predecessors did not do. What are we told by hon. gentlemen? One time we did not do a certain thing and therefore it should not be done now. My hon. friend with just as much accuracy could say "Because I put a duty on cigarettes which was all wrong it should be left there." The status quo prevails; there is not to be any change. Surely that cannot be any reasonable ground for my hon. friend's action. If he adopted that policy throughout he would never do anything except what we ask him to do. My hon. friend only assumes that role because he thinks it pays him to assume it. I do not think he should assume it at all. So far as this particular industry is concerned my hon. friend will also recollect there was a war tax of 7½ per cent which of course came off about three years ago, I think in 1920. But the industry was fairly well looked after down to that date because that act was in effect the whole time this company was operated.

Mr. FIELDING: My hon. friend asked the question "What are we holding office for?" I am afraid it is chiefly because the people of Canada got tired of another set of gentlemen and made up their minds there ought to be a change. If we had made the particular change which my hon. friend is now discussing I am not sure but that he would again have referred to that platform of 1919 and said "Here is a thing that was free when our government were in power and you have actually put a duty on it." That would have been the cry. However we have not given him that opportunity. These products were free in his day and we leave them free now. We may be all wrong, but it is a wrong in which he will have to share the responsibility with us.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am not at all afraid of any responsibility but I put this to

my hon. friend: Following what he has already said to the hon. member who brought this matter to his attention, is the reason he has not done anything in this particular case because this industry started operations under a free entry tariff, or is it that it is of such a class that the hon. gentleman thinks it does not merit protection?

Mr. FIELDING: The reason is that we are unwilling to take articles from the free list and put them on the dutiable list unless there be a stronger reason than was presented by my hon. friend when he declined to do it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend seems to know what was said to me now when the previous government were in power. I am quite sure he does not.

Mr. HOEY: Will the minister tell us how many firms are producing copper bars or copper rods in the Dominion at the present time?

Mr. FIELDING: None at the moment.

Mr. HOEY: I mean producing the commodities to which this bounty applies?

Mr. FIELDING: The only concern, I think, contemplating this production in a large way is the Consolidated Mining and Smelting Company at Trail. That is the only large concern doing it. To be perfectly accurate, they are not doing it at the moment but they expect to do it.

Mr. HOEY: Would the minister mind giving us the name of the president and the directors of that company?

Mr. FIELDING: The gentleman we know best in the matter is Mr. Warren. I think he is president. I could not give the names of the directors. My impression is that it is an association of Canadian Pacific Railway people.

Mr. CLARK: I am not satisfied that this matter has received the consideration it merits, and I rise again to seriously ask the minister to take it under consideration. I would like to feel that as long as this country is going to have a tariff that tariff will be a scientific one, and that it will be based on sound business principles. I would hate to go away from this House with the impression that no protection will be given this industry, and that no article can be taken from the free list and put on the protective list merely because of the remarkable platform of 1919. I am not interested in that. What I am interested in, though, is in being satisfied that no matter what party is in power so long as the tariff is a recognized principle in this country it shall be based on scientific grounds and not upon a platform which the minister himself admits is exploded.

Mr. GOULD: The hon. member for Burrard is very anxious to have more protection granted an infant industry. He wants it to have "the helping hand" to quote an expression we heard during the delivery of the budget. It does seem to me that the mind of the protectionist is absolutely inconsistent. Not very long since, during the budget debate the hon. member for Fort William and Rainy River (Mr. Manion) returned thanks for the reduction of the duty on stumping machines. Again, we had the member for East Elgin (Mr. Stansell) thanking the Minister of Finance because he had reduced the duty on tile. Now we have the hon. member for Burrard advocating a higher rate of protection, while we in this corner of the House, are between the nether stone of East and West. If we ask the members from British Columbia for anything, or if we look at them, what do we find? We find they are asking for protection on apples and lumber, we find huge votes being passed for the construction of their wharves, and we are supposed to be the legitimate prey for them. They are again asking for duties on the implements which they manufacture in the East and which we use in the West. I am glad that the deaf ear is being turned to them, and I hope the parliament of Canada in future will be constituted of men who will turn deaf ears to these species of pleas advanced by these men who ask for duties.

Mr. CLARK: Can the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Gould) see any difference in principle between giving protection to the copper industry and giving protection to the creosoting industry?

Mr. GOULD: I am opposed to subsidizing the copper industry, and I am speaking on absolute principle. I think the hon. member mentioned some $200,000 as being the cost of the machinery of this plant of which he spoke. We might also say that we have minor plants on our farms, for instance, and we are sacrificed, because we do not ask for concessions of that kind. We are not making the specious plea the hon. member is making. We do not ask for protection, and we do not want it, but we want everybody else to stand on his own feet as we do. We believe others can do it, and the government should ask them to try.

Mr. CLARK: What about the wheat board?

Mr. GOULD: It will stand absolutely on its own feet, and it does not propose that it shall cost anyone else one extra cent.

Mr. COOTE: Would the minister tell us who it was that made representations to him asking to have protection granted to this particular industry?

Mr. FIELDING: I think my hon. colleague from British Columbia, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. King) had a good deal to do with it, but others drew our attention to it. Members of this House brought our attention to this matter. I do not want to single them all out, but several of the hon. members from British Columbia did me the honour of calling on me and making these representations. Quite a number of people were interested.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): In regard to the bounty on copper, it is well known to the members of this House that British Columbia is a province rich in minerals. We have a great mining industry. We are mining our ores, putting them through the process of concentration and to some extent carrying on a refining process. That is to say, we make matte copper. Heretofore our matte copper, or our concentrated ores, had been taken to Tacoma, an American refining centre, and refined there, and from that point shipped east, and brought into Canada, for the purpose of manufacturing articles made of copper. All of those articles are on the dutiable list to-day. In order that the manufacture of copper wire, copper rods and so on, may be carried on in Canada a duty has been imposed, but we have heretofore allowed these raw products to go to the large American centres, where copper matte ore is reduced or refined in a larger way than at any other point in the world. We know the value of our copper deposits. We know—at least we are advised by those who are in the industry of mining and producing copper ore—that, with a bonus extended over a period of five years, they will establish a refined copper industry in Canada. That will mean that the people of Canada will use the refined copper from their own ores, and it is also anticipated that we will be able, in the period of four or five years to place our refined copper on the world's markets in competition with American copper. I think the effort is well worth while. Although I have no objection to my hon. friend making his case to-night, it is the first representation I have heard of the situation regarding the creosoting plant. However, the two items are not in the same category at all. They are entirely different, and the discussion of one does not mean that the other is in the same position. Personally, I am satisfied, from the information I have been able to gain by inquiry, that this bonus on the production of copper will do very much along the same lines as was done for the lead and zinc industry in British Columbia some years ago, when this parliament voted a bonus, which resulted in the establishment of very large lead and zinc works in British Columbia; so much so that to-day British Columbia ores are being made into lead and zinc, are holding their own in the world's markets and are the means of bringing millions of dollars to the Dominion.

Mr. GARDINER: I take this opportunity to enter a protest against giving any bounties to this particular industry. I would like to ask this House, fairly and squarely, just where we are going to stop. When are you going to stop putting burdens on the shoulders of the people? Are you going to place burdens on our shoulders that we cannot bear and force us out of the country, or are you going to take some of the burdens off our shoulders and give us an opportunity to exist? I would like to call attention to the fact that the farmers of Canada have to compete against the world. It does not matter what market they compete in, they compete against the world on an open competitive basis. The position simply is that if we farmers desire to continue farming we have to put a great deal of backbone into our work in order to exist, and I would suggest that, instead of granting a bonus to these particular industries, the House ask these industries to put a little more backbone into their particular jobs and see if they cannot carry on without bounties.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: Something I was going to say has been said for me by the last speaker, but I want to add my voice in protest against the granting of bounties by the government. One of the principal reasons has been advanced eloquently by the hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Clark) to-night. Once this government starts—I am not referring to past governments with their records of bounties and tariffs—it means that they are opening the door to pleadings such as we have heard to-night. If you start giving bounties, where are you going to stop? We have heard the argument, if you are giving a bounty to this industry, why not to the other industry, to my industry or to some other industry? That kind of argument will be used continually, and is the government going to be able to stand up against it, once it has opened the door? I have sympathy with the

hon. member for Burrard, especially in reference to one of the handicaps which he mentioned as being placed on the industry he is speaking for to-night. One of the handicaps is the high cost of machinery which enters into the work, due to protective tariff. While I sympathize with him, I am perhaps inclined to be a little glad that other people feel the pinch as well as we do. We extend sympathy to him from that point of view also. But I believe, as has been shown by the hon. member for Burrard, that the idea of protecting machinery, thus raising the cost of machinery which is necessary for the development of our natural resources, is the greatest handicap we have in this country. It has been shown by the hon. member himself that that was one of the handicaps, and if he were to make the request that the machinery that that industry used should be admitted free of duty to enable the company to compete with their American rivals, I should be glad to support him.

Mr. MANION: In regard to the remark which the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Gould) applied to me as to stumping machines, I should like to say a word. He pointed out that, though we in this section of the House took a protectionist attitude, I congratulated the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) upon putting stumping machines on a lower basis of customs taxes than heretofore. I repeat my congratulations to the Minister of Finance, and I might point out to the hon. member that stumping machines are, among the farm implements that should be put upon the free list. They are, in fact, among the lines of goods asked to be put upon the free list in the farmers' platform; so at least my hon. friend should have hesitated to criticize me on that account. I am pointing out in general to my hon. friend from Assiniboia, who took such a strong attitude regarding bounties, and to some other hon. gentlemen, that ever since I have come into this House I have noticed in the annual estimates, items amounting to about $6,300,000 to assist agriculture. It is in this year. If that item of $6,300,000 for the Department of Agriculture is not a straight bounty to the agricultural interests of this country, I do not know what it is.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. MANION: My hon. friend from Assiniboia and other hon. gentlemen shake their heads and oppose that view. I know it is of no assistance to me directly; it is certainly of no assistance to the Manufacturers' Association or to any other line of business in this country that I know of, and it is certainly of direct assistance to the agriculturists of this country. Therefore, I would say that it is, if perhaps not a direct, certainly an indirect bounty to the agriculturists, if it does not assist them individually. My hon. friend continues to shake his head. That item deals with the prevention of disease among cattle, with agricultural colleges to educate those who are on the farms, and all the other different items.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): Is the prevention of disease amongst cattle, for instance, especially dairy stock, carried on merely in the interest of the farmers, or in the interest of the general health of the people of Canada?

Mr. MANION: I am not criticizing the item in any way; I stand by it; I support it, and I always have supported it. Moreover, in helping the farmer, we are helping the whole of Canada. I agree with the item. But I think my hon. friends are somewhat inconsistent when they criticize the hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Clark) when he asks for support for some industry. I am not taking any part in discussing the question of the bounty for which he is asking; but when they criticize him so severely as they do, they are inconsistent in not remembering that amongst the estimates there is an item of $6,300,000 of direct or indirect assistance to the farmers of this country. I do not now hear, and I have never heard any argument to show that that is not a bounty to the farming interests of this country. Before I sit down, I will say further that, with the exception of a few little bounties given by this government and other governments for manufactures, such as the copper industry, I do not know of any other class of people than the farmers who receive a direct bounty of that sort.

Mr. GOULD: In reply to the hon. member for Fort William and Rainy River (Mr. Manion), who argues that an item of $6,300,000 is given to the agriculturists of Canada as a direct benefit to them, let us suppose that we admit that. We have in this country about five million people engaged in agriculture, so that this would amount to about $1.10 apiece. On the other hand, will my hon. friend, who is a gallant gentleman in national defence, admit that the item of twelve or fourteen million dollars for 400,000 men in Canada is a direct gift or money spent directly for the profession of which he is a member? I only point this out to show how erroneous is the basis of his argument.

When the hon. gentleman says that this item of $6,300,000 voted for agriculture is specially beneficial to agriculturists, I do not admit that, because I maintain that every individual in Canada who receives his living or any direct benefit from agriculture, receives his fair proportion of that sum. If the hon. gentleman admits the other argument in connection with the twelve or fourteen million dollars for national defence, I am prepared to admit his argument, because that is not as erroneous an argument as is his.

Mr. MANION: Every country in the world has some form of defence; no country in the world could carry on without having a defence force of some kind, and surely Canada is not to be placed in such a humiliating position as to have no defence force. I deny, however, that any part of the money spent on defence is in the nature of a bonus to any person; it is spent for the benefit of the whole population of Canada. But this item of $6,300,000, so far as I can see—and my hon. friend has not punctured my argument—is a direct bounty to agriculturists, though I take that attitude, I support it.

Mr. GARDINER: Is it not a fact that this item of $6,300,000 is granted for the purpose of assisting the farmers to produce more in this country?

Mr. MANION: Certainly. That is what the copper bounty is for too.

Mr. GARDINER: In order that the farmers may be exploited on all they produce.

Mr. MANION: I do not agree with that at all. I think too much complaint is being made by my hon. friends that they are being exploited. They are not being exploited in any shape or form by anybody in this country.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I would like to ask the hon. member—

The CHAIRMAN: This debate is getting out of order. The item is in regard to the copper bounty.

Mr. CHURCH: It seems that there is protection for some people in this country and none for others. The farmer is protected on his wheat and dairy products, and many other things.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I rise to a point of order.

Mr. CHURCH: I am just coming to the point.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The hon. gentleman is as far from the point as I was.

[Mr. Gould.]

The CHAIRMAN: Exactly. The Chair agrees with that.

Mr. CHURCH: The resolution before the Chair is for a copper bounty. If the government will look over the industries of Canada and every year assist one or two basic struggling industries that need some protection and that are trying to get on their feet, the government will do a great deal towards building up Canada. There has been a great deal of discussion in regard to the

9 p.m.

principle on which this bounty is recommended, but it is hard to find an underlying general principle, because the copper industry in Canada is well organized; it is to-day functioning; it is well established and it is already doing a great deal of work in the way of smelting. I think the government is right in its attitude of giving bounties to basic industries that are struggling to get on their feet, and I hope the government will go further in this direction because there are many other industries not included in this particular resolution, which require some direct aid or protection. Copper bars are included. Why not brass? Why not glass, and steel plates? Why not wool? The people of the United States began as Canada did, as an agricultural country and the farmers wanted a home market. The farmer and the city or town man worked together, and the government of the United States encouraged bounties for various industries, with the result that they became the great industrial people they are to-day. I think we could take a leaf out of the book of the United States in that regard. If the government can encourage the farmer and the city man in Canada to work together so as to provide a home market, the government will be doing a great thing, not only for the farmer, but for struggling industries that are trying to get on their feet. For instance, there is the wool industry which is practically not protected at all. There is a 15 per cent duty regulation, but I do not believe it is being enforced. In my opinion, this bounty and direct aid principle should be extended to other basic industries as well as copper and copper bars. If the government will extend this principle to other industries such as those I have mentioned, this will provide work for our workmen and close the doors so that our skilled labourers will not be driven to the United States. What is the use of bringing in immigrants, unskilled labour, whom you have to finance and help until they get on their feet, when you leave the door open for our own skilled labour to go to the United States

because of the absence of adequate protection to basic, struggling industries of various kinds?

Mr. KELLNER: I understood the minister to say that the company which hoped to benefit from this bounty is a subsidiary of the Canadian Pacific Railway. If I am capable of interpreting the ambitions of the people of British Columbia, nothing is more desired by them than a lowering of the freight rates, and in particular the elimination of the mountain rate. Might I suggest to the minister that if he did not give this bounty the Canadian Pacific Railway Company might at least reduce the freight rate on copper in order to enable its subsidiary to compete with copper produced in other countries? I think that would be one way of forcing the Canadian Pacific Railway to meet other countries in open competition.

Mr. BAXTER: If not by vain repetition common to the heathen, yet by constant repetition it seems to me people after a time come to accept as true that which is absolutely false. Now, it is absolutely false to suppose that you can pay one dollar by expending fifty-five cents; in other words, if you are going to bonus some industry by reducing the freight rates somebody has got to pay for the cost of running the railways. This parliament, at the instance of some very good friends of ours who did not constitute the government, last year took six and a half million dollars out of the pockets of the rest of the people of this country. It was not a subsidy, it was not a bonus, it was six and a half million dollars that the rest of Canada had to make up, and some of us in parts of the country that are not getting any benefit from such expenditures are becoming a little tired of the whining.

Mr. MILLAR: I was rather pleased at one stage of this discussion when the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean) and the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) began to scrap over old times, and I concluded it was all up with the bonus. Being opposed to the bounty on copper and to the increased protection on creosote, I was glad to see the discussion take that course. However, it has veered around several times. Recently I read somewhere what I thought was a very good explanation of the difficulties of Canada at the present time. It was explained in this way: Since confederation we have, by legislation, been interfering with the natural flow of money through normal channels; that is, by giving bonuses and protection we have caused money to flow in other than its natural channels, consequently we have deprived those basic industries of the capital which normally they would have attracted, and for that reason they have become impoverished. The explanation proceeded to show that after doing that to encourage young industries to get a start, we had continued the encouragement so long that we had allowed the pendulum to swing too far in the wrong direction. This proposal is a move in the same direction. What has taken place during the past forty years once an industry was given protection? It always wanted a little more protection, and appeal after appeal was made to parliament for further assistance.

Let me say a word in reply to the hon. member for Fort William and Rainy River (Mr. Manion). He is usually very fair, and therefore I was somewhat surprised at his statement that agriculture had been given a bonus of six and a half million dollars. When we consider the destruction that is possible through a great influx of grasshoppers or the other insect pests that attack wheat, I wonder whether the wholesalers, the retailers, and those engaged in other businesses that are not directly interested in agriculture would not in their own protection desire the expenditure of such a sum of money rather than see the crop swept away. It is a very great stretch of the imagination to describe this expenditure as a direct grant to the agriculturists when we bear in mind the amount of money that is expended by various departments of government in seeking markets for the manufacturing interests and assisting them in various other ways. If these expenditures were put together it would be seen that in comparison the six and a half million dollars spent in encouraging agriculture was a small sum.

Reference has been made to the wheat board—

The CHAIRMAN: I would draw the hon. member's attention to the fact that he is not given the same freedom of discussion in this debate as he would enjoy on the budget. Rule 13 prescribes that addresses in Committee of the Whole must be strictly relevant to the item or clause under consideration. By way of comparison the hon. member may refer to other subject matters, but in treating them in detail he is altogether outside the rule.

Mr. MILLAR: I submit to your ruling, Mr. Chairman. I suppose it is quite right to draw the line somewhere. I was just going to say that instead of the wheat board cost-

ing the country anything, a sum of five hundred thousand dollars accrued to the public treasury from the operations of that board. I hope the minister will seriously consider that added protection by way of bonus to copper and a higher duty on creosote is simply another burden placed on the backs of those who are carrying all they can possibly bear—in fact a little more than they should carry. It is easy to see that some benefit would accrue to Canada if a little protection were given to enable these industries to get started, but when it is remembered that other industries are going out of business I think it is only fair that a halt should be called for the present, at least, until agriculture gets on its feet, and then we hope we shall be able to move forward as a solid Canada. I have nothing whatever against the province of British Columbia. I realize that their interests are a little different from ours, but in every case where it seems to me they are entitled to assistance I am as willing to give the subject just as favourable consideration as I would a similar request from Saskatchewan where I live. I quite appreciate that a few provinces cannot prosper unless their sister provinces are given that consideration to which they are entitled. We must move forward together, and for that reason I am against giving further assistance to these industries.

Mr. CAMPBELL: The minister told us a few minutes ago that by granting this bounty the industry could in a few years stand on its own feet. That is precisely what Sir John A. Macdonald told this House fifty years ago in regard to all other matters of protection. When I have to choose between two evils I prefer the lesser. If we are to grant protection in a lump sum and so know precisely what we are paying, something may be said in favour of a bounty. In regard to the comparison between this and the so-called bonus to agriculture, I do not consider that one-half of that six million five hundred thousand dollars was of any assistance to agriculture at all. So far as our experimental farms are concerned, I was suggesting to the hon. Minister of Agriculture a few days ago that the only experimental farm of any practical use was that which was made to pay, that is, where you could demonstrate to the farmer that stuff could be grown at a profit. He told me "It is impossible."

Mr. COOTE: How many men are engaged in this particular industry in British Columbia?

[Mr. Millar.]

Mr. FIELDING: I do not think that in this particular branch of the industry there are any at present, but it is the expectation that there will be a considerable number. Copper bars or rods are not, I think, being made at present, but they expect to make them.

Mr. COOTE: It is an entirely new industry?

Mr. FIELDING: This branch of it is new, but the copper industry itself is there. They are producing copper ingots, but I think I am correct in stating that they are not now producing copper bars or rods.

Mr. LUCAS: It might be described as a real infant, I presume.

Mr. WARNER: If it is not out of order I would like to point out that agriculture is an old-established industry, an industry which has itself paid the greater part of the grant that has been given to agriculture, in the products that it has put on the market in Canada. I am willing to be fair and I want everyone else to be fair. We do not want it understood that the copper industry or any other industry which has not been in operation has paid this grant.

Mr. FORKE: I would like to say a word as to what has been said in regard to the bonus to agriculture. Like another hon. member I admit the fairness of the hon. member for Fort William and Rainy River (Mr. Manion), but after all, he is making a mistake when he says that that six and a-half million is a bonus to agriculture. A large amount of that money was paid out for educational purposes—most of it, in fact.

Mr. MANION: To the agriculturists.

Mr. FORKE: To the people of Canada. I admit that when a specific grant is made to an agricultural fair it is a bonus, but I do not think the Dominion government makes any grant of that description; the municipalities and the provinces do. I do not really know of any case where money paid by the Dominion government for the advancement of agriculture can properly be called a bonus; it is a sum of money paid for educational purposes for the benefit of all the people of Canada, not for the particular benefit of any one calling or class of the people. And for fear I should forget it, I want to compliment the member for Strathcona (Mr. Warner) upon the knowledge he has of agriculture. There is a very old story I read in my youth about a man and a woman who started agriculture a very great many years ago, and ever since that time it has been a much honoured

occupation. Now, in regard to bonuses, like my friends behind me, I am certainly opposed to protection of any sort. I agree, however, with the statement that has been made that a bonus is, perhaps, the least objectionable of all the methods of protection. There is another item here that will be discussed at length; that item was a kind of temptation to me and I made certain statements in the House regarding it that I will stand by when it comes up for consideration in committee. However, if we admitted that the bonus should be granted in this case we would be admitting a principle that we believe to be wrong, and I cannot see anything for it but to vote against this item if it comes to a vote.

Miss MACPHAIL: I wish to protest against the granting of any further bounties. I believe that the granting of bounties is building up industry on a false foundation. When the bounty is subsequently to be taken away the industry in question will come swooping down upon unoffending members howling like wolves, just as industries that have been built up by protection have kicked up a fuss when it was suggested that that protection be taken away. I do not see that there is any use in building more industries on a false foundation; if they cannot get a footing by having free machinery to start with and getting the benefit of all the legitimate aid we can give them, then let them not come into being at all. As to the six and a half millions that was granted to agriculture, most of it, I think, has been spent for officials and what one might call firewood, that is, the bulletins they send out. If we could all afford farms like the experimental farms it would be very fine indeed; the only ideal farms are the experimental farms and the golf links. I was not in the House this year when the grant was passed; had I been here I would have advised the government, instead of granting this money to agriculture to teach farmers how to farm, to give it to the manufacturers to teach them how to manufacture without bounties.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the resolution carry?

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): No, it is not carried. I wish to join in the protest of those who have spoken from this corner of the House against the granting of bounties. Every evil that has been attributed to it will sooner or later be realized if the line is not drawn somewhere.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the resolution carry?

Mr. LEADER: I wish to offer my protest to the resolution and express my anxiety that the committee shall vote on the question. Let us have the vote.

Mr. GOULD: Hon. members stand in their places and say that British Columbia is blessed with a bountiful supply of copper, yet with that bountiful supply and with the factories here in Canada they cannot compete with the United States or any other country which would, of necessity, have to import that product. I would think that an industry having the valuation that is claimed for the copper industry in that province would be ashamed to come to the government asking for this bounty. Either the company is not ashamed, or it believes there is a weakness in the government that would lead it to support their request. That is not a fair condition of things in the public life of Canada, and I do not think it should be tolerated. I do wish to join my protest with those who have objected to the establishing of another industry of this nature at the present time. If the door is opened now, what may we expect next year? We may expect a flood of people coming down—in fact, it has been attempted here to-night—and asking the government for these subsidies and bounties. Who pays these subsidies and bounties? I know who pays them, and there are lots of other members in this corner of the chamber who know only too well who pays them. We shall continue our protest against this procedure, a protest which we will emphasize by all legitimate means.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the resolution carry?

Mr. HUMPHREY: Before the question is put, in view of the objection that has been raised, I would like to say just a word, as this industry is in my district. I know that hon. members are sincere in the position that they have taken, but possibly they do not realize what the situation is in regard to the copper industry. One or two questions have been asked by hon. members, as a matter of information, in respect to how many men this industry affects and what its progress has been in the past. The actual production of copper is an old industry in Canada; as concerns the converting of the copper into rods and bars it is entirely new industry. An investment of a number of million dollars is involved. Now, let us take the facts as they are, from the point of view of whether it is right or wrong to enable this production of copper bars and rods to be brought about. This industry if established, I know for a fact, would employ in the neighbourhood of

at least a thousand more men in the province of British Columbia in refining the copper and turning the copper bars into copper rods and copper wire. Under conditions that have prevailed for the last few years it has been impossible for any industry in this country to produce these copper bars and rods in competition with the United States, and in that period a good many millions of dollars have gone to the United States in consequence. As to the principle of giving protection to the copper industry, I am sure that the people of British Columbia will be only too glad if it is necessary to assist other industries, especially agriculture in the prairie provinces, to look at the question broadly and not from any selfish point of view, and to support the giving of the necessary protection that is asked. Knowing the facts connected with this industry as I do, and knowing how its establishment would affect the province of British Columbia and the whole Dominion, I can wholeheartedly approve and support this resolution.

Mr. EVANS: I wish to add my voice to the protest against this bounty being given to the copper industry. Although bounties are perhaps the least evil under the whole protective system, I do not see why any industry of this kind should need a bounty to-day in Canada. For many years we gave a bounty to the steel industry which cost this country something over twenty million dollars, and the people did not get their steel any cheaper because of that bounty. In fact, it created a monopoly, and the very steel companies we were bonusing and giving bounties to at that time were delivering rails on the other side of the globe at thirteen dollars a ton cheaper than we were paying for them at home. The minister has not told us one word of what he expects this industry to do for this country, and surely there are always two sides to a bargain. Does the company even guarantee that it will employ so many men and make this home market a little bigger than it is? Can the minister show any benefit the people will derive from the giving of this bounty? I just rise to protest as vigourously as I know how against the giving of bounties to any industry.

Resolution agreed to; Yeas, 72; Nays, 48.

Resolution reported.

INLAND REVENUE ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 187 to amend the Inland Revenue Act.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

[Mr. Humphrey.]

ACTS RESPECTING BOUNTIES REPEALED

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 188, to repeal the acts respecting bounties on manufactures from manila fibre in Canada.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

BOUNTIES ON COPPER BARS OR RODS

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 189, respecting the payment of bounties on copper bars or rods.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

SUPPLY

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

House again in Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

Department of the Interior.—Expenses connected with the Dominion observatory at Ottawa, $58,420.

Expenses connected with the Dominion Astrophysical Observatory at Victoria, B.C., $18,500.

Mr. LUCAS: Will the minister explain the increase in these two items?

Hon. CHARLES STEWART (Argenteuil, Minister of the Interior): The increase in connection with the first item is $2,705. It is accounted for by statutory increases in the salaries of the staff. There is an addition of one official to the staff of the observatory at Victoria with a salary of $2,400.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I wonder if the minister would tell us why this vote is still carried in this way. I may be met with the criticism that we allowed it to be so carried, but I do not believe the government is going to assume that as a permanent position because it would be a barrier to all progress. Why is it we cannot get all these permanent officials on the civil list?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I agree with my hon. friend that permanent officials should be on the civil list. There is no doubt they should all be placed there, but that has not been done. However, I am looking over the whole of the staff of the Department of the Interior with a view to doing that, because there are a number of officials in permanent positions who are not at present on the civil list, but who should be there.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I admit I did not follow that course. I will save my hon. friend that argument.

Mr. FIELDING: I promise not to use it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Perhaps the minister will not in this case but I am afraid he will persevere in that argument.

Mr. FIELDING: The occasion arises too often to use it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: We started, when we were in office, trying to get some changes made in connection with the whole of these matters. We began reforms which I think my hon. friend considers were right although they had not been carried out previously. For example, I believe he thinks the balance sheet now prepared is a vast improvement on the previous system. Many other reforms were contemplated in connection with the inquiry we instituted. An investigation of that character takes some time. It has been going on for the last eighteen months, ever since hon. gentlemen opposite have been in office. One of the improvements contemplated was to have the estimates prepared in such a way that they would mean something to anybody that was looking at them. I am mentioning this matter now and I brought it up last session. I am glad to see we have one convert in the person of the minister. It does really seem ridiculous that no one can pick up a copy of Canada's Estimates and form the slightest idea of the cost of civil government in this country. That is the situation we have. I had hoped to see the change made this year. I hope that it will be carried out next year beyond all doubt, and that objection will not be taken to doing it because it was not done before. I am going to ask the minister how much of these items is for salaries which should appear in the details of civil government?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Out of the $58,420 the sum of $26,685 is for salaries at Ottawa.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: And how much of the $18,500 is for the same purpose?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The sum of $11,400, out of the $18,500 is for salaries at Victoria.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: For what purposes is the expenditure which is not for salaries?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I will read the items:

Astrophysics—	
Material, optical parts, etc., for instruments under construction	$ 500
Repairs and supplies	500
Geographic positions—	
Materials for piers, line connections, express, instrument repairs, etc.	$1,000
Latitude and longitude determinations by wire and wireless	3,000
Gravity survey—	
Materials for piers, express, instruments, etc.	1,000
Experimental field work with torsion balance	1,500
Field work with pendulums and torsion balance	2,500
Library—	
Books, subscriptions to publications, binding, etc.	600
Magnetic Survey—	
Materials, express, instruments, repairs, etc.	1,000
Field expenses (two observers in field, with guides, transportation, etc.)	3,000
Seismology—	
Material, special parts, etc. for mounting of the new seismographs	500
Photo and other sheets for instruments at Ottawa, Halifax, Saskatoon and Chebucto; repairs and supplies	600
Solar Physics—	
Instruments, supplies, etc.	600
Stellar photometry—	
Instruments, repairs and supplies	350
Time service—	
Time-signal apparatus and supplies; repairs and maintenance of instruments; time for whole of Canada	1,000
Wireless equipment—	
Erection of aerial (authorized)	2,960
Apparatus, repairs and supplies	400
Total	$21,010

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Does that cover the expenditure for these purposes in connection with both institutions?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The statement I have already given applies to Ottawa. What I am now going to read has reference to Victoria:

Printing, etc.—		
Printing publications	$1,800	
Books, periodicals, binding	500	
Stationery	400	
		$2,700
Supplies and maintenance—		
Instruments and apparatus	$1,500	
Photographic supplies	400	
Machine and instrument work	600	
Hardware and chemicals	400	
Automobile maintenance	600	
Postage, customs, freight, telephone	500	
Contingencies	400	
		4,400

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It looks as though you had for maintenance charges something like $4,400 and for the purchase of instruments and other things $21,000.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): It is $21,000 in case of the Observatory at Ottawa.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The minister is quite right there. A lot of those things are for purchases which will not have to be made

each year. Why do we require so much money for next year? We will not be buying instruments every year.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No. Instruments, of course, have to be purchased, but most of these items are repairs to existing instruments.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Could we not have an understanding that something should be done to save the time of the House, and obviate a lot of questions, by showing just what is to be paid for our Civil Service? I think the minister will agree that we ought to be able to tell just what we are paying for the ordinary salaries and the like, in connection with our Civil Service, so that the matter will be clear to us. I would only agree to this course being adopted owing to the fact that these estimates have been prepared in this way for many years, and the chances are that it would be bad for everybody if we had a sudden change which would throw away the basis of comparison. If my suggestion were adopted, the House would know what it was doing, and the Finance Minister, when he was checking up the estimates, would be in a position to see what the department was doing. I would not suggest that these salaries should be taken away entirely from these estimates, and put in civil government, but that there should be, in connection with each one of these items, an extra line which would show how much of these items consisted of salaries, so that we would be able to tell the position exactly.

Mr. FIELDING: Does the hon. member mean the separation of salaries from the other matters, so that the salaries would be shown distinctly? Well, I will consider it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: You have already done it. We have done it for many years under civil government. It was never intended that it should be done partially and that the country should be misled. The estimate for civil government was intended to truly represent the cost. I am not blaming anybody. I do not know where it commenced. I could not blame my hon. friend the Minister of Finance because it was done during his long term of service in this country, but in some way or another, or for some purpose or another, lump votes were treated in such a manner as to cover not only expenses in a business sense, entirely apart from salaries, but were made up in such a way as to cover all the other charges. I think the minister will agree that that is not right, that the civil government estimates ought to be complete, and that instead of treating these votes on the wrong basis, which has been adopted in the past, we should carry the totals just as they appear here, with a note explaining that there is included in them a certain amount for salaries and then give the details of the salaries under civil government.

Mr. FIELDING: In order to illustrate the point, take this item in connection with the observatory at Ottawa, $58,420; the hon. member simply wants to divide it into two parts, so much for salaries and the remainder for other services? Is that correct?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Yes, we go half the distance there. Of that $58,000, $26,000 is for salaries. That sum ought to appear in the cost of civil government as admitted by the minister.

Mr. FIELDING: It is pretty hard to define what civil government is.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: You will find great difficulty in distinguishing between any of these items and other items of civil government. In the department, for example, with which my hon. friend from Argenteuil (Mr. Stewart) is perfectly cognizant, you will have people sitting in the same room, doing the same work, some of them included in the cost of civil government, and others included in some lump charge not shown under civil government at all. Our accounts should start out with being honest and complete, but they are not, unless they show what they are supposed to show. My hon. friend will agree with me that the civil government schedules are intended to show the salary costs of this country.

Mr. FIELDING: The hon. member means that in these items clerical services charged under other heads should hereafter be shown under civil government. I am not saying the hon. member is not right, but the result would be that it would show a large increase in cost of civil government, when in reality there would be no increase at all.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I would have it carried in this item as well so there would be a check on it.

Item agreed to.

Topographical Surveys—Topographical and general surveys, traverse of northern rivers and lakes, classification of lands for the settlement and development of Canada, plotting and printing of plans, etc, $520,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Where is that work being abandoned, to permit of the diminution in the vote?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Last year we had a very full discussion upon this question of topographical surveys, and I think in the main I agreed with the trend of the discussion then. One of the complaints was the fact that in three of the departments, at least, topographical work was being carried on, namely the Mines, the Interior and the Defence departments, and it was suggested that it might be well to try to combine the three. We have not succeeded in combining them, but we have a definite understanding that there will no longer be overlapping of work, and I think it would be an admirable thing if we had topographical maps of the whole of Canada, but we have in mind the fact that we must go slowly in this work. I am not prepared to say we could not cut the item still further. We have now no overlapping and uniform work is being carried on all over Canada. However, we have a great deal of pressure from the provinces asking that this work be prosecuted in a much larger way than we are endeavouring to do. I hope to cut it down practically to a minimum. Canada is yet a new country, in comparison with other countries, and topographical work is no doubt valuable. I think it is warranted and we now have the assurance of no overlapping. We are not meeting the demand by any means, but we are giving the survey as fast as we can afford to give it, although perhaps not as fast as they require it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: How much was spent last year?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Last year—$562,000.

Mr. EVANS: Was there not some overlapping in the classification of lands for settlement? I understood the provinces were doing that.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The Dominion survey parties are doing no classification except of Dominion lands. They are doing no classification of natural resources in any of the provinces.

Geodetic Survey of Canada—investigations, reconnaissance, triangulations, precise levelling, geodetic astronomy, etc., $325,000.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Will the minister explain this work?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I hope the hon. member will not ask for a scientific explanation. I will give a layman's explanation. Again I am afraid I shall be accused of copying; but on looking over some of the remarks made by previous ministers, that made by my predecessor in this department, now the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) struck me as being very appropriate, when he said that he could not give a better comparison than that of a steel structure for a building. The work of this particular branch of the Department of Surveys is the establishment, at points throughout the country, of permanent centres from which surveys may be carried on. That is one of the duties, combined with many others, of this branch. This is a branch of the surveys that I made some careful inquiry into as well as that of the Topographical Surveys, and I think we are well ahead with this work. We cannot anything like meet the requests of the provinces for this particular kind of work. From Nova Scotia, British Columbia, from the other provinces come requests for more of this work in order that definite points may be set up from which precise surveys may commence and be established. I do not feel like expanding this work; I was rather of the opinion that we might curtail in that direction, but I have not suggested that we do that this year. I should like to know a little more about the work than I do at present. This is, undoubtedly, a very important work. Some aspects of it, as I have said before, I am not critical about, but perhaps the branch has expanded more than there has been necessity for in some of its work.

Mr. EVANS: This is one branch of the service that I cannot quite see the use of. I have read carefully the report of the Geodetic Survey, and so far as I can find out, it has done nothing yet but test geographical positions as determined by the topographical and hydrographic surveys. A number of steel towers have been built at immense cost in the vicinity of Ottawa and at other points in Ontario particularly. I think the work of this branch is an overlapping of the topographical and hydrographic surveys, and that the work could be conducted by the one department. From this report, the only good that I can see in this branch is that it has helped some cities, only a very few, to get their precise levels. One excuse—and this looks as though the branch was hard put to it to find a justification for its existence—was that steel towers helped to locate forest fires. We surely do not need that now. I should like to know more about the work of this branch. I have no technical knowledge, but having read the report I cannot see any particular use for it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not disagree with all that my hon. friend has said; but if I

understand the Geodetic Survey, it is not of the character that he describes it as having. It is not an overlapping of topographical survey work; it cannot be. It is the foundation of survey work for all others. The Geodetic Survey seeks to establish pivotal points and establishes them, not in relation to points already found by topographical or other surveys, but from astronomical bearings. That is to say, the points established under the geodetic surveys are the points from which triangulation goes out and in relation to which other surveys have their bearings. That is to say, it is basic. Without it the other surveys would not have the certainty that they now possess. I was in hopes that it would not require such a great number of these points to be so ascertained, and that by this time some contraction would be possible. But I believe the points so ascertained by the bearings established by geodetic signs are an essential; they must be found. Otherwise our other surveys would not possess the value that they are intended to possess; indeed, they would be more or less, as I understand the matter, of a confusion. I never heard before that the steel towers erected upon those points became of value for forest protection, and it seems to me that that is pretty far-fetched.

10 p.m.

Mr. EVANS: That is one of the excuses in the report.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think the service needs an excuse. That is to say, it is a service that we must have, but it should be a contracted service. A great deal has already been done, and I do not think we should look forward to continuing it on the present scale.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): If the points are to be established as close as is suggested by the departmental heads, this would doubtless require to be carried on for a considerable number of years at the present appropriation. But I frankly have some doubts whether they are required as close as they are suggested.

Item agreed to.

International boundaries—expenses connected with the survey and demarcation of international boundaries, including $1,000 to J. J. McArthur, as International Boundary Commissioner, $42,940.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This is an appropriation that I cannot understand the continuance of year after year. Are we never going to get through with this international boundary? We have been finding the location of this international boundary ever since we were children. As I remember—I do not like to speak too positively—we were virtually through when I was minister, and I have been out of the department now for two years, yes, for three years. I am sure I remember being advised that only a very small amount was required for another year or, at the most, a few months, and we would be through. Now we come back this year with an increase of $7,260 in our efforts to get this international boundary located. Has the boundary been moving? It is getting harder to find all the time.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): All I can say to my right hon. friend is that I have exactly the same promise that this is the last year in which we shall require any considerable amount to be voted for this purpose; that the work is completed with the exception of the re-establishment of some of the monuments that have either moved or been destroyed. I am afraid I shall have to admit that last year I had something of the same statement.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is taking more money to find lost monuments than it took to locate them there in the first place.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): (reading)

The surveying operations in connection with the demarcation of the international boundary through the different sections from the Arctic ocean to the bay of Fundy, a distance of 4,083 miles, have been completed, and there remain the completion of the reports of the sections, and the engraving and printing of the maps to accompany them. On the reports, two have been submitted to parliament and distributed to the public and 140 maps have been engraved and printed. There remain five reports on all of which a good deal of work has been done, and the completion of 155 maps, all but six of which are ready to be engraved. It is expected that this amount will cover all printing and engraving that can be completed this year. The work of this commission will end when these maps and reports will have been submitted to parliament.

There are two undecided but undisputed points along the boundary which will have to be settled by a convention before this commission can close its operations. A recommendation from the commissioners is before the two governments for the signing of these conventions and also for the appointment of a permanent commission to maintain an effective boundary.

To provide for repairing and renewing monuments and reference marks and reopening the vistas along the 49th Parallel in British Columbia, $5,000.

An inspection along this section of the boundary showed that many of the monuments had been disturbed and that others had deteriorated, and that the vistas opened seventeen years ago had in places so grown over that there is no indication of the line. The customs and immigration officers strongly urge the reopening of the line, particularly in the vicinity of the customs houses.

To provide for repairing and renewing monuments and reference marks on the Quebec-Maine and New Brunswick-Maine boundary lines, $7,500.

On the boundary between the state of Maine and the provinces of Quebec and New Brunswick, long stretches of the line are through low and wet land, and many of the monuments have collapsed, and inspection shows

that unsuitable material was sometimes used in their construction.

Travelling expenses of the commissioner and engineer, $2,000.

For further investigation of the deeper channel St. Croix river at Milltown, in connection with the undecided nationality of an island, $500.

I do not know what that means particularly.

The commissioners have not succeeded in coming to an agreement as to the deeper channel of the St. Croix river near Milltown, N.B., and the nationality of an island, and further conference and investigations may be necessary.

Allowance to Commissioner J. J. McArthur, $1,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: My heart is sinking more than ever. This report indicates that the job is likely to be eternal and the expenditure increased. Furthermore, the recommendation is not being dealt with. I remember it being before the government prior to this administration coming into power. It is apparently lying there still. Why is it not disposed of? Surely we do not have to keep hunting away in the bottom of the lakes for these monuments and trying to ascertain the situation of little islands for all time. I think we may have to have a convention and appoint some permanent body to see that the line is constantly ascertainable, but that body should be composed of officials of the department engaged in other work, some engineers for instance. The way things are going now, it would seem from the report read by the minister that there is a constant evolution of new duties with the probability of a continual increase in this vote—that instead of looking towards the end of it we are opening the vista of new expenditures all the time.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I agree thoroughly with my hon. friend that one or two engineers of the department might very well act on behalf of Canada, and I presume some arrangement could be made with the United States, because they are interested as much as we are in the demarcation of the line. This is something that I intend to take up actively. I do not think we should require further expenditure upon this line except perhaps in regard to the settlement of the difficulty about the island that is referred to.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Would it not help in carrying forward the policy of the minister to cut out the vote of $1,000 to the present commissioner so it would go to the other engineers?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I should think the matter might very well be closed out before we begin to deal with the present engineers.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is his regular salary? Is not this a bonus for keeping the thing open all the time?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The information I get is that as Mr. McArthur succeeded Dr. King this additional gratuity was paid him for the work. It has been continued from year to year while the work has been going on. I may say very frankly that I think one salary should be sufficient for any man, but inasmuch as this matter will be cleared up as far as I am concerned, I think we should be hardly warranted in interfering with what has continued for so many years.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think I remember dropping this $1,000. It was restored later on after I left the department. I know I instructed that it should be dropped.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): It was not dropped.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I know I gave instructions for it to be dropped. It may have got squeezed in, but I do not think so. I know it was restored later on.

Mr. CALDWELL: Did I understand the minister to say that parts of the boundary line between the province of New Brunswick and the state of Maine had become so obscure that the marks had to be renewed?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I said the marks would have to be renewed.

Mr. CALDWELL: On the line between New Brunswick and Maine?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Mr. CALDWELL: Could the minister tell us when they became so obscure? I know it is only a few years ago since a gang of men was put on that boundary, and where the line ran through any forest country a four-foot strip was cleared and concrete monuments were put up on any height of land, so that in following the line you would come to one monument and then get your bearings by the monument on the next bit of rising land. The monuments are built of concrete with a substantial base. I have been over a good deal of that country and they all appeared to be permanent monuments, marked "United States" on one side and "Canada" on the other. I know that some of our people to their sorrow have found that the boundary is too easily defined when they begin to attempt to smuggle something across.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): It is only in the lower and wet spots apparently that these renewals are to take place. Probably

my hon. friend has seen only the monuments that are on the hills. "Long stretches of the line are through low and wet land and many of the monuments have collapsed."

Mr. CALDWELL: What are these monuments made of?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I could not answer that. I have not seen any of them except those in western Canada.

Mr. CALDWELL: What part of the line are they on?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The notes say between Maine and New Brunswick and Maine and Quebec.

Mr. FORKE: How is the expense of carrying on this work apportioned? Will the United States be granting a similar amount for the same work?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The cost of the monuments themselves is divided between the United States and Canada. Each government pays for its own parties.

Mr. CALDWELL: The St. Croix river is the boundary line on the south, and the St. John river on the north. Only a comparative distance is over land, and most of that is through cleared farm lands. I would not think there would be very much expense involved on that portion of the line between New Brunswick and the state of Maine, and I know the monuments there are of a permanent character.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not think the minister stated what the salary of the commissioner was.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): It is $4,500.

Mr. MILLAR: In many departments there are decreases in the amounts appropriated, but here we seem to have more increases than decreases. What inconvenience is involved in the line not being clearly marked? That is, what is the occasion for the urgency which would justify an increase in the vote?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): We have to have a clearly marked boundary line; if the markings get out of place or become destroyed they have to be re-established. Then, we have a number of people who are desirous of missing the customs officers, some of them anxious to engage in the carrying of liquor back and forth across the line, and it is important that the lines be clearly established.

Mr. FORKE: I cannot see how you come to any arrangement with the United States as to how much will be required to carry on this work. There is an amount of $45,000 here; are we figuring on $45,000 from the United States for its share of the cost?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Each would bear its share of the cost, because both are interested. This is the last year we shall have a substantial expenditure of this character. We have to settle the boundary line in the river, and decide whether this island belongs to Canada or to the United States. My information is that the remainder of the work will be largely completed this year. Of course, there will be some annual expenditure in succeeding years, but it should be comparatively small.

Mr. CALDWELL: How long has the question respecting this island in the St. Croix river been a matter of dispute?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I cannot tell you.

Mr. CALDWELL: It is a pretty old river and a pretty old island.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Can the minister give the committee the exact amount paid by the United States for similar work to this?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I cannot give that.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Then we do not know how much is being paid by the United States?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No, I have not the amount.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Have you an agreement with the United States?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): What are the terms of the agreement?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): One-half the cost is contributed by the United States. Of course, they pay their own parties.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): But if the minister does not know how much the United States is paying, how does he know they are paying half?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I said I did not know what they were paying their men. There may be differences in the wage scale; I cannot tell my hon. friend as to that.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is there really any such agreement as my hon. friend refers

to? Is it not a fact that the two countries divide the cost merely of the actual monuments erected?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: We cannot look to the United States for any further contribution than that, can we?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes. It would be unfair, for example, for the engineering work to be done by one country. That should be divided proportionately.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is the minister quite sure that is done? Have you joint parties doing all the work?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Arrangements are made for the work to be performed by each country. The parties do not work together.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: So that the division of cost between the two countries has relation only to the actual cost of the monuments themselves, which is a comparatively small thing. Now, does the minister not think it would be better to withdraw this increase, instead of going on, piling up costs? I would think he would consider it wise to force this work to cease by doing away with the vote, excepting, of course, such part of it as would be necessary to keep up the monuments. That would be only a small amount.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I have gone into this matter fairly thoroughly, and I am told by those who are engaged in the work that this amount is required to complete it so that it will be of value to the people of Canada. When that is done all that remains is just what my hon. friend suggests. A small amount will have to be spent annually to make any necessary repairs, but as these monuments are of a permanent nature the repairs should not require any considerable amount.

Item agreed to.

Dominion Lands and Parks—salaries of the Dominion Lands outside service, $561,380.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Are the details of these salaries given in the civil government details?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: No reference at all to them?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Not under civil government details.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That is the only place where we can get any details of salaries, is it not?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then I would ask my hon. friend for the details of these salaries.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Does my hon. friend want the full list?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I would like to see it.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): There is no increase in the number employed. I have the full list here, and it shows there are 417 employees.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am very glad that the Minister of Finance is still in his seat. Here we have permanent employees to the number of 417 in one department and the details of these salaries do not appear at all in the civil government details.. What is the highest salary paid, and what are the ratings generally?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Mr. Cuttle, Superintendent of Western Land Agencies appears to receive the highest salary, $4,020 a year; his assistant, Mr. Wright, receives $3,090; Mr. Stephenson, Chief Timber Inspector, receives $4,020; Mr. J. W. Martin, Inspector of Agencies, Calgary, $3,300; Mr. Bronsdon, Assistant to the Land Agent Inspector, $2,100.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The minister says there are no increases.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): There is no increase in the number of employees, but there are certain statutory salary increases as follows: Twenty increases of $15, making $300; thirty-five at $30, making $1,050; twenty at $45, making $900; one hundred and seventy at $60, making $10,200; two at $75, making $150; three at $90, making $270; fifteen at $120, making $1,800, and four at $180, making $720, a total of $15,390. Increases due to reclassification amount to $9,053.60. There is a contingency vote for additional help that may be required of $556.40—total $25,000.

Mr. CHURCH: Referring to the item for the preservation of historic sites, I should like to ask what has been done in that connection in the Niagara district.

The CHAIRMAN: The question is not in order under this item. We are considering

the first item under Dominion Lands and Parks, which is the salaries of the Dominion Lands outside service.

Mr. SHAW: I would like the minister to give some indication of the work accomplished by the Dominion Lands and Parks branch for which these salaries are paid, especially with reference to the work done last year as compared with preceding years.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I am afraid my hon. friend has asked for almost an impossible explanation. This is largely inspectional work. So far as the Land branch is concerned, no new offices have been opened. The inspectional work carried on from year to year is much the same with the exception that homestead inspection is on the decrease, and there is no doubt that we shall be able to do with fewer homestead inspectors than we have had in the past unless we have an increase in the applications for homesteads. The work is very similar from year to year. As to the parks, they are constantly growing in importance and will require additional votes, I imagine, from year to year if we are to keep them in anything like the shape of the parks of our competitors to the south. We must make them attractive so that people will come to Canada and spend their money here. With regard to the whole vote, with the single exception of homestead inspection, one cannot look for very much in the way of diminished cost of administration. The land offices will have to be maintained until such time as the system in connection with the Dominion lands is changed. That is, if we were to abandon the homestead principle then we could cut off a considerable number of these offices. But until that is done they will have to be maintained, and the inspection, which is the chief cost in connection with this particular item will also have to be kept up.

Mr. SHAW: Is it not a fact that the work done by the Dominion Lands department has been rapidly decreasing during the past several years, but that the staff, apparently, continues to increase?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No, there is no increase in the staff.

Mr. SHAW: There certainly is no decrease. What I want to know is, if the work is rapidly decreasing why should not the staff decrease correspondingly?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): To say that the work is decreasing is scarcely a fair statement. It may be true of homesteading. There is no doubt that homesteading is not carried on to the same extent that it was in former years, but there is inspection work to be done in the interest of many of the homesteaders who have not been granted patents. We find that a great deal of the work of the homestead inspector is taken up in connection with disputes as to whether or not the man has done sufficient improvement on his land to earn patent. I do think it is rather an expensive method of dealing with the land; but perhaps more than 50 per cent of the work required of the inspector relates to this very item that I have mentioned, namely, where the patent has not been granted, although the applicant thinks he has earned it four or five years ago, and is yet in dispute.

[Mr. Chairman.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is it not a fact that the minister has increased the number of land offices, or sub-land offices, in the West?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Well, there has been an increase although there was a very substantial diminution five and six years ago, a collecting of them together and a reduction by, I think, about one-half.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): You mean sub-offices?

Mr. MEIGHEN: There are some offices as well as sub-offices. Many sub-offices, and some of the offices, were amalgamated but part of that good work has been undone since.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I have no knowledge of any office being opened since I took over the department. Medicine Hat has been closed, and one or two other offices. I have no knowledge of any office having been opened. The Wetaskiwin office was moved but it has not resulted in the creation of a new office.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The office at Medicine Hat was closed before there was an amalgamation.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The office at Medicine Hat was open when I took office.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The offices at Medicine Hat and Lethbridge were amalgamated and the office placed at Medicine Hat.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No. the Lethbridge office is open.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Then the Medicine Hat office was closed.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I beg to differ with my hon. friend. There was a gentleman in occupation of the office at Medicine Hat when I entered the government.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I will undertake to say one of the two offices was closed, because I closed it.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): They were both open when I took office; that is all I know.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It must have been very shortly before.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I cannot tell how soon it was. All I can say it was open when I took office.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think if the minister will look into the matter he will find he is mistaken, because I remember definitely closing the one and putting it into the other, and taking all the abuse that was offered.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): As to that, all I know is that the office was in existence at Medicine Hat when I took office. I happen to know that because I am so familiar with the territory. If it were somewhere else I might be less certain.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I remember now it was the office at Medicine Hat that was closed, it was not the office at Lethbridge. There might have been a building there but the office was closed without any question.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): You mean—

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Dominion Land office.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): That may be true but there was a sub-agency there. Perhaps that is how the disagreement has arisen.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I knew my recollection of it was right. There might be a sub-agency open but the land office was closed. It was merged in the office at Lethbridge.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): That is quite right.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Has not the minister made that office at Medicine Hat a land office since?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No it is closed. There is a sub-agent there.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): How many homestead inspectors are there in the three prairie provinces?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Sixty-four.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Can you give me the number by provinces?

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): No I am waiting for an answer to my question.

Mr. BANCROFT: While the minister is looking up the information I should like, if it is in order, to ask him about the improvements that are necessary for proving up lands. I have in mind particularly the land in the lake districts of northern Manitoba where many of the homesteaders have to drain their land before it is of any use to break, because if they did break the land without constructing the drains or without doing any ditching they could not work it after it was brought under cultivation. Consequently they have to construct ditches first. Now, I have had several requests, and I have forwarded some of them to the minister, asking that this be considered as part of their improvements—that is that anything in the nature of a permanent ditch be considered as part of their improvements in applying for a patent. I wonder if the minister has considered these applications, and is he favourably disposed towards them with respect to those districts where ditching is necessary?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): May I first give the information for which the hon. member for Bow River has asked. The first answer was not quite correct. The 18 timber inspectors are included with the 64 homestead inspectors that I mentioned. There are 6 homestead inspectors in Manitoba, 20 in Saskatchewan, and 20 in Alberta, making a total of 46 There are 5 timber inspectors in Manitoba, 3 in Saskatchewan, and 7 in Alberta. In the block in British Columbia there are 3 making a total of 18.

In reply to my hon. friend (Mr. Bancroft) I may say that I have not come to a decision as to his request to include improvements in the shape of ditching in the regulations governing the amount of improvement to be done to earn the title to a homestead. That work is perhaps legitimate improvement and one worthy of consideration. It is a new request, however, and it will be given full consideration.

Mr. BANCROFT: I might just say that I think the regulations could very well be made so elastic that the homestead inspector could take into consideration any permanent ditches that were constructed. This will only apply to very few districts, but it is a matter of great importance to the people in those districts.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): In regard to the 20 inspectors in Saskatchewan, are they paid a straight salary, or paid simply for the number of inspections they make?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): They are paid a straight salary.

Mr. MILLAR: It seems strange that twenty inspectors can be employed in Saskatchewan all the time. I do not know how many homesteads there are in that province, but one could travel in the southern part for days and could count on the fingers of one hand all of the homesteads he could see. In the north there are considerably more.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I am informed that the department had sixty inspectors in the days when a good deal of homesteading was going on. We are endeavouring to cut down the number of homestead inspectors. Some of them were cut off in Alberta. We have not as many in that province this year as we had a year ago.

Mr. COOTE: What other officials are included in that list? Are forest reserve rangers included?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No, this simply applies to Dominion lands. There are no forest rangers in this particular vote.

Mr. KELLNER: Does this apply also to lease inspectors, or are they separate?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The range and lease inspectors come under this vote.

Mr. SHAW: Are all the employees covered by this vote subject to the provisions of the Civil Service Act? Are the provisions of that act applicable to all of them, or are those provisions being evaded in any way?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No, they apply to all the officials in the list.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister does not appoint them notwithstanding the provisions, the way he does in the Immigration department?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I think that is a sore point with my hon. friend, but I should like to point out there are occasions when it is necessary to do something of that character. Immigration is more or less of a fluctuating character. For example, we have had the Carlisle and Belfast vacancies in the Old Country since last October. Two men were recently appointed by the Civil Service Commission to fill those vacancies.

[Mr. C. A. Stewart.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: When did the minister apply?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Last October.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The last time I inquired the minister was wrong. He had not applied to the commission until some time afterwards.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Where did the right hon. member get that information?

Mr. MEIGHEN: From the commission. I wrote and asked, which I had a right to do.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I am not disputing the hon. member's right to do that, but I say that at the moment those officials have not gone forward, indeed one of them is just leaving his home in British Columbia to begin to perform his duties. I have no desire to make an appointment, but when you need an official in a hurry some latitude should be permitted. I want to say most emphatically that I have no desire to appoint any civil servant. My experience is all the other way. I am perfectly content to let the Civil Service Commission make all the appointments.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: On that point of homestead inspectors, have any requests come from the Hebrideans who went to my constituency of Red Deer a short time ago, or from the provincial government, regarding settling those men upon homesteads in that part of Alberta?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes, we had a considerable number of telegrams. I will be very glad to go into the matter with my hon. friend. I have been following the fortunes of the Hebrideans very closely, and they, in common with all other newcomers, got rather bad advice. I think if they had accepted the advice of the Soldiers' Settlement Board and of the Immigration department, no considerable harm would have been done. My recent information is that they are all being settled upon land happily in the vicinity of Red Deer.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I am glad to hear it.

Mr. EVANS: I would like to ask regarding the twenty homestead inspectors in Saskatchewan. There cannot be work for more than two at the present time. I do not know what twenty are doing.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I have not the full knowledge of Saskatchewan that my hon. friend appears to have, but I fancy there is work for more than two. Probably the twenty are not so busily engaged, but I will

promise my hon. friend I will find out what they are doing.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: One more question regarding this matter, which is not absolutely under this item but connected with it very closely indeed; was any part of the grant made for these men applied to settle them on the land, or was the whole sum applied in assisting passages, or to put in proper condition the old school in the vicinity of Red Deer? I have been asked a great many questions with regard to how that money was spent, and if any part of it was being used to settle these people on the land.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No money was spent in establishing the settlers on the land. Money has been spent in repairing the school buildings on the Indian farms, and in assisting the families.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The minister has given the number of homestead inspectors in the three provinces as: Manitoba, six; Saskatchewan, twenty; Alberta, twenty. Can he tell me the number of homesteads filed on in the last year in the three provinces?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): In all probability we will be dealing wth this matter on another occasion, and I shall endeavour to give that information to my hon. friend. I do not have it with me.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): In the event of the matter not coming up again, I would ask the minister to send me the information.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I will be very glad to give it to the committee, if the hon. member will bring it up.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I may not be here to bring it up, and I would like the minister to send it to me.

Mr. SHAW: The minister has given us his assurance that the provisions of the Civil Service Act have been complied with. I want to point out, for his information, that his department appointed a grazing inspector, who was employed for a period of six months at a salary of $250 a month, and no notice was given the Civil Service Commission, despite the fact the regulations required that notice should be given.

The CHAIRMAN: That does not come under this item.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, it does.

Mr. SHAW: It has already been suggested that it comes under this item. This man was employed approximately for six months at $250 a month. No notice was given the Civil Service Commission with respect to that appointment at all. I have a fear that there may be other appointments of this character.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I do not know where my hon. friend got this information. Both my hon. friends got information from the Civil Service Commission with respect to this matter. However, I presume it is Mr. Helmer to whom he refers.

Mr. SHAW: Yes.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): As far as I know, his name was before the Civil Service Commission, at least, for a portion of the time he was employed. He was employed on special work at that time in connection with grazing in the forest reserve, when Mr. Cloakey, the regular range inspector, was not available, to settle a dispute with regard to grazing. It was not anticipated in any way that he should be permanent, or that he should be continued for any considerable length of time.

Mr. SHAW: The point I want to suggest is this, that the regulations of the Civil Service Act are not being complied with. That is not right. If the act is not satisfactory, then repeal it; but no deputy minister should have the privilege, under any circumstances, of violating the law in that regard.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): All that I can say to my hon. friend is that there is in the Civil Service Act a provision under which you can for temporary periods employ individuals.

Mr. SHAW: The commission must be notified.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): If we have gone beyond the provision in that regard, of course we are guilty of an offence; but so far as I know, we have not been sinners in that particular case, that is in doing it without the knowledge of the Civil Service Commission, nor have I any desire to do that.

Mr. SHAW: I quite appreciate that the minister has no desire to infringe the law; but the law is perfectly clear that notification of appointments of this kind, even for temporary purposes, must be made to the Civil Service Commission. In the case I mentioned no notice was given at all. If a person is employed for a period, I think, of thirty days, a communication must be sent to the Civil Service Commission. This man was employed, I think, for approximately six months, and the Civil Service Commission,

according to a written communication I have received, had no notice at all. What I fear is that, perhaps, there may be other appointments and expenditures of this character, certainly without the minister's knowledge, and this is a matter that should be carefully gone into.

Mr. McBRIDE: There are a number of disputes out in British Columbia in connection with grazing leases, and I have asked for an investigator to go out there in order to try to straighten them out. This is the gentleman whom the department says they will send out there if they can get him. I understand he is a very capable man and has rendered good service wherever he has gone. If they can get him to go out to British Columbia, it is not likely they will go to the Civil Service Commission to get him; they will appoint him without doing that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member for Cariboo (Mr. McBride) is a man after the minister's own heart. Just appoint whom you like! The minister has no power to appoint save under emergency circumstances, and that does not mean that because he wants somebody to inspect ranches, he can appoint a man. That clause was intended to cover, say, cases of destruction of property, property that had to be immediately restored, an emergency of that kind. It is that clause which the minister has abused, not only in the Interior department, but in these other departments, and it has been abused pretty consistently. The other week I had a communication from some party in connection, I am practically sure, with the Geodetic Survey, and I simply transmitted it to the Civil Service Commission. I have the letter in my office, and I find that the department has appointed someone to fill a vacancy in that branch without notice to the commission at all. This sort of thing is going on pretty generally. The minister has some officers who are quite capable of doing this, and I cannot acquit the minister quite so readily. It is a strange thing to me that the appointee in Manitoba in one case was the former Liberal organizer. On more than one occasion the appointee in Alberta was a former Liberal candidate, and an appointee in Saskatchewan had somewhat similar experience. This man Helmer I have not heard of before. What is his political experience?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I could not say except that he was ranch inspector prior to the appointment of Mr. Cloakey. I venture that as a correct statement. At all events he had had experience in this work.

[Mr. Shaw.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: What was his political experience?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I cannot tell my right hon. friend that.

Mr. STEVENS: It is a secret.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I do not know what his political affiliation was. We are not such hide-bound partisans in Alberta as, perhaps, people are in some other parts of the country.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Mr. May is a pretty good example.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Mr. May was a Liberal candidate for East Edmonton. There is no doubt about that. Mr. May has been a lifelong Liberal.

Mr. McBRIDE: The right hon. gentleman said that I was a man after the minister's own heart. I should like him to mention one instance in which I have suggested an appointment or brought about one in any way.

Mr. SHAW: With reference to the gentlemen referred to by the minister, I think he is a very competent official. May I say further for the benefit of the hon. member for Cariboo (Mr. McBride), that when they wanted that gentleman to go out to British Columbia, they made application to the Civil Service Commission and they were given permission for that purpose. This was after the matter had been brought up in the Civil Service committee. What I object to is not the appointment of the particular individual. I am sure that he will give satisfactory service. What I object to is the method by which the appointment is made. Some of the officers of that department are apparently not as careful as they should be in seeing to it that the regulations are obeyed. The people of this country have no assurance that patronage has been eliminated unless all the officials comply with the provisions of the Civil Service Act. That was not done in that case, and I think the officers are entitled to a reprimand for their failure to comply with the provisions.

11 p.m.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What has been done with respect to the lease for pulp purposes to the Manitoba Pulp and Paper Company in Manitoba? I understand the minister has added by order in council an immense area to the land which the company obtained previously by tender. Is that correct?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Is that the McArthurs'?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, the Manitoba Pulp and Paper Company. Mr. McArthur is, I believe, the owner.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): He has an addition under lease, under the ordinary provisions of granting leases for this purpose, not of a very large area, as my right hon. friend mentions.

Mr. MEIGHEN: About 555,000 acres, I think, was the addition. What does the minister mean by the "ordinary provisions?" I venture to say that there has never been an addition to a pulp lease before, for this is the very first pulp lease that has been granted. It was obtained by tender and given to the highest bidder at a very fair price. Then the minister added, without any tender at all, about as much more as the original allotment. What does the minister mean by saying that this was under the ordinary provisions?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): My information is that it was granted under the usual provision by which leases of this character are given to applicants for them. I have no knowledge that anything out of the ordinary, as my right hon. friend speaks of, was done in connection with this particular lease.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have the order in council before me. On the 11th November, on the recommendation of the minister, there was added to the Manitoba Pulp and Paper Company's lease a whole series of townships. I think if the minister collects the acreages together, he will find that the quantity is about 555,000 acres, or about the quantity that this company obtained by tender in its original lease. That is to say, he almost doubled the acreage. In the original lease, before there was any advertisement for tender at all, the utmost precautions were taken to see that a sufficient area was given to enable the pulp industry to be financed, to supply pulp for a large mill, for the length of time that the very best authorities stated would be required. Then advertisements were issued and tenders were called for on the basis of 80 cents per cord for spruce, which is the chief wood and, I think, 40 cents per cord for the others. Tenderers were asked to say how much more they would pay above these standard figures of 80 cents and 40 cents, 80 cents for spruce being really the figure that counted. The company that secured the tender had paid a very considerable bonus, indeed, if my memory is correct, at least twice the eighty cents per cord, making the payment altogether about $2.45. I do not think I am very far out in that figure, if I am out at all. That was a substantial bonus. Now, under this order in council the minister has granted an addition to that berth of virtually the acreage covered by the original lease, and he has granted it without any bonus whatsoever, merely at the upset rate of eighty cents per cord for spruce and forty cents per cord for pulpwood and other species of timber. It looks as if the timber wolf were abroad again. What is the minister's explanation of losing to the country that immense sum of money?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Representations were made to the department that a larger area would have to be granted before the project for the establishing of a mill in this particular locality could be financed. Not only that, but the upset price paid at the particular time the berth was offered appears to be very, very high because pulp was then selling at an extraordinary high price. The additional area was granted to enable the company to get the pulp industry started there, but it does not seem that even with the additional area this is going to be possible. I am informed that so far the financing has not been accomplished, and that it is doubtful if, even with the additional area, the industry can be started in that locality, notwithstanding the fact that the company appear to have a lease of a very desirable water power.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The question is not answered yet. The fact is that pulp is at a very high price to-day, as is also paper. I feel pretty sure that this lease was granted in the early part of 1921, and I am not aware that there was any very greatly higher price for pulp then than now. Suffice to say that at the present moment pulp areas are as valuable, if not more so, as they ever were in this Dominion. I do not think the minister can point to the sale of a pulp area within the last six months that is not at a record price—higher than could have been obtained at the time this lease was made. Now, Mr. McArthur tendered. His tender was accepted. It was the highest and it provided for just three times what the minister has granted in this additional area without tender at all. It may be that he has not got it through yet. I do not know what plan of financing he has adopted. I have nothing to say against him personally, not a word, but the interests of the country are not protected under this order in council. It looks as if we are getting back to the old days again. I protest against adding this immense area, almost an empire. I know I am not appreciably in error when I say it is 550,000 acres.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I think my hon. friend will find there is not anything like the amount of pulpwood on this area as shown by the cruise, in fact scarcely half that amount. I am speaking from memory, but I shall be glad to get the information.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister will get that much less then even at the eighty cents a cord. But I am not so sure. Certainly there is some excellent pulpwood in this district because the utmost care was taken in determining what would be the amount required. It was not intended to add to that pulp area. If it were added to some means should have been taken to get the actual value of the timber and not fix the value at a third, or less than a third, of what was paid in the open market. What is to hinder this new company so planning its mill as to utilize this area that the minister has added at eighty cents per cord and leave the area tendered on practically untouched? Has not the minister in effect simply taken the price procured by the late government and cut it in three parts, leaving two parts to the lessees and retaining only one part for the country?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I do not think so, because of necessity a mill will have to be established at a point where the lease is held of the water power.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But they can use only this timber and never touch the other at all now.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): You mean they may use the timber on the leased area first?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, they will use the cheaper timber off what the minister has given them and leave the rest, so in effect the minister has just cut in three parts what he ought to have got for the timber.

Mr. MILLAR: I should like to ask another question in regard to the matter.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is worth a little more attention.

Mr. MILLAR: It is. In order to get some practical results from this discussion I would ask two questions: What is the salary of one of these inspectors? And have we an assurance from the minister that consideration in the very near future will be given to this matter so that the surplus inspectors will be retired and some economy exercised? This does seem to be a very large number of inspectors for the work they have to do.

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I gave the committee an assurance that these men would be retired just as fast as possible. We commenced that policy in Alberta last year. I cannot say from memory we retired any in Saskatchewan, but undoubtedly some men will be retired this year.

Mr. MILLAR: Are the inspectors allowed to do other work, or do they devote all their time to inspection?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The only other work they are engaged in is the investigation and collection of seed grain accounts, which are now of course getting down to a fairly low point.

Mr. MILLAR: What salaries do they receive?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): A maximum salary of $1,800.

Mr. MILLAR: And expenses?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes. If my hon. friend will let the matter of the lease stand I will get full information for him.

Mr. STEVENS: Will the minister add to the information a full statement of the amount of pulpwood on this addition covered by the order in council?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I will bring down all the information I have in connection with it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Let the item stand.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): It is not necessary that this item should stand.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This is really the item the matter comes under.

Mr. CALDWELL: Does this pulp have to be manufactured on the land which is leased, or can the lessees ship it off to other points even outside of Canada?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I cannot give that information now.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The regulations provide that all the timber should be converted into pulp in Canada, and that a certain proportion of the pulp should be made into paper, I think one-half.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): This is just the salary item we are dealing with. I am willing that the matter should be raised again; I will procure the information.

Mr. BIRD: I wish to ask the minister a question that really concerns the scope of his

department. I have in mind two sections of good farming land near the railway that is pretty well settled by a good class of settlers, many of them returned soldiers. I am informed that these settlers will have to get out of there if they cannot get some drainage done. It is low land and in a wet season it is almost impossible to cultivate it. I know that strictly speaking this matter is outside the scope of the department, but these men went in there in more optimistic times thinking they could make good, but under present conditions they will likely have to back out. I know another district in which there is a good class of settlers, most of them returned soldiers, but they are under this difficulty—and I think it is a common one throughout the West: a good many of them have relinquished their holdings, their homesteads have gone back to the government, and the accumulated taxes have been automatically cancelled, leaving a heavy burden upon those remaining there. It seems to me that the department ought to have some policy in a matter of this kind. In both these cases the settlers are prepared to go on and make good if they can get the help they need. I think it is a legitimate function of the department to take care of these people who, as I say, in more optimistic times, went out to the edge of things and tried to establish themselves, but who in these harder times, will have to pull up and find other fields if they are not afforded relief.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I do not know whether the Drainage Act of Manitoba is similar to that of Saskatchewan and Alberta, but in cases where Crown lands are affected arrangements are made with both these provinces by the federal authorities for the inclusion of Crown lands in these drainage areas. The problem of drainage, however, is one that is assumed by the provinces. Perhaps my right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) could tell me how long it is since the federal authorities ceased their operations in drainage.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We had not ceased when I left the department, in drainage.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I mean, commencing new projects.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We had not ceased then. We may have in 1921.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): All I know is that Alberta made an agreement with my right hon. friend when he was minister respecting both irrigation and drainage.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, that is right.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Clearly both governments cannot be engaged in drainage projects. The federal government will carry out the agreement made with the other two provinces; I am not familiar with the legislation of Manitoba dealing with drainage. The federal government is prepared to treat Manitoba on the same basis as Saskatchewan and Alberta, leaving, however, to the provincial government the responsibility of taking care of drainage. If it is true that soldier settlers were placed on some of these low lying lands, that is a regrettable circumstance, because they are bound to have difficulties in wet years until drainage is undertaken.

Mr. BIRD: In the latter part of my statement I said that in certain districts the land was reverting to the government, the taxes were automatically cancelled and the burden was falling upon the handful of settlers left, wtih the result that they were gradually being forced out.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Does my hon. friend refer to soldier settlers' land that has reverted to the Dominion?

Mr. BIRD: Yes.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): That is true. I submitted that question to the Justice department and have a report from them in which they point out most emphatically that we cannot pay taxes upon Dominion land and that lands reverting to the Dominion, although they have been in the hands of private individuals, are in the same category as though they had always been Crown lands.

Mr. FORKE: Did the minister not go so far as to say that it would need an amendment to the British North America Act?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Well, I cannot say that.

Mr. BEAUBIEN: In the organized territories the provinces claim they have nothing to do with the matter of drainage, improvements, and so on in the unorganized districts. How, then, is the homesteader to get any of these improvements if he is in an unorganized district? The provincial government really "passes the buck," so that the homesteaders are up against a tough proposition.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): There is no difficulty in Alberta; they have full authority under their act to deal with the matter. My hon. friend says they "passed the buck," but they are the responsible people on the ground, able to give supervision and to know the re-

quirements much better than the federal authorities at this distance from the scene of operations.

Mr. BEAUBIEN: The Dominion government still holds the natural resources of the three western provinces and the provincial government does not feel disposed to spend any money in these unorganized districts.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): There would be no cost to the provincial government other than the expense of financing the scheme. The land invariably would pay for the drainage. I can scarcely conceive of drainage being undertaken in an area where the lands would not pay for the drainage. If they would not pay for it, it would be a poor proposition to undertake.

Mr. BEAUBIEN: The provinces will not get any taxes until these lands are patented.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): They will get taxes as soon as the lands are occupied.

Mr. WARD: I think this is a question that should receive serious consideration. There are large areas in western Canada that are unorganized, and in these unorganized areas the question of road building and drainage is a very serious one. Personally I think the responsibility is on the Department of the Interior of this government to see that some measure of relief is given to these districts. I do not think we should pass over this item lightly. These people are doing the best they can to develop these unorganized areas, and it is not their fault that the territory is unorganized. I think this question should be seriously considered by the government.

Mr. CALDWELL: Referring to the cancellation of taxes on land that reverts to the government, while it is a well-known fact that Dominion lands cannot be taxed for any purpose, I submit that not to pay the taxes even on Dominion lands that have been settled by soldier settlers and that have reverted to the government works a very great hardship on the people other than soldier settlers who are living in that district. For instance, the government will settle a number of soldiers in a district where there are other settlers farming on their own hook. It is an organized school district, for people will not go where they cannot get a chance to educate their children. An education is the birthright of every child in Canada these days, but due to the fact that a good many soldier settlers are leaving the land, and I submit that under present conditions a great many more of them will have to leave, the older settlers are unable to keep up the schools.

In my own province this has been working a very great hardship, and even if it should be necessary to amend the British North America Act, there should be some effort made by the government so that the people who have settled in these districts will be able to give their children a common school education. That has been looked upon as a necessity in this country since the days when we replaced the Indians on this North American continent. A good many people are beginning to think that we made a mistake in usurping the rights of the Indians and the bears, and that we should have left the country to them due to this and other causes. I submit that this is working a serious hardship to the school districts. It is a different matter to say that Dominion lands which are wild lands should not be subject to taxes, but it is not wild lands that I am speaking of. The government takes land that has been in organized school districts for years, where people have settled simply because they were organized and where they would have a chance to educate their children, and then when this land reverts to the government these older settlers are unable to maintain the school and a great many schools are closed to-day on this very account. I think it is a more serious situation than the government realizes, and I would like to impress upon them the seriousness of it. Education is one thing we cannot afford to do without, and one thing that the government should not do is to bring about conditions which will prevent people from giving their children an education in this country, and the government's action in this matter is having that effect.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We would not need to amend the British North America Act to enable the minister to pay taxes on soldier settler lands after vacation. We would need to amend the budget, and likely would have to amend the government as well.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I have not had a legal training, but I may say that this matter has been submitted to the Department of Justice, and I quoted from the advice they gave.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Naturally their advice would be that we could not be taxed with it. No one says we can, but we can pay it without having to do it.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): As a voluntary contribution?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly. We could assume the liability. It could not be forced upon us.

Mr. CALDWELL: To illustrate: A man goes through bankruptcy and pays his creditor, we will say, twenty cents on the dollar, but if he goes into business again and later on accumulates wealth if he is any sort of honest man he is pretty certain to pay off his debts. You cannot compel him to, but you would not regard him as a good citizen if he evaded payment through some technicality in the law. That looks to me the position the government are in under the circumstances I speak of.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): So far as I personally am concerned I have no particular objection, but I wanted to be sure that I was legally right in the matter, because cases of this kind have been occurring in all parts of Canada. True in the aggregate there are not a very large number of soldier holdings vacant, but a few have been given up scattered throughout the Dominion, and a great deal of complaint has been made with respect to the condition of affairs. The advice I have received is that it was not legally possible for the government to pay claims of this character. I suppose that we could vote a sum of money for this purpose and make a grant to the municipalities in lieu of taxes. There is nothing to prevent that, I suppose, but that is a matter to which I have not given consideration.

Mr. CALDWELL: I would submit that the ruling is right that there need be no taxes paid on any farm on which a soldier settler is settled to-day, because the government has the deed of that farm absolutely, and they are just as much in possession as if the soldier had not one scratch of the pen to the title. The government are in possession until the loan is fully paid. The term is twenty-one years, I think.

Mr. COPP: The soldier has an equity in it under his agreement.

Mr. CALDWELL: He has no equity until his loan is fully paid off.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The courts have held that the occupational interest is taxable.

Mr. CALDWELL: I know cases where a soldier settler has deserted the land and the Settlement Board has turned it over to someone else who is now working it, and they refuse to pay taxes. I know cases of that kind where the Board is receiving a higher rent than the yearly return from the soldier settler would amount to, yet the board or the government refuse to pay the taxes although they are getting more revenue than if the soldier was occupying the land. I submit that that is working a hardship, and a hardship not only in dollars and cents, but in the direction of closing the schools because the other settlers are not able to keep them going. They are not able to get away, or they do not want to abandon their farms, and the result is that it is preventing their children from getting a common school education.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Does my hon. friend mean to say that lands that are leased are not paying taxes?

Mr. CALDWELL: By the Soldier Settlement Board, yes; and I could give names and the places where the land is located.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I had not heard of that before.

Mr. CALDWELL: I know it to be a fact.

Mr. KNOX: I want to revert for a moment to the drainage area question. Is it not a fact that the lands which are drained carry the expense of that drainage?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Mr. KNOX: In the case of the Moose Range drainage area I find that in the years 1919 and 1920 the expense amounts to the sum of $23,000, yet there has been no drainage accomplished there. What about the expenditure which has been made, I think in connection with survey work? If eventually the lands are drained will that expenditure all be charged up against those lands?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Mr. KNOX: In the meantime what is it charged to?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): It will have to be from an appropriation for that purpose, but all expenditure in connection with drainage will be charged to the lands eventually and it will be paid out of the sale of the lands.

Mr. KNOX: I think there is little likelihood at the present time of the drainage project being carried out.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): In case the drainage project did not go on, the Reclamation department of this government would have to stand the cost; it would come out of the revenue of Canada.

Mr. BIRD: With regard to the liability for taxes, I appreciate the minister's explanation. It no doubt is the case that the government is not liable for these taxes, but the fact remains that a good many people

and very worthy people at that—not only in my constituency, but right through the West —feel they have a grievance, a very keen grievance, against the government, and I think it would bring a good deal of satisfaction to the minds of those settlers if the minister would only indicate that he is going further into this matter. He is up against a negative but then the problem remains, and there is this feeling in the minds of a good many people, and good people. In the case that I have in mind, I do not know anywhere in Manitoba where you could find a group of more promising settlers. If there is a community of promising settlers anywhere in the West it is that community. But they are disheartened and whether they have a grievance against the government or not they feel they have. I think the minister would be doing what we all naturally expect would be the right thing to do if he would indicate that he would go more deeply into this matter and see if some policy could not be formulated whereby these people could be relieved to some extent. It may be that this department has not all the responsibility. It may be that the provincial government might be stimulated to take some interest if this department would. Most of these men are in unorganized territory though, and the provincial government therefore has not that sense of responsibility that would attach to this department here. I know the minister is sympathetic, and I would like him to express himself sympathetically in order that these people might have some satisfaction.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): If it is a matter of taxation I, personally, am quite prepared to put the matter up to the government—that is the matter of the taxation on land reverting to the Crown held by soldier settlers. If it is a matter of drainage I can say that I am perfectly willing to go the full length so far as the federal government is concerned in assisting; but I must point out to my hon. friend that I think it is the duty of the provincial government to carry out the scheme. That responsibility certainly does not, in my opinion, rest upon the federal authorities; the work would have to be done by the province. Where Crown lands are affected in the area those Crown lands would be made available and no difficulty would be placed in the way of drainage; but that the federal authorities shall step in and take the responsibility for drainage is a recommendation I can hardly make. I will have to be frank and state that fact to my hon. friend.

[Mr. Bird.]

Mr. FORKE: I should just like to point out to the committee that when the right hon. leader of the Opposition was Minister of the Interior he was memorialized quite frequently in regard to this very subject, but we did not get very much satisfaction that I can remember. It is no new subject because, acting for the Manitoba Union of Municipalities, I think I memorialized every member of the House and all the members of the Senate from Manitoba, and the only reply I ever got was from my predecessor, the member for Brandon. I could not even get an answer from the Minister of the Interior at that time. I do not think my right hon. friend is listening?

Mr MEIGHEN: Yes, I am. I do not know what the subject is. The hon. member did not say whether it related to the drainage undertaking or had to do with the taxation of soldier settlement lands.

Mr. FORKE: Taxation.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The taxation of soldier settlement lands? Well, I assure the hon. member that if he wrote the Minister of the Interior, an answer was sent him regardless of whether he ever received it or not. We never arrived really at the time when the question of the payment of taxes on deserted soldier settlement lands came up, not while I was Minister of the Interior—not up to the end of my tenure of office. I can remember that the number of soldiers who had left the lands was virtually nil; these cases have come in since. So I do not think there were representations made to me at that time; I do not remember any being received. I have not argued in this debate that the minister should assume responsibility. I know that a great deal can be said for it, but I have not taken the stand that that burden could safely be assumed by the government. I do not know that I have any final opinion on the question. Consequently I have not taken a stand against the attitude the minister has taken. I have only said that while we are not liable we certainly have the right to pay, and all that is needed is an appropriation of parliament for the purpose. I fancy it would be a pretty large appropriation and it might carry the government into responsibilities in other fields that would be much more serious even than this. Those are the thoughts that have been running in my head. I think the hon. member is wrong in stating that representations were made to me in respect of soldier settlement land because the numbers would be so very

few up to the month of July, 1920, of those who would have left. The soldier settlement plan only went into effect in the summer of 1921, one year before, and there would not be soldiers deserting their land before July, 1920. Therefore what my hon. friend has reference to must have been some subject very closely akin.

The CHAIRMAN: The first item is carried.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Mr. Chairman, we have now transgressed some forty minutes on the quiet of the night as limited by the government at the opening of parliament.

Mr. GRAHAM: We are working on standard time to-night.

Progress reported.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MACKENZIE KING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. MEIGHEN: May I ask what business will be taken up to-morrow?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: There is a resolution, No. 33 on to-day's order paper, in the name of the Minister of Railways which will be taken up; the second reading of the bill to amend the Dairy Industry Act, 1914, in the name of the Minister of Agriculture; and the bill to amend the Naturalization Act in the name of the Secretary of State. We propose to take up the estimates of the Department of Customs the first thing to-morrow. If we conclude with them we will continue with the estimates of the Department of the Interior upon which we have been engaged to-night.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The budget resolutions will not be taken up to-morrow?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No, not the budget resolutions. In reference to the observation of my right hon. friend as to the lateness of the sitting, the government has hoped all along that it would not be necessary to extend the hour of sitting at night beyond eleven o'clock, but I think there is a feeling on the part of many members of the House that we should begin now to do so with a view to expediting the conclusion of the business of parliament. For that reason it may become necessary to sit later in the evening if we find we do not make much progress during the day.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 11.45 p.m.

Wednesday, May 30, 1923.

The House met at three o'clock.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING

Mr. GAUVREAU presented the third report of the Joint Committee of the Senate and the House of Commons on Printing.

COMMITTEES — CHANGES IN PERSONNEL

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) moved:

That the name of Mr. Descoteaux be substituted for that of Mr. Gauvreau on the select standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization, and for that of Mr. Trahan on the select standing Committee on Banking and Commerce.

Motion agreed to.

COMPANIES ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. A. B. COPP (Secretary of State) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 190, to amend the Companies Act.

He said: The bill comprises twenty-eight sections, all of which, with the exception of two, are to correct ambiguities and make other changes of minor importance. I would direct the attention of hon. members to sections 22 and 23, which make special provision regarding the paying of dividends of mining companies. These, of course, will be thoroughly examined when we go into committee. Otherwise the changes are merely alterations of wording, as I have said, to correct ambiguities.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

PHARMACEUTICAL PREPARATIONS

Mr. LUCAS:

1. Has the government any means of discovering whether or not certain dealers in completely manufactured pharmaceutical preparations fail to indicate the country of origin on their packages?
2. What does the government intend to do in cases where the present law and regulations are being systematically avoided?

Hon. Mr. BELAND: This question has been on the order paper for a long time, and I might say to my hon. friend that I was under the impression that the Department of Customs or the Department of Trade and Commerce would supply the information sought. I find, however, that these departments are not concerned with the matter referred to in the question. I shall make inquiry, and I think

perhaps under the regulations of the Health department we can ascertain the country of origin. I promise my hon. friend an answer at the next sitting of the House.

Question stands.

MARGAREE RIVER SALMON FISHERIES ASSOCIATION

Mr. HANSON:

1. When was the Margaree River Salmon Fisheries Association formed, and what are its relations, contractual or otherwise with the Department of Marine and Fisheries?

2. What were the names of the members of the association in 1921?

3. Was any change made in the membership of the association in 1922? If so, at whose instance?

4. Were any persons, members of the association in 1921, deprived of their interests or shares in the Association, or in the proceeds received from the Department of Marine and Fisheries in the year 1922 by reason of any action of the department or any officer thereof, in the year 1922?

5. Has any claim been made to the Department of Marine and Fisheries by any persons, for a share of the payment agreed to be made to the association by that department, which has been disallowed? If so, who are the persons and what are the reasons for such disallowance?

6. Has the Department of Marine and Fisheries at the instance of any member of parliament, changed the membership of such association?

7. If so, who was such member of parliament?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE:

The answer to these questions will be contained in the return moved for by Mr. Hocken for Mr. Hanson on the 14th instant.

ST. ANNE-ST. CHARLES TELEGRAPH

Mr. HANSON:

1. What were the revenues from the telegraph line between St. Anne and St. Charles, in the county of Chicoutimi, during the past five years?

2. What were the revenues of the same line between St. Charles and Péribonka during the same period of time?

3. What were the expenses for the maintenance and salaries on each of these sections during the same years?

4. Does the government know that the length of this line there is a telephone system which serves all the parishes and which is in direct communication with all telegraph offices of the district, and that consequently the existence of this telegraph line has become absolutely useless from all standpoints?

5. Is it the intention of the government in these circumstances to discontinue immediately the maintenance of these two sections of telegraph, which have no reason for existing from the standpoint of public interest and economy?

Hon. Mr. KING (Kootenay):

1. $323.47.

2. $23.13.

3. Ste. Anne-St. Charles, $4.201.90; St. Charles-Peribonka, $4,774.85.

4 and 5. Yes, and as the telephone system supplies all accommodation required in the district, negotiations are in progress with the view of disposing of this branch line at an early date.

CRUDE OIL BOUNTIES

Mr. FANSHER:

What are the names of the producers of crude oil, in Lambton county, Ontario, who received a bounty on crude oil, and what amount of bounty did each receive during the last fiscal year for which returns are complete?

Hon. Mr. ROBB: List of producers of crude oil, whose wells are located in the county of Lambton in the province of Ontario, and the amount of bounty paid to each during the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1923:

Anderson, J. H.	$1,060 26
Anderson Bros. & Thompson	1,535 70
Armstrong, J. E.	2,145 61
Atkinson, John	8 89
Anderson, George	8 78
Atkinson, Wm.	18 70
Barrett, C. H.	691 72
Brock, Thos. A.	916 36
Bradley, R. N.	129 79
Bridges, E. O.	16 08
Barnes, John	30 77
Braybrook, J. F.	161 16
Baker, Jas. D.	39 24
Bailey, John	114 11
Balls, E. H.	36 86
Bowles, Herbert	156 85
Boges, Melville	134 31
Bidwell Oil & Gas Co.	83 89
Big Win Oil Co.	66 57
Byers, R. & Sons	483 76
Crocker Parks Oil Co.	1,417 28
Canadian Oil Producing & Refining Co.	3,907 22
Canada Crude Oil Producers	2,427 41
Canadian Oil Companies	19 53
Chesher, Geo.	143 93
Cann, John	287 81
Carlton, W. G.	373 71
Coulter, James	96 74
Corporation Town Petrolia	297 91
Dempsey, James	106 77
Donald, George	713 48
Dennis, H. S.	231 83
Dowler, C. E.	8 07
Duncan Bros.	1,101 19
Davis, Alex.	60 72
Edward, Estate, A. C.	177 34
Edward, F. H.	1,788 32
Elliott, Henry	64 40
Elliott, C. H.	141 16
Elliott, Kenneth	97 01
Fairbanks Estate, J. H.	7,014 30
Fowler, John	54 72
Font, Maurice	197 26

Finn, W. W.	33 99
Gregory, Henry	202 71
Goudie, John	355 50
Gillespie, Wm.	128 62
Heal, John	178 94
Houston Estate, King	527 89
Hastie, Wm.	101 31
Hillis, Jas. J. & Sons	920 46
Hardy, Chas.	29 56
Howlett, Fred.	328 50
Howell, Harold H.	91 44
Holmes, D. A.	65 99
Hamlin, Samuel	12 39
Ivinson, T. C.	8 94
Inland Oil & Gas Co.	198 73
Jackson, Wm.	279 47
Jackson, L. H. & R. B. Morningstar	271 69
Joseph, Mrs. Esther	331 22
James, G. E.	633 33
Johnston, Thos.	170 40
Jewell, Daniel	555 22
Kerr Estate, J. J.	3,104 07
Kerr, Ross	811 70
Kelly, J. E.	711 15
Kettle, Robert	280 08
Kirk, Elmer	40 50
Lucas, Colonel	71 31
Loxton, Thos.	189 79
Logan, Leslie	23 68
Lambton Oil Syndicate	21 20
Lewis, Estate, J. J.	459 10
Logan, Herbert	26 46
Lambton Oil Company	76 70
Mott & Mitchell	923 93
Learn, Chas.	71 57
Mutual Oil Producing Co.	1,979 38
Maw, F. N.	40 11
Miller, W. W.	109 91
Miller, Silas	41 64
Metcalfe, J. N.	148 43
Miller, Frank J.	202 15
Mott, E. J.	254 95
Mills, John	98 70
Maitland, Jas. B.	31 83
Morris, Geo.	251 98
McGillivray, G. A. & Co.	751 52
McDonald, F. D.	180 22
McAlpine, T. A.	26 93
McLellan, James	129 16
McCrie, Wm.	17 70
McKay, John	65 17
McManus, Alex.	38 30
McManus, J. A.	4 28
McDougall, D. J.	240 33
McPhedran, John	11 97
McLellan, Peter	40 49
McFarlane, Wes.	112 40
McMahon, A. A.	33 90
McDougal, Alex.	141 79
McRury, Alex.	90 43
Morningstar, Leslie	794 41
Napper, Fred	29 01
Niblock, R.	40 62
Ontario Lands & Oil Co.	3,496 90
Osborne Oil Producers	366 82
Parks, E. M.	574 60
Portsmouth, Thos.	62 50
Paul, John D.	37 99
Peat & Ward	21 28
Powers, Edward	27 72
Rainsberry, Walter	243 79
Rainsberry, N. J.	66 69
Rawson, Andrew	462 31
Robinson, John	92 29
Rowe, George	42 45
Ruckle, Harry	53 18
Redwick, W. O.	22 83
Schumacker, B. W.	1,315 21
Smith, T. E.	154 00
Sprcule, Bros.	372 36
Sanson, Mrs. C. E.	77 98
Sproule & Johnston	270 70
Stonehouse Bros.	249 04
Saulsbury, J. L.	9 27
Stamm, David	32 16
Stevenson, Lorenzo	147 75
Shaw, Henry	503 43
Strangway, Howard	71 07
Telsey, Abram	3,165 08
Union Natural Gas Co.	2,144 70
Watt, P. J.	493 07
Wallen, A. C.	351 95
Wallen Estate, John	268 11
Wallen & Wallen Estate	564 66
Woodward, John & Sons	22 99
Woodward, John	107 04
Warwick, Jos.	912 80
Woodward, John	565 22
Wilson, Wm.	235 70
Wilson, James	36 18
Welsh, Mrs. Thos.	56 98
Yerkes, Carlton	215 83
Young, W. E.	20 38

CANADIAN GOVERNMENT MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. COOTE:

1. How many ships owned by the Canadian Merchant Marine are on the Great Lakes?

2. How many of the said ships are being used in the Grain Trade at the present time?

3. Are any or all of them under lease to other firms or persons?

4. If so, to whom?

5. What rate are they charging from (a) Fort William to Bay Ports; (b) Fort William to Port Colborne; (c) Fort William to Buffalo; and (d) between Port Colborne and Montreal?

6. What is the highest rate charged this year on each of the above hauls?

7. What is the lowest rate charged this year on each of the above hauls?

8. What was the highest rate charged in the year 1922 on each of the above hauls?

9. What was the lowest rate charged in the year 1922 on each of the said hauls?

10. What was the highest rate charged in the year 1921 on each of the above hauls?

11. What was the lowest rate charged in the year 1921 on each of the above hauls?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Ten.

2. Six.

3. Yes; two.

4. S.S. T. J. Drummond and J. A. McKee are chartered to the Great Lakes Transportation Company Limited.

5. (a) Fort William to Bay ports, 1923, 4 cents per bushel. (b) Fort William to Port Colborne, 1923, 4 cents per bushel. (c) Fort William to Buffalo, 1923, nothing carried. The Canadian Government Merchant Marine confines its efforts to the carrying of grain between Canadian ports. (d) Between Port Colborne and Montreal, 1923, nothing carried.

6. (a) and (b), 4 cents per bushel.

7. (a) and (b), 4 cents per bushel.

8. (a) and (b), 5 cents per bushel; storage grain 7½ cents per bushel.

9. 4½ cents per bushel, (a) and (b).

10. (a) and (b), 4 cents per bushel; (d) 7 cents per bushel.

11. (a) and (b), 4 cents per bushel; (d), 6½ cents per bushel.

ASSINIBOINE RIVER WORKS

Mr. LEADER:

1. What is the total amount of money expended by the federal government in dyking, excavating, etc., on the Assiniboine river between the cities of Portage la Prairie and Winnipeg?

2. In what years were these expenditures made?

Hon. Mr. KING (Kootenay):

1. $33,127.84.

2. Expenditure 1908-09, $5,211.50; 1913-14, $5,117.80; 1914-15, $14,309.74; 1916-17, $2,274.45; 1917-18, $1,598.45; 1919-20, $177.20; 1920-21, $316,25; 1922-23, $4,122.45; total, $33,127.84.

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

CIVIL SERVANTS IN OTTAWA

Mr. McQUARRIE:

1. How many civil servants employed full time are there in all departments, resident in the city of Ottawa?

2. How many civil servants employed full time are there in all the departments, resident outside the city of Ottawa?

RURAL MAIL CARRIERS

Mr. W. C. GOOD (Brant) moved:

For a return showing the names and addresses, by provinces, of the rural mail carriers.

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM: I would ask the hon. gentleman not to press this motion. The same principle would apply to it as applied to the one moved yesterday by the hon. member for Calgary East (Mr. Irvine) which the House thought it not wise to press for the reasons I then gave to the House.

Mr. GOOD: I do not think the expense involved in answering this question would be considerable, nor could I quite appreciate the objections that were raised yesterday. I might call attention to question No. 5 on to-day's order paper which also involves bringing down a considerable list of civil servants in Ottawa. However, if the government declines to give the list, I shall have to be content.

Mr. SPEAKER: Dropped.

Mr. GOOD: No, Mr. Speaker, I did not drop it. I say that if the government declines to give the information I shall have to be content with that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Then it is dropped.

Mr. GOOD: I understand it is voted down. I did not drop it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Motion negatived on division.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

BANK RETURNS

Mr. COOTE:

For a copy of all returns made to the minister during the last fiscal year under subsection 2 of section 91 of the Bank Act.

GOVERNMENT GRAIN ELEVATOR SYSTEM

Mr. COOTE:

For a copy of all correspondence, telegrams, reports, memoranda and other documents, passing between the Department of Railways and Canals or the Department of Marine and Fisheries and Messrs. Fennell, Henry and Smith, in regard to the grain elevator system from Fort William to Montreal, during the years 1922 and 1923.

JUDGES' ACT AMENDMENT

Sir LOMER GOUIN (Minister of Justice) moved that the House go into committee at the next sitting to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, That it is expedient to amend section six of the Judges Act, as enacted by chapter fifty-six of the statutes of 1920, by providing that the salaries of the judges of the Supreme Court of Ontario shall be as follows—

	Per Annum
(a) The Chief Justice of Ontario	$10,000.00
(b) The Chief Justice of the Second Divisional Court	10,000.00
(c) Eight Justices of Appeal, each	9,000.00
(d) Nine judges of the High Court Division, each	9,000.00

Provided that the judge who at present holds the office of Chief Justice of the Exchequer Division, and the judge who at present holds the office of Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, shall, each respectively, and irrespective of the Division, Appellate or High Court, to which he may be assigned, continue to receive the salary of $10,000.00 which he is now receiving instead of the salary which he would otherwise receive; but that upon a vacancy occurring in the office of Chief Justice of the Exchequer Division, or in the office of Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, the salary of such Chief Justice shall cease; and provided moreover that, when the two last mentioned offices shall have been abolished, the Chief Justice who may be appointed to preside over the High Court Division shall receive a salary of $10,000.00 per annum, and the number of salaries hereby authorized for the judges of the High Court Division shall thereupon be reduced to eight.

He said: His Excellency the Governor General, having been apprised of the subject matter of the resolution, has given his consent thereto and commends it to the consideration of the House.

Mr. CALDWELL: Explain.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: By an act of the legislature of Ontario at its last session a second divisional court was created. The judges who are to sit in that second divisional court are already judges of the Supreme Court of Ontario. They will be given new commissions, but they will receive the same salaries that they are now receiving. The number of judges is not changed, and the salaries are not increased.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Do I understand that this is just a motion that to-morrow the House will go into committee on the resolution?

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes.

Motion agreed to.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

LEGISLATION

On the Orders of the Day:

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): It is now about two weeks since I asked for a statement of the government's remaining legislation. It has not as yet been given. Legislation has been dribbling in day by day—

Mr. BUREAU—In every way.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In almost every way and in almost every form.

Mr. BUREAU: Not form, but way.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In every way except a good way—

Mr. DUFF: And it is growing better and better.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Well, there is ample room for improvement. We have received no statement yet as to the balance of legislation the government intends. There are certain subjects as to which intimation has been given of an indefinite character. I think we should know it to-day.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): As I mentioned to my right hon. friend the other day, the legislation to be brought down depends in part on the reports we receive from the committees. I think the Minister of Soldiers' Civil Reestablishment has legislation, based on the report of the commission that has been investigating matters pertaining to returned soldiers, that he will introduce immediately. Then there will be some legislation introduced based on the report of the Great Lakes inquiry into lake freight rates and possibly other legislation on other reports which may be brought down. I think that, along with the legislation on railway construction that has already been mentioned, includes practically all the important legislation the government will still have to submit.

Mr. MEIGHEN: May I ask, first, what is the nature of the very important legislation that the government intimates they are going to bring down regarding the control of lake freight rates? It seems to me that should be down by this time. We are very close to the end of the session, and the report has been in for several days, or rather I should say for a couple of weeks.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Oh, no, a couple of days.

Mr. BUREAU: Three or four days at the most.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have had the report for a week.

Mr. BUREAU: You are a privileged person, then. There is something wrong about that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I got the report from the government. Secondly, could the Minister of Railways intimate what is the nature of the proposed legislation regarding railway construction?

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways): The right hon. gentleman will remember that in the railway statement which I made earlier in the session, I indicated that there would be a construction programme presented to parliament. I think I stated that all the construction likely to take place would probably be paid for out of consoli-

dated revenue. I want not to retract but to intimate, that perhaps that part of my statement may be changed. What the government proposes to do, on the recommendation of the board, is to construct a number of branch lines, the great majority of which have been started and not completed. Many of these branch lines have been graded but the rails have not been laid on them yet. However, we hope to have the legislation down in a few days.

CIVIL SERVICE SUPERANNUATION

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. GAUVREAU: May I ask the Minister of Finance if there is to be a superannuation bill for the Civil Service this session? If not, will the Calder Act be continued?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING: There is a notice on the order paper for the continuance of the Calder Act.

DISTRIBUTION OF REPORTS

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. JOHN MILLAR (Qu'Appelle): May I ask the government that in future, when ministers make motions in this House for the printing of reports, provision be also made for the distribution of those reports. Yesterday I was searching for a report that I thought would be out, and after going from one office to the other I found that the distribution office did not know whether the report would be distributed from there when it was printed, or what number of copies would be available or to whom they would be sent—no provision whatever of that nature had been made. I wondered, therefore, whether it would not be possible in future when motions are made for the printing of reports to provide also for their distribution.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: We will endeavour to meet the wishes of my hon. friend as far as may be deemed advisable.

PRIVILEGE—MR. CARROLL

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. W. F. CARROLL (Cape Breton South and Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. It really is not a question of personal privilege but a matter which concerns the entire House, the committees of the House, and the country at large. There are standing committees appointed by the House to look into various subjects which may be submitted to them each session. I want to bring to your attention, Sir, the fact that the select standing committee on Agriculture and Colonization held a meeting this morning which was called by the Chair. I happened to learn of that fact—I was not informed of it by the chairman who perhaps was not called upon to advise me—and I went into the committee and saw the somewhat unwholesome and unsavory sight of a gentleman making propaganda on a question which will, in the immediate future, come before the members of this House. You will notice, Sir, there is a resolution standing on the order paper in my name—No. 12—which has reference to the question of oleomargarine—and I can see the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) bowing his head when he hears of oleomargarine. Sir, the subject of oleomargarine was never referred this session to the committee on Agriculture, and I do not see by what right, or by what authority, that committee should undertake to discuss the matter and allow the solicitors, the paid solicitors, of any industry, whether it be the dairy industry or any other, to appear before them without notice to other persons who may have an interest in that particular question. I went to the committee and raised objection to the proceedings, but I was told, first by the chairman and then by the hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Caldwell), who is an all-wise man in this sense, that I had no authority there. I would like to point out to the House that in my humble opinion the committee on Agriculture had no more right to sit and discuss that matter than I had to go there—and I had no right.

Mr. Speaker, we pay certain officials, such as stenographers and secretaries of committees. to do certain work, and no chairman and no minister has the right to call a committee, and to use the services of these officers, in order to make propaganda, whether it be on the question of oleomargarine or a much lesser subject. I wish to point out, Sir, as strongly as I can, that the committee on Agriculture are doing something they have no authority to do. The meeting of this committee was called by the chairman three or four days ago, and however decent a man the chairman may be—and I am making no charge against anybody—the unfortunate part is that it was summoned for no other purpose than the making of propaganda. The chairman of that committee, in my humble estimation, and the gentlemen who supported him, exceeded their powers in allowing the solicitor for the dairy institutions of this country to make a speech of a couple of hours duration in connection with a matter—

Mr. McBRIDE: I take exception to that statement. The gentleman in question made no speech of two hours duration; it occupied less than twenty minutes.

Mr. CARROLL: My hon. friend is one of those who objected when I went to the meeting and said I was trying to make political capital.

Mr. McBRIDE: Certainly, I did.

Mr. CARROLL: I was at the committee for at least twenty minutes listening to this gentleman and I am told he continued his —may I say?—his peroration, long after I left. However, the question of time as between my hon. friend and myself is a very small matter. I say that such representations should not have been allowed to be made at all. I maintain that the committee on Agriculture should not allow itself to be used for the making of propaganda for any industry or any set of men in this country, and I charge that was the object in view when the committee was called together. Now, Mr. Speaker, I did intend bringing this matter up in a somewhat different manner. I was of the opinion that it might be considered a matter of national importance, and that I might be allowed to move the adjournment of the House in order to draw attention to it.

However, on consultation with gentlemen who know more about the procedure than I do, I concluded to bring the matter up on a question of privilege, and I wish to say that this is a matter which I think may be discussed. It is a debatable matter, but it does not pertain to the question of personal privilege. For that reason I brought it up in this way. I do not know that I can use language sufficiently strong to impress upon the members of this House the grievance which I, as a member, and the grievance which I think every hon. member of this House should have on a question of this kind.

Mr. CALDWELL: I rise to a point of order. I should like to have your ruling, Mr. Speaker, as to whether the hon. member is in order in discussing this matter.

Mr. CARROLL: Is the hon. member not a little late?

Mr. CHAPLIN: On a question of privilege. I think that if the hon. member was not allowed to go into it in committee, it is a question of personal privilege.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think there is no question with regard to this being a matter affecting the privileges of the members of the House. I do not wish to give a ruling before I have heard the parties, but from what I gather, the whole question is whether a committee has a right to discuss or deal with a matter which has not been regularly referred to that committee. I wish to hear discussion on that point.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I submit, with all deference, that the hon. member cannot bring this matter before the House in this form. That an hon. member, as a matter of privilege, can rise in the House to debate the conduct of a committee without any report from that committee is totally at variance with what I have understood to be the practice, and certainly no debate can take place on that matter. How can such a matter be debated—how can both sides be heard? The hon. gentleman may rise and complain of his treatment in this House or in the committee, but having made that statement, he has stated his own position, and the matter is through. But the hon. member has gone far beyond that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Referring to rule 47, I find the following:

> Whenever any matter of privilege arises it shall be taken into consideration immediately.

Then, paragraph 479 of Beauchesnes', I find the following:

> May says, page 241, that the proceedings of the House may be interrupted at any moment, save during the process of a division, by a motion based on a matter of privilege, when a matter has recently arisen which directly concerns the privileges of the House, and in that case the House will entertain the motion forthwith. Bourinot, page 303, quotes an ancient authority as saying whether any question is or is not before the House, and even in the midst of another discussion, if a member should rise to complain of a breach of the privileges of the House, they have always instantly heard him'. It seems that the first duty of parliament is to keep its privileges and no rule or standing order should restrain its conduct when it must vindicate its authority.

In the present instance, I understand, the hon. member (Mr. Carroll) has a motion on the order paper relating to oleomargarine, and he now states that a committee to which this matter has not been specially referred, dealt with that question this morning, thereby anticipating his motion to be debated at a later date before the House. This, in my judgment, is contrary to the rules of the House, and the rules to be followed in the committee. If hon. members will refer to Bourinot they will find that the special committees and standing committees can only deal with matters which are specially referred to them. I am informed that Mr. Todd, who is the chief of the committee clerks, and an

old authority, having been in the service of this House for over forty years, decided —and I agree with his decision—not to allow the evidence to be reported under such circumstances.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have no exception whatever to take to the quotations cited by your honour, nor to Mr. Todd's decision, because both are in conformity with my own view. An hon. member may rise to a question of personal privilege any time if his personal privileges have been interfered with. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Carroll) does not so allege. He seeks as a matter of privilege to bring before the House what he claims to be the irregular conduct of the committee. That does not affect the personal privilege of an hon. member at all. Even were he raising a question of privilege, he cannot debate the question, because there can be no reply. I strongly affirm the position taken by the hon. member for Victoria and Carleton (Mr. Caldwell) that the hon. member for Cape Breton South and Richmond (Mr. Carroll) is out of order.

Mr. CALDWELL: Just to correct a possible misapprehension with regard to what happened this morning—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order, order.

Mr. BOIVIN: That is not a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. CALDWELL: The hon. member (Mr. Carroll) said he had been denied the privilege of being heard before the committee.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand the hon. member is discussing the point of order which has been raised.

Mr. CALDWELL: The point of order depends on the question under consideration as a point of order. The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Chaplin) said that, because if the fact that the hon. member had been denied admission to the committee he should be heard. The committee met this morning and practically unanimously decided to hear certain men who might give us information on a question which is to come before this House. Whether we were in order in that decision or not, I do not know. The hon. member who raises the question of privilege objected to the committee dealing with the matter. What the committee objected to was the interrupting of a gentleman who had been called before the committee.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question of order has been raised as to the right of the hon. member to rise to a question of privilege on the facts which have been adduced before the House. In my humble judgment I consider that, whether it is a personal privilege or a matter affecting the privileges of the House, the question is properly before the House.

Mr. CARROLL: I think I made it very plain when I rose to the question of privilege that it was not a matter of personal privilege. I am not complaining in that respect. I do not mind that. Perhaps I deserved everything that was said to me in the committee when I went there. But I want to assure my hon. friend from Victoria and Carleton and the chairman that I am not complaining of that. My complaint is on a matter which I would think might perhaps come before the House in other ways. I am finding no fault with the committee. My reason for raising this point is that I think the committee is hearing evidence on something which is not referred to them. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt in the world that the committee on Agriculture might, if they so desired, revise the Bank Act, they may revise the Criminal Code, they may do anything in the world, so long as they do not report their findings to the House. I have said—and I reiterate—that they have no right to use the public offices of this building to discuss matters which were not referred to them. That is my chief objection. They may do anything in the world as long as they do not usurp the function for which they were appointed. I have said that I hope I have brought fairly to the attention of the House a matter which, in my estimation, is one, not only of privilege, but of national public importance.

Mr. W. F. KAY (Missisquoi): Mr. Speaker, I trust I may be allowed to reply to the hon. member for Cape Breton South and Richmond (Mr. Carroll). The question of privilege which the hon. member raised, as he stated at first, was that he had been refused a hearing before the committee on Agriculture.

Mr. CARROLL: I made no such statement.

Mr. KAY: I wish to say that I myself sent a personal messenger to the hon. member this morning asking him to come to the committee. I have been a member of the committee on Agriculture since coming into the House some twelve years ago. The practice has been almost invariable, that that committee should hear discussions on matters relating to agriculture delivered by prominent agriculturists or by officials of the Department of Agriculture, and to my knowledge those matters had never been referred by the House to that committee. I yesterday received a letter from the secre-

tary of the National Dairy Council of Canada saying that a number of representatives of the dairying interests from the different provinces were in Ottawa and had had an interview with the cabinet, and requesting me as chairman of the committee on Agriculture and Colonization to call the committee together in order to allow them to address the committee. Having in view the procedure which has been followed in that committee for many years, I acquiesced, after, I may say, consulting with Mr. Todd as to the propriety of doing so, and I called the committee together. The notice of the meeting is on the notice board in the lobby, and each member of the committee received the usual notice, at the bottom of which was the order of the day which stated that the committee was called for the purpose of hearing representatives of the National Dairy Council on the question of oleomargarine. On that committee there are not only members who are in favour but members who are against oleomargarine so that I think there was no discrimination against anybody. When the committee met this morning, the question was put to them, and they decided unanimously, at least not by vote but by great enthusiasm, that they desired to hear the representatives who were present before them. I may say that sixty-five members of the committee were present. Not on a question of privilege, but on behalf of the committee and the members of it, I must respectfully draw to your attention, Sir, the exceedingly unparliamentary and almost unmannerly behaviour of the hon. member for South Cape Breton when he entered the committee room this morning.

Mr. CARROLL: I object to the use of unparliamentary language by my hon. friend.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think the expression "unmannerly" should be used, and I would ask the hon. member for Missisquoi (Mr. Kay) to withdraw that expression.

Mr. KAY: I will withdraw it at your request, Sir, and I will stand by the word "unparliamentary." The hon. member for South Cape Breton entered the committee room while a speaker was holding the floor, and without addressing the Chair, without addressing the committee in particular, without asking permission to say a few words, the hon. member very abruptly or roughly interrupted the speaker and complained that he had not been advised of the meeting, which statement was false.

Mr. CARROLL: I object to the use of the word "false" by the hon. member.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think the hon. gentleman meant to use the word "false."

Mr. KAY: I will say "inaccurate statement."

Mr. CARROLL: I would ask that the hon. member be requested to withdraw the word "false."

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand the hon. gentleman has withdrawn the word.

Mr. KAY: I withdraw the word "false" at your request, Mr. Speaker, and I will say "inaccurate," because I sent the clerk of the committee to notify the hon. member of the meeting. His remark was false so far as I was concerned. Whether he received the notice or not I do not know; anyway he came to the meeting shortly afterwards. The hon. member proceeded to protest because he said that it was unfair that one side of the question of oleomargarine should be discussed without the opposite side being notified. He did not take the ground, when he entered the room, that the committee was discussing a question without having authority to do so He took the ground simply that it was unfair that one side of the question should be heard without the other side being notified, and he demanded that the committee rise and adjourn until the other side could be present. I pointed out to the hon. member that as an old member of this House, as chairman of an important committee, he should well know the rules which govern committees and which state that a member of the House who is not a member of a committee has no right to interrupt the proceedings of that committee without first obtaining permission from the Chair and from the committee. After that the hon. member put in a scribbled note, which I found hard to make out. I do not know what it meant. Then he, in a very gruff manner, said that he refused to stay, and he withdrew. I think my course in calling the committee together to hear these gentlemen was quite in accordance with the precedent which had been followed for many years in that committee. As we met merely to hear discussions of interest to the agricultural interests of the country, I think we were not very much out of order.

Mr. T. W. CALDWELL (Victoria and Carleton): Mr. Speaker, as one of the co-respondents named by the hon. member for Cape Breton South and Richmond, possibly it will be in order for me to say a word.

Mr. BUREAU: Is that in reply, closing the debate?

Mr. CALDWELL: I was a little disappointed that the hon. member for South Cape Breton did not include the cabinet in his objection to getting information on matters that are liable to come before the House. He objected to our committee hearing people who might give us information on a subject that is of vital importance, a matter that, possibly, as members of this House we shall be called upon to decide in the very near future. I think I speak for many members of the committee when I say that we felt we had not sufficient information on the subject to decide it as we should, and we were pleased to hear members of the Dairy Council and anyone else who might appear. A motion was passed, before the committee adjourned this morning, that an opportunity should be given anyone who might wish to do so to prevent the case in favour of oleomargarine. Now, if a committee of this House is going to be denied the privilege of obtaining information on any important question in regard to which certain evidence is considered essential, I presume that the hon. member for Cape Breton South and Richmond (Mr. Carroll) would also object to the cabinet meeting these people and hearing their views on the subject. The cabinet, of course, is far more responsible than any group of members of parliament, but I submit nevertheless that the members of this House are undoubtedly charged with some responsibility. I do not wish to prolong the debate, but I though it only proper that I should submit these remarks.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Some time earlier in the session I gave an undertaking to the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Carroll) that an opportunity would be afforded him before the session was over to debate the resolution which appears in his name on the order paper. Probably this is an opportune time for me to ask the House if it would agree that the hon. member should be allowed to take up his resolution. If it is the wish of the House that this be done, the resolution might be made a special order for consideration to-morrow. In that event, before the House proceeds to the Orders of the Day to-morrow I shall move that the resolution be taken up.

Mr. SPEAKER: In support of the opinion expressed a moment ago with regard to the duties of select and standing committees of this House, I may refer to a motion made on Monday, February 12, 1923. The right hon. the Prime Minister on that day moved:

[Mr. Caldwell.]

That the select standing committees of this House shall severally be empowered to examine and inquire into all such matters and things as may be referred by the House.

It is obvious therefore that only such questions as are referred to the committees may be discussed by them. I am bound to say, of course, in justification of the course followed by the standing committee on Agriculture, that unless exception is taken, as has been taken this afternoon, to the investigation of any matter outside of the scope of the subject submitted to a committee for its consideration, a very wide latitude is generally accorded such a committee as that on agriculture. Strictly speaking, and adhering to the letter of parliamentary procedure and constitutional practice, certainly no committee can deal with a question unless that question is specially referred to it. For this view I have ample authority. I add this rider, however, that very wide latitude is given an important committee such as the committee on Agriculture, when no exception is taken by any hon. member that a resolution standing in his name, which it is intended he shall bring before the House, is being anticipated and prejudged by a discussion or by any evidence brought before that committee. I understand that the incident is closed.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): I rise, Mr. Speaker, merely to put myself on record in this matter, because it may be wise at a later date that I should have done so. I submit that the conduct of a committee cannot come before the Speaker of this House for a ruling merely on a complaint of an hon. member of the House; and further, that the conduct of the committee in question has never been before you, Sir, for any ruling. There is a method of bringing the conduct of any committee before parliament, but that method has not been adopted in this instance, merely, on a question of personal privilege. Hon. members have certain rights, and to say that those rights in this case have been exceeded, and exceeded to a considerable extent, is to my mind to express a very obvious truth. That, however, was not what I rose to say. I rose simply to observe that the conduct of the committee was not properly before the House, nor was it, either properly or improperly, before the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER: Of course, I have May and Bourinot in my favour. I wish to assure the House that I have the highest opinion of the ability of the right hon. member (Mr. Meighen) and of his knowledge of the rules.

I would however refer the House to Beauchesne's under Rule 47, paragraph 479, which reads in part:

> May says, p. 241, that "the proceedings of the House may be interrupted at any moment, save during the process of a division, by a motion based on a matter of privilege, when a matter has recently arisen which directly concerns the privileges of the House, and in that case, the House will entertain the motion forthwith."

I consider that the grievance, founded or unfounded, which an hon. member may have against the proceedings of a committee constitutes the subject matter of a question of privilege.

Mr. MEIGHEN: With all deference to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, I beg to submit that you have not grasped my point. I do not take any exception at all to the quotation from May; what I say is that the mere rising to a question of privilege on the part of an hon. member, even though the subject matter of the question may have arisen in a committee, does not bring before the Speaker of the House for decision the question of the conduct of that committee. It may be quite true that the conduct of the committee was wrong, but I submit with all respect that that question is not before you, Mr. Speaker, for a ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER: A question of privilege is in order at any time during a debate when an hon. member declares that the privileges of the House are being infringed upon. The question is not restricted to the individual privileges but to the collective privileges of the House.

Mr. CALDWELL: I understood the Prime Minister to ask the consent of the House to have the resolution standing in the name of the hon. member for Cape Breton South with regard to oleomargarine brought up for discussion to-morrow. As a member of the special committee which is inquiring into agricultural conditions, I wish to enter my protest to that resolution coming up before the report of that special committee is submitted to the House. We have taken evidence on the question of the manufacture of oleomar-
4 p.m. garine in Canada, and as the report of the committee has not yet been brought down and probably will not be brought down for a few days, I think that a discussion of the hon. member's resolution would only be anticipating that report.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understood that the House agreed a moment ago to the suggestion of the Prime Minister that the hon. member's resolution be taken up to-morrow.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the suggestion of the Prime Minister never reached the House in the form of a motion. He merely mentioned the matter and the House proceeded to another subject immediately.

Mr. CALDWELL: No question was put concerning the Prime Minister's suggestion.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understood that the House had acquiesced in the Prime Minister's proposal; if it did not, then it is important that a definite understanding should be reached in the matter.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: To avoid a formal motion, I should be glad if my hon. friend (Mr. Caldwell) could see his way to waiving any objection that he may have towards bringing up the resolution to-morrow.

Mr. CALDWELL: It is a well-known fact, I think, that evidence given before a special committee of the House cannot be discussed in the House before that committee has reported. I am sorry that the chairman of the committee is not in his place.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: But the question that forms the subject matter of the resolution which it is proposed to consider to-morrow was not referred to the committee.

Mr. CALDWELL: All questions of any description whatever affecting agricultural conditions in Canada generally were, I take it, referred to the committee.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Does the hon. member suggest that we cannot legislate until that committee has reported?

Mr. CALDWELL: I am not suggesting anything of the kind, but I do say that the particular question which we have been discussing was undoubtedly included in the comprehensive reference to the special committee that has been considering agricultural conditions generally throughout the country. The question which it is proposed to take up to-morrow certainly affects agriculture, and we have taken evidence upon it. I say that the report of the committee is not yet before the House, so that any discussion of that question would necessarily anticipate that report. I stand by my objection.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Perhaps the hon. member for Victoria and Carleton (Mr. Caldwell) will mention something that has not been discussed before that special committee.

MANITOBA GRAND JURIES

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. R. A. HOEY (Springfield): A few days ago, I think it was on May 14, the right

hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) put a question to the government with respect to a certain resolution that had been passed by the legislature of Manitoba. The subject matter of that resolution, the Prime Minister will remember, related to the abolition of the grand jury system in that province. I should like to ask the government if it is their intention at this session to bring in legislation in conformity with that demand. I have been in touch with the members from the province of Manitoba; they are exceedingly anxious that the government submit such legislation this session if at all possible.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It is the intention of the government to bring in such legislation.

SUPPLY

The House again in Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

CUSTOMS AND EXCISE

Civil Government—Customs and Excise—Salaries and Contingencies, $625,375.

Hon. JACQUES BUREAU (Minister of Customs and Excise): This is the same as last year, except that there are two officers less.

Item agreed to.

Customs and Excise—	
Salaries and contingent expenses of the several ports in the Dominion, including pay for overtime of officers, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act,—and temporary buildings and rentals..	$5,581,800 00
Salaries and travelling expenses of Inspectors of Ports and of other officers on inspection, preventive service, and in connection with the Board of Customs; the latter including salaries of $1,500 for the Chairman, $1,000 each for three members and $500 for the Secretary..	761,379 00
Miscellaneous—Printing and stationery, subscriptions to commercial papers, flags, dating stamps, locks, instruments, etc., for various ports of entry, express charges on samples, stationery and legal forms, legal expenses, premiums on guarantee bonds, and uniforms for Customs officers..	550,000 00
To provide for expenses of maintenance of revenue cruisers and for preventive service..	276,950 00
Amounts to be paid to Department of Justice to be disbursed by and accounted for to it, for secret preventive service..	10,000 00
	$7,180,129 00

Mr. STEVENS: Has a decision been arrived at by the department authorizing the shipment of goods from ports in eastern Canada via the Panama canal to ports in western Canada, even though the vessel carrying such goods should call at an intervening port? When the minister answers that question I have another to put to him.

Mr. BUREAU: I suppose this is the same question that has been asked before, involving the appointment of a customs officer in New York.

Mr. STEVENS: No. Let me make myself clear before the minister answers; I do not want to be discourteous to him. There are three questions; I will put them all and the minister can, if he will, answer them at the same time. There is the question of shipping goods—I will specify, so as to make the point clear—say, steel from Sydney, Nova Scotia, to Vancouver, all-water route, by the same vessel; and suppose that vessel calls at an American port en route. Then, there is the question of shipping Canadian goods from Sydney to New York by water, with transfer from a coastal to an ocean-going vessel, thence through the Panama canal to Vancouver, but the goods always being the same. Then there is the third case, the shipping of Canadian goods from eastern Canada, say, from Hamilton, by rail to New York, loading them on a vessel and sending them on in that way to the Pacific coast. Will the minister say just what is the situation in regard to permitting the shipment of goods in these three different ways?

Mr. BUREAU: Number one; a British ship loads rails at Sydney and goes via the Panama canal to Vancouver. There is no breaking of bulk; the cargo remains the same. In that case there is no objection. That is the first question.

Mr. STEVENS: Even if call is made at other ports?

Mr. BUREAU: Even so—if the bulk is there; if the cargo remains in the ship and is not broken, there is no objection. Number two: shipment is made in a British bottom from Sydney to New York, with breaking of bulk and transfer to another ship. In that case, it would be necessary to have a Canadian customs officer to supervise the trans-shipment, to check the goods and send copies of the manifests to the officers of the department in Vancouver. Number three: shipment from Toronto, Hamilton, or Montreal by rail to New York and transfer there to a ship. Here the answer is the same as in the second case, because you break bulk, and that would have to be done under the supervision of a Canadian customs officer, who would also mark and initial the necessary papers. Now, about

the appointment of a customs officer at New York, here is a letter that was addressed to me on the 18th of May—and my hon. friends will see that everybody is not of the same mind so far as that goes. It says:

Minister of Customs,
Ottawa, Ontario.

Dear Sir:

We understand that representations have been made on behalf of Canadian shippers and importers for the appointment of a customs officer at New York, in order to encourage exports to British Columbia via American ports. We have pleasure in advising you that we have arranged to load the steamer Margaret Coughlan from Montreal to Vancouver, via the Panama canal, about the middle of July, and are in communication with the Canadian Manufacturers Association, and a large number of firms in eastern and western Canada, and are quoting them competitive rates in order to secure traffic for an all-Canadian steamship route between the East and the West.

For your further information, we may state that the above steamer is loading a full cargo of lumber from British Columbia to Montreal, and is also accepting shipments of canned salmon for this port.

That is, the port of Montreal, from which this letter is dated.

Under the above circumstances, we do not think that there is any justification for an appointment of the customs officers in New York, as if we can obtain any reasonable amount of support for a direct steamship service, we expect to make the line permanent. In any case, we do not think it to the interest of Canada to encourage shipments via American ports, in view of a direct service being opened up. We may say that we have been requested to make this communication to you by the owners of the above steamers, and also our agents in British Columbia.

Yours very truly,
Thos. Harling & Son.

Mr. STEVENS: Where is that letter from?

Mr. BUREAU: It is from Thomas Harling & Son, Montreal. I do not know the gentlemen.

Mr. FIELDING: It is a well known shipping concern.

Mr. BUREAU: We may well hesitate in this matter when we consider that, taking as a starting point Hamilton, Montreal, or Toronto, the most our Canadian railways would get on the rail haul when shipment is made via the Panama canal would be about 20 per cent of the charges involved. In the case of Toronto, the freight by rail to the seaboard would be about 17 or 18 per cent of the whole. No decision has yet been reached by the department; we are hearing the pros and cons in the matter. I understand it may take some time before there is a definite and permanent line established. It takes goodwill and the encouragement of all people concerned on this side of the border to keep these people going.

Mr. STEVENS: There was a statement made by Mr. M. A. Macdonald in a coast paper only a day or two ago to the effect that he had been in Ottawa last week and that the federal government had definitely arranged to place this officer at New York for the purpose of the trans-shipment of goods. He announced this as the official representative of the government party in Vancouver. He had just spent, I remember, a very pleasant visit here of a week or two in consultation with the hon. minister, and I wanted to get from the minister exactly what had been done so that the public would know.

Mr. BUREAU: If Mr. Macdonald has made any such statement it was not a statement that came from me, nor was it based on anything I might have promised. I said in the House here, and I repeat now, that the matter is still under consideration. I think it was my hon. friend from Vancouver South (Mr. Ladner) who had a question on the order paper a few days ago inquiring as to the cost of maintaining an officer in New York, and I replied that we could not answer the question then because we were investigating the whole matter. No definite decision has been arrived at yet. I do not say there will not be an officer stationed at New York, but I do not affirm that there will be, either.

Mr. STEVENS: Before we leave this question, the trans-shipment of steel products from, say, Sydney to another vessel at New York for the purpose of transport through the Panama canal would not be affected by the letter which the minister has just read to the committee. That does not affect the rail haul at all. That is all-water haul from a Canadian port in the east to a Canadian port in the west. The only thing is that it is carried in coastal vessels from Sydney, Nova Scotia, to New York, and there trans-shipped to an ocean-going vessel for carriage through the Panama canal to Vancouver. Will the minister not give consideration to that, and grant the privilege?

Mr. BUREAU: My hon. friend did not give the whole case. He says it would not affect the rail haul to the border. But it would affect it in this way. If a Canadian ship leaves Montreal and lands the goods in Vancouver, and a Canadian ship leaves Sydney and lands the goods in New York, all the Canadian bottom will get will be the transportation of the goods from Sydney to New York whereas if you encourage a Canadian line it will get the transport from Montreal to Vancouver, which makes quite a difference.

Mr. STEVENS: There is a line of steamships registered in Canada, the Dollar Steam-

ship Company, running from Singapore to New York via Vancouver. It runs a regular line of freighters from Singapore to Shanghai and Vancouver, touching at Mexico, passing through the Panama Canal and going on to New York. They do not run up to Sydney because they are large vessels of 10,000 tons, and they cannot get full cargoes but they do get cargoes to New York. They will pick up a part cargo at New York from Sydney and carry it on their return trip to Vancouver; so it is a British bottom that carries the goods all the way through.

Mr. BUREAU: My hon. friend must not lose sight of the fact that they break cargo, and every time the goods are trans-shipped it must be under the supervision of an officer.

Mr. STEVENS: Certainly. That is what we want.

Mr. BUREAU: Whether it is a British or a foreign bottom, whether by water or by rail.

Mr. STEVENS: That is exactly what we want, and what I am trying to induce the minister to agree to. We want the appointment of an officer at New York for that purpose.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Can the minister inform us to-day what would be the probable cost of maintaining an officer at New York? I think it is desirable, unless the cost is prohibitive, that that should be done. I do not think the need is obviated by the fact that one steamship company is establishing a line between Montreal and Vancouver, though I am very glad to hear of that, and I hope that another line will be started. I should like to know what the minister thinks would be the cost.

Mr. BUREAU: I have not formed any opinion yet. Our investigation has not gone far enough to enable us to give any data that would satisfy my hon. friend. I have not satisfied myself yet, and I do not like to give figures at random.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Is it a small amount or a very large amount?

Mr. BUREAU: My hon. friend must form his own opinion. He knows what it costs to live in New York, and that you cannot take a common labourer to fill a job of that sort. It requires a man who would command a certain salary, and there are the expenses, of moving down there, living expenses and so forth. My hon. friend is able to form an opinion just as well as I can.

[Mr. Stevens.]

Mr. CLARK: This question has been discussed in the House on several occasions. It came up in the discussion on railway rates. My recollection is that the minister gave as his reason for not stationing a customs officer at New York that it would take away business from the railway companies, more particularly from our own railways. He also mentioned to-day the fact that there was not unanimity on this question, and quoted from a letter from Montreal. There may not be unanimity in Montreal on the question, but I can assure him that there is unanimity in the province of British Columbia, and unanimity on the part of Canadian manufacturers and of all people who are doing business with western ports. The fact is that to-day the business that is going via the Panama canal to the port of New York is business which under no circumstances would go across the continent on our railways. Our business men in British Columbia are to-day being forced to go to the American market to buy manufactured articles which they could buy in Montreal and Toronto just as cheaply as in the American market, but they cannot buy them in Montreal or Toronto owing to the freight rates on these articles being prohibitive. If they pay the freight rate over the railways, by the time these manufactured articles are landed in British Columbia the cost is so great that our people are much better off by buying the article in the United States or Great Britain, shipping it via the Panama canal and paying the duty. They get the articles much cheaper in that way than by buying from the Canadian manufacturer. I advocate the establishment of a customs officer at New York more particularly to enable us to do business with the eastern manufacturers in Canada to the exclusion of the manufacturers in the United States and Great Britain, and also to enable the British Columbia manufacturers, canners and so forth, to ship into eastern Canada markets by water the products which they cannot ship there to-day owing to the prohibitive freight rates on the railways.

Mr. BUREAU: I understand my hon. friend to say that there was unanimity in British Columbia on this question of having an agent, a customs officer appointed at New York.

Mr. CLARK: I might qualify that—unanimity with the exception possibly of a person such as my hon. friend cited who is interested in establishing a steamship line. I am in favour of the establishment of a steamship line myself and will do everything I can to

support it. In fact, I will go this far and suggest that if you cannot get a private enterprise to establish such a line you might use some of the ships of the government merchant marine for the purpose of establishing a direct service between Vancouver and Montreal in the summer and between Vancouver and Halifax in the winter time.

Mr. BUREAU: This question has been discussed for a long while and so far no action has been taken upon it. I must tell my hon. friend that I did not say we would not appoint an agent in New York—

Mr. CLARK: I did not say that.

Mr. BUREAU:—any more than I affirmed that we would. The question is being considered. Now the difficulty under which we are labouring is this: The National Railways and the Canadian Pacific Railway come to you and say, "If you do this you will hurt us. The British Columbia people ask for special rates and at the same time they want to take freight away from us." The railway officials represent that whenever 100 loaded cars are shipped from Vancouver to the East it means that 60 empty cars have to be brought back from the East to the West.

Mr. CLARK: Did I understand the minister to say—

Mr. BUREAU: That if you want 100 cars to be shipped loaded from the West to the East you have got to carry 60 cars empty from the East to the West.

Mr. CLARK: I may inform the minister that same statement was made to me by a very high official of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. BUREAU: It was made to me by officials of the Canadian National Railway.

Mr. CLARK: It is an official of the Canadian Pacific Railway that I am referring to. So I went to the Bureau of Statistics and found that the total going into British Columbia from the East and coming from British Columbia to the East is almost equal.

Mr. BUREAU: In what years?

Mr. CLARK: Any year you like.

Mr. BUREAU: Oh, no, last year there was a difference caused by the shipments of grain.

Mr. CLARK: I looked the matter up over a period of about three years and the statement is true that the tonnage coming from the prairie provinces eastward is very much greater than the tonnage going westward. But that is not true of all British Columbia; the tonnage is almost equal going in both directions.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I would like to add my word of support to the remarks which the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) and the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) made on this matter. It seems to be an absurd policy to ignore the economic effect of the construction and operation of the Panama canal and yet that is virtually what we are doing so long as we keep away from the establishment of this customs office. So long as we have these iniquitous tariff duties let us make the tariff as ineffective as we possibly can so as to get our goods from one Canadian port to another without penalizing the man who sells goods or the one who purchases them. I sincerely hope the minister will take this matter into favourable consideration and that before the year is out it will be possible for the canners of salmon in British Columbia to ship to Montreal or other ports on the Atlantic seaboard and correspondingly possible for the shippers on the Atlantic to ship to the Pacific seaboard via the Panama canal without any such consequences as are now complained of.

Mr. STEVENS: I just want to add one word and I think I can help the minister out of the dilemma he is in somewhat because there are regulations in the Customs Act which give the power to do this without any question. For example take subsection (q) of section 286 of the Customs Act.

Mr. BUREAU: I have got it here.

Mr. STEVENS: The section prescribes that:

> The Governor in Council may, from time to time, and in the manner hereinafter provided, in addition to the other purposes and matters in this act mentioned, make regulations for or relating to the following purposes and matters:—
>
> Subsection (q) Prescribing the rules and conditions under which goods imported in bond or duty-paid, and products or manufactures of Canada, may be transported from one port or place in Canada to another port or place therein, over any territory or waters outside the limits of Canada: Provided that the goods so transported shall, upon arrival in Canada from any place beyond the limits of Canada, be treated with regard to the liability to, or exemption from, duty, as if the transportation had taken place entirely within the limits of Canada;

Now, that is the old regulation.

Mr. BUREAU: That is the law.

Mr. STEVENS: That is the law, and the regulations have similar provisions as well.

Now, I just want to say two things in reply to the observations made by the minister. First, in reply to the suggestion that this demand was one of long standing and had never been acceded to in the past. I do not want to do more than refer to the fact that that is not argument, although it is used as such by the members of the cabinet.

Mr. BUREAU: No, I did not put it in argument. I simply mentioned it to show the difficulty we were working under.

Mr. STEVENS: Exactly, but I want to explain that it is said the previous government had done nothing and therefore we should not blame the present government. I do not want to blame the present government but I am asking that consideration be given to this fact: The reasons why nothing was done up to about two or three years ago were these. The Panama canal was closed in 1915 owing to a big land slide. During the following years from 1915 to 1920 the tonnage of the world was occupied on the Atlantic and we had very little tonnage on the Pacific in connection with purely war purposes so that there was no possibility, no physical possibility of giving effect to this during those years. Since the year 1920 down to the present time there has been a general release of tonnage all over the world so that there has been ample tonnage available, and it is during that period that this question has been pressed. That, I think, answers the contention as to inactivity in the past.

Now then one other point as regards railway tonnage. I want to say to the railways that they are not getting the tonnage. That is the point, they are not getting it to-day. We are forced to purchase very largely in the states of Washington and California many things that we would buy in eastern Ontario because the long freight haul by railway adds to the cost on the Pacific plus the duty. The result is that Canadians in the West are buying American goods because they get them cheaper. They pay the duty and get them cheaper because of the excessive freight haul; whereas if they could get the privilege of trans-shipping at New York we would buy the eastern manufactured goods, ship them via New York and, with the lower water haul charges, we would get them cheaper than we could import them from the United States. I want to impress upon the minister and these railways that if they would give this point consideration they would find out that what I say is perfectly true and accurate.

[Mr. Stevens.]

Then, as regards the haul by railway. There is an awful lot of goods hauled by railway from the eastern states and sold in western Canada—extreme western Canada, Alberta and British Columbia. That traffic goes over American roads; it does not travel over Canadian roads to-day. Some of it does but the great bulk of it is going over the American railways, so that if this privilege were established at New York it would not interfere, as I say, to any great extent with tonnage. What you would do is stimulate business in eastern Canada and business in western Canada, and anything that will stimulate business must ultimately benefit the transportation systems of the country.

Mr. SHAW: I should like to ask the minister a couple of questions. First, I should like to know the particulars of the increase in the first item, and second, the necessity for that short and very elegant phrase "notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act"?

Mr. BUREAU: The increase in the first item is due to these causes. There are statutory increases which amount to $131,175, there is an increase due to reclassification which amounts to $18,215, some 114 additional officers have been appointed necessitating $96,130, and there has been an increase in contingencies caused by an augmentation in overtime pay amounting to $20,765. There are decreases due to promotions and appointments to vacancies at less salary amounting to $18,595, making a net increase $247,690.

As to the expression "notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act" the object of that is to enable our men to go on trains and boats on Sundays. Under the Civil Service Act we could not pay them for that work. They are paid by salary and we could not give them any extra remuneration for their overtime. When a train comes in from the United States at ten or eleven o'clock at night, our inspectors go aboard to examine the passengers' baggage. That is the reason we have to do that, apart from the Civil Service Commission. I explained to my hon. friend that the wages paid on Sunday by the department are reimbursed by the various railways and steamship companies that use our service, but they do not appear against the expenditure, because they go to revenue. The expenditure seems greater than it really is. We pay money which we get back, but it is not credited to a special account, and thus a lesser expenditure is shown, because the moneys go to revenue generally. There is an increase in the number of officials in the various ports, Montreal, Toronto, Que-

bec, and so on, on account of the increase in work, both in customs and excise. There have been various complaints, and I see by the papers that a lot of smuggling is going on. It is impossible to stop smuggling entirely but we determined that we would reduce it to a minimum. The same condition exists in regard to bootlegging and the various excise taxes that have been imposed lately.

Mr. CHURCH: I observe that part of this item is for temporary buildings and rentals. At the request of many of the business men of South Toronto and other parts of that city, I wish to call the attention of the minister to the very inadequate plant for a city of the size of Toronto. This year $50,000,000 net has been collected by the government in customs at the port of Toronto—more than seven times the total vote of $7,000,000 now before the committee. An agreement was made a few years ago, when the old customs house was torn down. At present we have not a customs house suitable for a city of over half a million people. Business is done in that customs house for a population of three quarters of a million, because the business done there includes business coming from the suburban districts, where there is a population of 200,000. We collected from that population of nearly three quarters of a million $50,000,000, in spite of the business being done in those old dilapidated buildings. They tore down the old customs house at the corner of Front and Yonge streets.

A lot was sold by the city of Toronto to the government at a cut rate to encourage the government to give the city the plant they required for the business. If you go into those dilapidated customs buildings throughout the city you will find business men trying to do some business. The minister has a good staff there and they are doing good work. At the same time if new buildings were erected the increased volume of business would produce a revenue which would more than pay the fixed charges on the cost of the building. The city of Toronto sold a large lot on Front street to the government at a cut rate. They did not consider the commercial value of that lot because it was worth three or four times what the government paid for it. We gave them that lot because they guaranteed a proper building capable of accommodating the business in Toronto. It was promised that a suitable building would be erected on the land in one year. Six or seven years have gone by and nothing has been done. The city of Toronto does not seem to get anything anyway. With them it is simply a case of "pay, pay, pay." One of my colleagues from Toronto said that the city got nothing, did not expect anything and would not get it if they did expect it. But you have to consider the business people of that district in the counties of York, Peel and Ontario. They are getting volumes of goods at that port of entry. Toronto stands as the great gateway of Canada. The local business is just $50,000,000 net. But other business is being done there, many villages and towns contribute to it, which would make it more a matter of $70,000,000 than $50,000,000. I hope this tu'penny-ha'penny, short-sighted policy of housing an important port like Toronto in a lot of small buildings which were used for other purposes and abandoned should be discontinued as far as Toronto is concerned.

We are in a similar position regarding post offices. From our post office at the Union station the receipts are nearly five and a half million dollars. I know that the present minister has been very active and has been trying to get increased facilities for the port of Toronto. He has been doing good work considering the poor plant he has to work with but the officials there cannot continue much longer. The condition of affairs for the wholesalers and retailers is intolerable. They are willing to pay for service. The erection of a new building is necessary, and the volume of business which is to be done there will be a paying proposition for the government, as it will pay the fixed charges on the cost of erection. I hope the minister will take this matter up and see if something cannot be done to meet the many protests made by the business men of Toronto. The present plant is utterly inefficient. We have not a plant there at all. The old plant was torn down and we have a number of rented buildings along the water front. The business men are willing to pay for it and we are not asking anything from the government. There will be more business for the government, it will be conducted in a better way and the public will be better satisfied. I think this condition of affairs is local to Toronto. Here we have a city of 600,000 population without any form of customs house except two or three little bits of rented buildings throughout the city. The minister has been very attentive and listens to any complaints the business men make as to the insufficiency of the plant. I hope he will give this matter his active sympathy before the next session of parliament. Could the minister tell me what arrangements are going to be made to tide over the temporary situation in

regard to rented buildings? Is it proposed during the next twelve months to give Toronto a proper customs house, instead of having the customs officials located in rented buildings?

Mr. BUREAU: I cannot give any assurance that anything will be done this year. I sympathize with the hon. member's views, and I admit that Toronto has not the facilities it ought to have to transact its business.

Mr. MEWBURN: Nor Hamilton.

Mr. BUREAU: I have not been there, but I have been in Toronto three or four times. I understand they have a better customs house in Hamilton. I admit that it is very difficult for the officers to give 100 per cent efficiency in the quarters where they are located, especially in the long room, and in the examining warehouse. There is the other disadvantage of being compelled to lose time going from one place to the other. You have your express office on the water front and your customs in the railway station, and an office on Wellington street. I am not familiar with the location of all the offices. The examining office is near the Canadian Pacific Railway freight sheds. This is an impediment and a handicap, not only for the people of Toronto, but for the customs officers. They cannot work properly in those quarters, and I am as anxious as my hon. friend to see a proper customs house built in Toronto, but I have been asking myself many a time why the old customs house was torn down.

Mr. CHURCH: Hear, hear.

Mr. BUREAU: I have seen only part of it where the express business is done, and it seems to me, from what is left of it, that it was a first class building, and why it should have been destroyed before the government were ready to put up another building I do not know. This year, however, there is nothing in the estimates. I am in sympathy with the proposition to build a customs house in Toronto. Toronto gave us $45,000,000 revenue. Montreal is in the same position as Toronto. Montreal has the long room in the examining warehouse, and has no proper place for the officers. They are handicapped. They cannot give us full efficiency, but we do not blame them, because they are working with artificial light and in badly ventilated quarters. But I took the premises as I found them, and until the country has enough money to build new premises or to improve on the ones we have now, I do not think I can give any encouragement, at least for this year, to my hon. friend.

[Mr. Church.]

Mr. CHURCH: I appreciate the line of argument of the minister; but when during the last fiscal year approximately fifty million dollars was made by the department out of the city of Toronto, surely a portion of that sum should be given back to the people who are paying that money, the business men of Toronto, by giving them increased plant to take care of the increasing business. At the present time a large portion of that sum is being utilized in other parts of the country, and surely the city which does the business and is paying in this huge sum to the department, should receive back some share of it in increased facilities. I think about one-third or, perhaps, forty per cent of that fifty million dollars was pure profit, and I do not see how the business is going to be conducted unless increased facilities are afforded. It will take two or three years to build a new customs house, and by that time the receipts will have increased well on to seventy-five million dollars. I would invite the minister to visit Toronto—we are always glad to see him—in order to see if something cannot be done. I understand the minister is doing the best he can; but at the same time the business men are protesting; they are paying for this, and a large proportion of the fifty million dollars is profit and is being used to give increased facilities in other parts of the country.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The hon. member says that he is at a loss to know why the old customs house disappeared. I do not know why he is at a loss. A proper customs house was to have been built; arrangements were made for it; the work was under way; the property was cleared, when the war came on and we stopped expenditures. There is no mystery about the matter at all. Can my hon. friend state how much money he is paying in Toronto now for rents? I do not know whether the other property is rented or is owned by the government. If it is on governmental property, that has a value; it is something that could be made use of and revenue could be brought in from it. The chances are, however, that some rent is still going out. If the minister were to take the value of other properties, whether rented or not, which could be put to other uses, easily sold, for instance, at the present time; if he were to consider the cost those properties mean and on top of that consider the extra cost he admits this means in carrying on business in Toronto, I am sure he would realize that, as a matter of good business, this place should be built at once.

Mr. BUREAU: Sure.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then that question is beyond all debate.

Mr. BUREAU: Find the money.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend talks about finding money. That port certainly is producing a great deal of money, and the money from that port is going to buy buildings elsewhere.

Mr. BUREAU: No.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Let us see. Does my hon. friend not think it would be better to have a customs warehouse where he can properly carry on business, something that will help business and help the country, than to buy a corner of King and Yonge streets for over a million dollars, and then put on top of that a building costing two or three million dollars for railway purposes? Does my hon. friend not think it is a good deal better to apply the funds which are got out of customs earnings in the port of Toronto, to giving decent facilities there than, to buy a large hotel in Quebec—I mean France—to look after railway business there? These things are being done.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am glad my hon. friend is uniting both Quebec and France.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I corrected myself. You see my hon. friend's mere presence is enough to remind me of his beautiful province of Quebec and to make it an uppermost subject in my mind. Why should this customs warehouse not be constructed; why should not this expenditure be made when business absolutely requires it, when my hon. friend says that it ought to be done but that the trouble is money. Is this not a little more important than a palatial ticket office at the corner of King and Yonge streets? Is it not more important than having this building in Paris at the present time? What real railway business does the minister think we are going to get out of that building in Paris, which would compare in importance with a proper plant at Toronto for his department?

Mr. HOCKEN: We had a Minister of Public Works for a few months representing this party, or rather Union government. He was Minister of Public Works for a few months on his way from the cool shades of opposition to the chairmanship of the Railway Commission. During the short period that he occupied that position he tore down the very excellent building which we had in Toronto, a building not adequate to the necessities of the case, an old building, but nevertheless infinitely better than anything we have now or anything you can get in the shape of a warehouse. The minister is occupying now for customs purposes a warehouse on Wellington street, and an old baking powder factory for his examining warehouse.

Mr. BUREAU: Was that what it was?

Mr. HOCKEN: Yes, Magic baking powder was made where the warehouse is to-day.

Mr. BUREAU: The magic has gone and the powder also.

Mr. HOCKEN: I was through the warehouse a short time ago, and it is entirely inadequate for its purposes. If the government could see things from the right perspective, we would certainly have had a new customs house in Toronto before we started building a hotel in Paris for the National Railways. The latter may contribute some little amount to the revenues of the National Railways, but even that is doubtful. It is a very speculative enterprise; but the customs needs of Toronto are pressing upon the people there, and every month and every year that we are without these facilities, the increasing business will make that necessity still more pressing. Ordinary business prudence leads a manufacturer to add to his building if he has not sufficient space wherein to carry on his business. It is always an expensive matter to conduct business in inadequate premises, and that is what the minister tells us is being done to-day.

Mr. BUREAU: That is so.

Mr. HOCKEN: I have an idea that a very large part of the interest cost of a new customs warehouse is being spent now through the congestion that is inevitable under present circumstances. If this government had been considering the welfare of its own services, the Minister of Public Works would have brought down an item this year for a new customs house in Toronto. We could stand the post office for another year or two, but certainly a new customs house for Toronto is one of the crying necessities of the business of this country. Moreover, we did a very large business last year and the customs receipts are very large; but with every year that passes, the customs receipts of Toronto will be greater, and if the customs business of Toronto expands in the present limited quarters that are now available, the cost of administering the department will be constantly increasing. I do not suppose it is of any

avail to say these things but I think the government is to be condemned for treating the city of Toronto and its customs necessities in the way that it has.

Mr. BUREAU: My hon. friend from West York (Sir Henry Drayton) asked how much we paid in rents in Toronto. I do not know; that is a matter that comes under the Department of Public Works. The hon. member (Mr. Hocken) says that it is a shame to treat Toronto in the way it has been treated. Let me tell him that I do not build custom houses; I simply ask that they be put up, and when there is no money forthcoming they are not built. The city of Toronto has produced this year $45,000,000 and the city of Montreal $78,000,000; but I would point out that the custom house in Montreal is in no better shape than that in Toronto, being indeed, if anything, rather worse, because they are using the examining warehouse as a long room.

Mr. HOCKEN: That is another reason for condemning the government.

Mr. BUREAU: That is a question I am not discussing. But I want to assure my hon. friend that we are not aiming at Toronto, as he seems to think.

Mr. HOCKEN: I did not say that.

Mr. BUREAU: The hon. member said that it was shameful the way we treated Toronto.

Mr. HOCKEN: I say it is a shameful way to treat any city.

Mr. BUREAU: I simply want to explain that what my hon. friend calls "shameful treatment" has been due entirely to lack of funds. However, I will not discuss the point further, because it is a question that will come up in connection with the Public Works estimates. I am with the hon. member in wishing to see to the comfort of the officials. I will stand by every official of the Department of Customs and Excise in an endeavour to see that he gives efficient service, and undoubtedly these people are handicapped when they have to work in quarters such as they have in Toronto and Montreal. We have no right to have a man work in artificial light from nine in the morning to five in the afternoon, or ask him to do his work in an unventilated place. I have protested against it, and when my hon. friend asks to have a custom house built in Toronto, or any other hon. member begs for a custom house in Montreal, I will stand by him.

Mr. CHURCH: The city of Toronto in 1914 sold to the government a lot for $110,000. To-day that lot is worth well on to half a million. The government has had the benefit of the increment in those nine years. The lot was sold for $110,000, but it was worth more than that at the time it was sold to the government, and a member of the government of that day, the Hon. Mr. Reid, promised to have a building erected on it within twelve months. There is no building on the lot to-day, and I think that every effort should be made to put one up because it would increase the value of the property to the government.

Mr. BUREAU: I have not taken any pledge to carry out the promises of my predecessors, nor do I intend to.

Mr. BEAUBIEN: Do the officers of the Excise department who go through the country looking for private stills come under this item?

Mr. BUREAU: Yes.

Mr. BEAUBIEN: I do not want to have it understood for a moment that I am pleading for the bootleggers or those who operate private stills; I hope the minister will put them all in gaol, because they make rotten stuff.

Mr. BUREAU: There would be few left in certain places if I did that.

Mr. BEAUBIEN: In my county, however, some of the officers came to a place called Vita and caught two men with stills. They brought them before Magistrate Willfong in Vita on New Year's Day for trial. The men asked for a postponement of the trial in order that they might obtain counsel. I believe that the officers requested the magistrate not to consider a postponement, but to go on with the trial, and this he did. He found the men guilty and sentenced them to nine and twelve months respectively, and they left their families in that district fairly destitute. I repeat, I am not pleading for the bootlegger, but I think the officers of the department should give every man a fair trial, and when he asks for a postponement in order to obtain counsel that request should be considered. I do not think, in any event, that it is right to try a man in this country on New Year's Day, because that is the day we celebrate.

Mr. BUREAU: I do not know what the facts are, and my hon. friend evidently is not quite conversant with them. Were the officers federal or provincial officers?

Mr. BEAUBIEN: They were Inland Revenue officers.

Mr. BUREAU: There is no longer an Inland Revenue department, but be that as it may, there are some provincial officers who are sworn in as preventive officers empowered to look for stills. I lived in Manitoba a few years, and so far as I know, New Year's was always a dies non; you could not try cases on that day. Now, you cannot put sense into a man's head if he is incapable of it; a man is born with a certain amount of brains and you cannot add to his mental stature. But I should think that a magistrate would exercise common sense and postpone a trial if it appeared that injustice would be done by proceeding with it. I blame the magistrate more than I do the officers in this case, because he is a man of higher education who should not be carried away by too great zeal in
5 p.m. the execution of his duties. If what my hon. friend says has happened, I am sorry. But when things of this kind do occur they should be reported to the department; otherwise people have no right to complain afterwards. I am prepared to stand by my officers when they properly execute their duties, and when they do not I am willing to reprimand, suspend or dismiss them as the necessity of the case might demand.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Has the minister had any representations with regard to the matter of the New York agent? Has he heard anything from Walkerville and the manufacturers at that point?

Mr. BUREAU: No.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The minister has had no complaints?

Mr. BUREAU: No.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Representations have come from points as far as Windsor that they are losing business because they cannot make use of the Panama canal. I do not know whether or not that is correct, but from what is stated it would seem to be. If these representations are true, and goods can be shipped from a point as far west as Windsor to New York and then trans-shipped by the Panama canal to Vancouver cheaper than they can be sent on the rail haul, then it strikes me that this is a matter that should be looked into by the minister. The business people represent that it is impossible to do business at present and that they are losing business. They say that it is absolutely necessary to have a customs officer appointed in New York. I sympathize a great deal with what my hon. friend says about the railway situation, but I doubt very much whether the railways are making anything at all in view of the statements I have heard from the railway officials themselves. Before the committee last year we had evidence of the railroaders as to the cost of hauling freight to Vancouver, and I doubt very much whether there is any money in the railway business to-day so far as that haul is concerned. It is claimed that the freight cost has been cut to the lowest possible point and that there is practically nothing in the business now. If that is true, and I see no reason to dispute what the railroaders themselves say, would it not be better for them to get a profitable haul even though it may be shorter? In other words, are not the railways losing money by trying, at the present high rate, to carry these commodities right over the continent in competition with the water rates? We all want to help the National Railways; there is no question about that; but I greatly doubt whether my hon. friend is helping them. It does seem to me that if the representations made before that committee are correct, there would be more money for the railways through this shorter haul.

Mr. BUREAU: My hon. friend proceeds on the assumption that I have refused the appointment of a customs officer in New York, but I have not done so.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The minister pointed out earlier in the session that the reason why it had not been done was because it would be a loss in respect to the long railway haul.

Mr. BUREAU: That was the representation made to me.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I would like him to look into it very carefully to see whether or not there is anything in that allegation.

Mr. BUREAU: I am doing that. There is something in what my hon. friend says, that if we double or treble the traffic to the frontier there will be that much more rail business done. But the representations that have been referred to have not come to me or to the department; there may have been something in the press about it, but there have been no official representations. All the information is being got together, and after we have made a thorough investigation and got all the necessary data, the matter will be submitted to council. I do not like to go ahead without being sure of my ground, but when all the information has been obtained a decision will be taken. I have no personal views on the matter, one way or the other; it is just

a question of what will be in the best interests of the country.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think the minister will agree that the most important consideration involved is the maintenance of interprovincial trade. To pass to another part of this item, I notice there is provision for 114 new employees. Are they all appointed by the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. BUREAU: Every one of them.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: So that no use is being made of the wording of this item except so far as it applies to overtime.

Mr. BUREAU: Only the overtime—unfortunately.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Very fortunately, for the service.

Mr. SPENCE: The minister said a little while ago that he was not obliged to carry out the promises of his predecessor, but I say that he should carry out those promises when he sees the necessity for doing so. There should be continuity in government business just as there should be in any other business.

Mr. BUREAU: I said I was not bound by the pledges of my predecessors.

Mr. SPENCE: But the minister knows the necessity for it. I would ask him whether, if it were a matter of his own business, he would continue to do business the way the government are doing it. We are not getting sixty per cent of efficiency from his officers; in Toronto the citizens who are doing business with the customs house are getting a minimum of service at a maximum of cost. We are running from Yonge street clear out to the corner of John and King streets; nobody seems to know where to go to get any customs business done. There is a site available for the erection of a proper customs building, but it is lying idle while large sums are being paid out for rent. The present quarters of the customs officers in Toronto are unsanitary and unsatisfactory in every way. Is that good business? I say it is not. The government should do away with the rotten old buildings they are using in Toronto and get a serviceable, sanitary building where the citizens can carry on their business in a proper manner; but instead of that, money is being spent in the rental of quarters in which the public cannot get service. I say it is an absolute waste of money. I have been around that customs house for thirty-five years and I know the inconveniences that the people are subject to. It is a crime the way the people have to stand for hours on the sidewalk trying to get into these old buildings in order to get their business done. You could now do without hundreds of the men now employed if you had a proper building.

Mr. BUREAU: I think my hon. friend did not understand me when I spoke a moment ago.

Mr. SPENCE: I understand you thoroughly, sir.

Mr. BUREAU: I said I was in favour of building a customs house. What more does the hon. member want me to do? I do not build the customs houses; I do not rent them or furnish them; I do not hang lamps in them. I am in sympathy with my hon. friend, and I do not see what he is getting excited about. I would like to see Toronto have a better customs house, because I would get better service from my officials.

Mr. SPENCE: That is what might be called passing the buck. We all realize that it is the Public Works department that puts up the buildings. That is what the Post Office Department says when a post office is asked for. Now, if the minister makes a real demand on the Department of Public Works for a building, he may get something done. The minister is the man who should be the judge; he should know what he wants, and he should have sufficient prestige with his government to see that he gets it. If I were in his position I would see that I did get it, or I would not be there.

Mr. BUREAU: That suggestion might apply both ways. The friends of my hon. friend were in office not long since; there was a Minister of Public Works and he made a promise in the matter. The former building that was torn down may have been a little cramped, but it was a beautiful building, if I remember it rightly. Now, I am willing to have a new building, but we cannot build these things with wind. We have to have the money, and as soon as we get the money I am satisfied that the Minister of Public Works will be only too glad to get rid of my demands and petitions for customs houses.

Mr. CHURCH: A contract should be a contract, even if it was made by the government. I realize that the putting up of these buildings is not done by the minister's department, but I am speaking of the government as a whole. Here is a contract made for the sale of lands in 1914, the parties to it being the city of Toronto on the one hand and the federal government on the other. The area involved

was a large tract of land on the south side of Front street, the purchase price being $110,000—away less than the commercial value of the land. The government were to put up a building there, and as I understand the contract it could be enforced in the Exchequer Court of Canada. But two bodies serving the public do not want to quarrel; they should work together to get a government building that will facilitate the public business. The city is interested in having a good government building there, and they are spending a lot of money in that district; they have put down a new pavement, they have given a new car service, and so on. I hope that during the recess something will be done in this matter, because twenty-six or twenty-seven public bodies have asked the Toronto representatives to urge upon the government the necessity for action. When the department is doing business to the extent of $50,000,000 a year, surely it should do something to save the time of the business men. Millions of dollars worth of time has been wasted every year through the inconvenience the public have suffered in trying to get service from the customs house in Toronto. I say that I hope the government will take the matter up in the recess and see whether something cannot be done.

Mr. SPENCE: I do not wish it to be understood that I am criticising the ability of the Minister of Customs, because I know that he is full of ability and "pep." I assure him that I am not a bit excited about it. I know the conditions around the customs house and the post office; I have spent my life there, and I have a right to speak of conditions as I find them. I believe in calling a spade a spade, and I do think that the government are deserving of criticism for their lack of interest in Toronto. It is a persecution of Toronto; that is what it is all the time.

Item agreed to.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Agriculture—dairying, $230,000.

Hon. W. R. MOTHERWELL (Minister of Agriculture): I think the committee will remember that this item was allowed to stand over at the request of the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Kennedy). I am sorry the hon. gentleman is not in his seat, but I was discussing the matter with him yesterday and he said that on the budget or on some other occasion I had dealt pretty fully with the question that he was desirous of taking up. He suggested among other things that he would like to know if the report of Mr. Ruddick and Mr. Wilson who went to Australia and New Zealand to examine into the dairy industry there would be ready for the House this session. Before coming to that, Mr. Chairman, I might deal with some of the activities that we intend to undertake this year partly as a result of the investigations of Mr. Ruddick and partly also as a result of the grading system that was provided for some years ago, but which only came into force on the 1st of April last. Under the Dairy Industry Act of 1921 provision was made for the grading of all cheese and butter for export. That has been let stand over from time to time so that the public would get familiarized with the idea of grading these dairy products. The system was accepted generally throughout the country, but naturally a new departure like this would meet with some opposition. This has gradually disappeared, more especially as the Ontario government was introducing at the same time the principle of purchasing milk for cheese factories on a basis of grade and a basis of butter fat. The two coming together helped each other, though to some extent where there was difficulty it seemed to accentuate the trouble. However, the difficulty has been largely localized, and now that grading has been in force for nearly two months the opposition has disappeared altogether. Just what results will come out of that so far as a more acceptable reception of our butter on the British market is concerned, time alone will tell. We have not had sufficient experience yet to indicate what the results will be, but I have no thought of anything else but that there will be a very decided improvement. The moment you can get quality paid for on a basis of quality there will be some encouragement to the farmers and cheesemakers to produce quality.

The intention is to extend the activities of the Dairy branch in several particulars, one of them as a result of Mr. Ruddick's interim report, and that is with respect to the pasteurizing of milk for the manufacture of cheese. Formerly in Canada pasteurization was confined largely if not entirely to cream for the manufacture of butter, and it was also practised with regard to the whey product in order to ensure against tuberculosis the animals that used whey from cheese factories. We have found, however, that one of the reasons why Australia and New Zealand have been able to surpass Canada in the manufacture of cheese has been the fact that they have also pasteurized the milk that has gone into the manufacture of cheese. There is no question that the pasteurization of cream makes butter very much better. It gives it better

keeping qualities, and raises the quality generally. The Australians and New Zealanders have found out that pasteurization has the same effect when applied to milk in the manufacture of cheese. That is one of the things to which we attribute the general excellence of the cheese they have placed on the market, and why they have not only come up to Canadian cheese, but I fear surpassed it in quality. I do not use the word fear in any other sense except that we are not where we were, and it is our business to get back to where we were at the top of the list.

There is a combined cheese and butter factory at the town of Finch between thirty and forty miles south of here. It was erected some seven or eight years ago for demonstration purposes. It was felt by a good many that in order that dairying should accomplish what it ought to accomplish, it should include winter dairying. Cheese factories were confined for the summer months to the manufacture of cheese, and it was thought that a plant that permitted the manufacure of cheese in the summer and butter in the winter would be a more suitable one for the coming dairy day than any other single kind could possibly be, and this factory at Finch was constructed with that idea in mind. It is the intention to enlarge the operations of that factory by a small extension for the purpose of providing for the pasteurization of milk for the manufacture of cheese, and then we will be able to experiment and find out just how much pasteurization will improve the quality and see how far that one change will help us to regain our lost position in relation to the reception of our products in the British market.

We also intend to extend the testing system. In some provinces we have arranged for the testing locally by the provinces on the ground that they can do it more cheaply being right on the spot than we could do it from a common centre like Ottawa.

A growing industry like dairying always has some new activities and new expenses associated with it, necessitating a larger vote. We believe that there is no more complete food for human consumption than milk. It is nearer to being a perfect food than any other product, and we are endeavouring to develop a larger use of milk among our population both young and old. We have a lady, Miss Campbell, who has developed that work in an educational way, and in a very acceptable way, in various parts of the country, and she has an assistant at the present time. Possibly I might leave the matter now to the committee to ask any questions they may have in mind rather than dealing with the subject generally.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Is Australia using the tuberculin test in the same way as Canada?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I understand not.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): It is depending on pasteurization?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I understand so.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Will anything be expended out of this appropriation for the establishment of a butter factory, say, in a new district where the people are anxious to go into the business? Could any of this vote be used for that purpose, and if so, in what way?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No. It is quite possible that in the near future we may construct another combined factory like the one at Finch, but that will not be decided upon until we know more definitely the results at the Finch factory. I think it is only a matter of time when we shall really want something like that in different parts of Canada. The construction of local factories such as my hon. friend refers to is a matter for the provincial government. I think my hon. friend is familiar with one in his constituency at a point called Fiske. The construction of that was assisted by the provincial department of agriculture in Saskatchewan, but any arrangement for assistance—with that exception,—has been invariably entered into by the provincial government.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: When this question was before the committee several months ago I think there was a misunderstanding in regard to a number of items that were being discussed. I would ask the minister if this is the only item left in the estimates undisposed of?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: This is the last item in the Main Estimates. We have all of the estimates of civil government yet.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I may possibly be out of order in referring to any matter outside of this item but I should certainly like to ask the minister if any of these other items will be opened up for discussion. On the previous occasion referred to there was a misunderstanding and Hansard does not contain what is set forth in the Votes and Proceedings as to what actually took place. There is no reference whatever in Hansard to the item for the enforcement of the Agricultural Instruction Act. No reference whatever is made to that

item in Hansard and personally I did not hear the matter discussed in committee.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: There is no Agricultural Instruction Act, but there is an agricultural instruction grant. The item is No. 50 "Administration of the agricultural instruction grant, $20,000". That has been passed. I may point out that if my hon. friend desires to discuss any question that has been passed my understanding is, he can do that on items of the estimates for civil government. If the committee desires to take up any question on any of these items I have no objection. I understand the usual practice is to do it on the civil government estimates when considerable latitude is allowed.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think we had better have a clear understanding in that connection. I would like the chairman to endorse the minister's suggestion.

The CHAIRMAN: I cannot make any ruling in such a case as that.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then perhaps we should have the discussion now.

The CHAIRMAN: If the subject is in order it can be discussed.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I may say this matter was before the committee on a previous occasion. I attempted to deal with it then but was called to order by the Chair who informed the committee that the item came under the heading of civil government. As a matter of fact it relates to item No. 50 and Hansard does not show that that item was passed or that it was even discussed. No reference whatever is made to the item in Hansard, so far as I can see, although it appears in the Votes and Proceedings as having been passed.

The CHAIRMAN: What appears in Hansard does not govern in these matters. I have some recollection of what the hon. member mentions now. The item was passed by the committee, as the records of the House indicate, and was reported, as is customary, to the Speaker.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I think I should point out that wherever the item is the same or less than it was before it is carried without discussion. Take, for example, the item of cold storage $6,000. The discussion in connection with that subject took place on the bill relating to that question and there was no discussion in Committee of Supply. The item of $15,000 for the International Institute went through without discussion, also the item of $20,000 for the administration of the agricultural instruction grant.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the item is called it appears in Hansard. The Votes and Proceedings must be made from Hansard. I have seen cases where that has not been done, where the Votes and Proceedings do not follow Hansard, and I must say it does look very curious to me. The officers of the House gain their information of what is done in the House from Hansard. That is what Hansard is for.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I do not want my right hon. friend to look across at me. I am not responsible for Hansard.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not intend to frighten the minister at all.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: It will take more than my right hon. friend to frighten me.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What I am saying is that we have to be governed by the records of the House, not by something that is made up from other records. I have not searched myself but unless item No. 50 "Administration of the agricultural instruction grant" appears in Hansard there is no authority for any officer of this House to insert in any report the statement that it was brought before the committee at all.

The CHAIRMAN: I may say in answer to the right hon. gentleman that the Clerk Assistant, under the rules of the House, is the clerk of the committee. Every resolution that is passed is taken down by him and sent to Mr. R. P. King, who prepares the Votes and Proceedings. That is the record which governs with respect to all proceedings in committee. My right hon. friend himself called attention to an omission in Hansard in connection with the Hoppe leases, although the occurrence took place and was reported. The Clerk Assistant, as I say, notes the passage of every item, every paragraph of a bill, certifies to its passage and a report is then made to the Chair.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is correct that the Assistant Clerk reports what is done but the Assistant Clerk has no right to report a thing unless it has actually taken place and is heard in this House. Now, if a statement is heard in the House it is heard by Hansard. In the case of the Hoppe leases there was no such statement ever heard as appears in the Votes and Proceedings. I never heard it made myself, I have no recollection of hearing it made. Hansard never heard it.

Nevertheless it appears in the Votes and Proceedings. I certainly do not impugn the Assistant Clerk. There is no officer of this House in whom I have greater confidence both as to ability and integrity. But it is quite possible for him to assume that a thing was carried when it was not actually carried. When a matter does not appear in Hansard as having been passed, it is only justice to this House that it should be called again and that discussion should not be shut off simply because of what is contained in another record.

The CHAIRMAN: The proceedings of the House in committee are not only reported, but the Clerk makes a record of them and that record goes into the Votes and Proceedings which are open to every member. There have been complaints. I think the right hon. gentleman himself complained some time ago about Hansard incorrectly reporting him and giving him the credit for an address which he had never uttered, an address which was actually made by another member. The fact is that Hansard is not taken as the record in dealing with resolutions and items which come before the House. What is accepted is the report of the official who is appointed for that purpose under the rules of the House. The record he keeps is the one which is accepted and appears in the Votes and Proceedings.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If we accept the Chairman's statement then there is no record in Hansard at all, and a subject which should come up can be refused consideration. How it will be possible to rule otherwise I do not know. If with no record at all of the Hoppe discussion, no record whatever of the motion being made, and no recollection of it being made by any person in this House, we are going to be debarred from legitimate discussion here the sooner we know it the better.

The CHAIRMAN: I should just like to draw the right hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that there is a record of the proceedings of the House signed by me and delivered to the Clerk, and the Clerk also signs the record. Thus there are two persons who are able to say definitely and absolutely that such an item has passed this House. It then appears in the Votes and Proceedings. When my right hon. friend suggested that no one has any recollection of what has taken place that is an error, because there are two officers of this House who have definite and absolute knowledge and have recorded it over their own signature.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: There is evidently a misunderstanding regarding the matter. I have a copy of unrevised Hansard of February 23, and the index showing the contents gives the different items passed, and this particular item is not mentioned. In attempting to discuss it before the item could possibly have come up I was called to order by the Chairman. I was then discussing this item referred to, which is omitted from unrevised Hansard, and the Chairman said that it came under the heading of civil government, and a little later on, when the item for agricultural construction was before the committee Mr. Spencer is quoted as asking—

> Is the salary of the Commissioner of Agriculture included in this item?

To which the minister replied, "No."

Mr. MOTHERWELL: That was the $900,000.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Yes. And a little further on he again asked a question, and the minister again replied, "No." And I asked the question as to where it appeared, and the minister remarked that it was in the previous vote that had just been passed.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: That is right.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I was present and put the question to the minister; I certainly did not hear the vote being called or being passed by the committee, and I was following it closely, as I think the Hansard will show. It passed without my knowledge if it did pass, and it does not show in unrevised Hansard. It is a most significant thing, and I think, in view of the circumstances, the minister might very well permit that item to be discussed under the item which is now before the committee.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have the references here, if the minister would like to see them.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: On the 23rd February the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland), seeking to discuss the salaries and the duties of the Commissioner of Agriculture, addressed the House. When he finished—page 594—the Chairman ruled as follows:

> I would draw the attention of the hon. member to the fact that what he is discussing comes under Civil Government. If he seeks to criticize the actions of some of the officers who come under this vote, he will of course be quite in order.

Then, on page 608, I find the following:

Mr. Spencer: The minister has not answered my question in regard to the salary of the Commissioner of Agriculture. Is that included in this item?

Mr. Motherwell: No.

Mr. Sutherland: Where does the salary paid the Commissioner of Agriculture come in? I cannot find it under the head of Civil Government.

We were informed by the Chairman that that was the proper place to discuss it, and where it properly came. Then the Minister of Agriculture said:

It was in the previous vote that has just been passed.

That is the way hon. members of the House have been treated.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I was calling the attention of the House to the fact that the vote had gone through.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We were informed by the Chairman before it went through that it came under civil government, and we were subsequently informed by the Chairman that it did not come under civil government.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the hon. member say that was before item No. 50 was passed?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes. At page 608 the Chairman's ruling appears. I do not know whether it was item 50 or not, but the item that included it, according to the minister, had just been passed. Either the Chairman was right and it had been passed, or the hon. member should have been allowed to discuss it.

The CHAIRMAN: I have the scroll of the assistant clerk of February 23, 1923, which indicates that No. 50 was passed in its consecutive order, after items 44, 46, 47 and 49 had been passed. The Votes and Proceedings of February 23, page 112, indicate that the vote, according to the scroll of the assistant clerk had been passed, which was notice to every member of the committee, whether reported in Hansard or not.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Might I draw attention to what I did intimate on that occasion. Objection was taken, as indicated by unrevised Hansard, by the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) at the bottom of page 609, the first column, where I replied to the hon. ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton). I spoke as follows:

Mr. Chairman, such an appeal I am sure is irresistible. Besides, this is getting too quiet! But I want to assure the committee that I did not try to "put anything over" when they called out "carried". I am not going to stand in the way of discussing any vote.

I think the appeal I referred to was by the hon. member for South Oxford. And that is what I say now.

Mr. MEIGHEN: While the minister said that the plea was irresistible, he refused to move the House to return to the item, knowing that if he refused it could not be brought up again. He was inconsistent inside of two minutes. At pages 594 and 608 this committee was informed that the proper place to discuss the item was under civil government. This committee the same day was informed by the Minister of Agriculture that the item had been passed just immediately before.

The CHAIRMAN: Does civil government stand?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister says it is passed.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I understand that when the estimates for civil government are under discussion, the salary of any employee of the government, whether included in the item or not, or anything pertaining to his appointment, may be discussed. I have been inquiring about that since then.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chairman must accept the word of the minister as to whether an item comes under civil government unless it is clearly within his own knowledge. I assumed, quite naturally, that this matter did come within the item of civil government. I understand from the minister that the item of civil government has not yet passed, and the item is still open for debate.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The fact is that the minister stated that it did come under civil government. This is included in another vote which passed after the chairman had given us the assurance that it came under civil government, and consequently we did not proceed to discuss it. We took his ruling that it came under civil government, and subsequently the minister said we could have discussed it all right under the previous item which had just been passed, we having kept quiet abiding by the ruling of the chair.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The hon. member is making a mountain out of a mole hill. There is no disposition whatever to shut off discussion. If the committee wants to discuss it the present time is just as good as any other as far as I am concerned, but let us do all things decently and in order. I thought at the time I made the statement that that was the proper procedure. I understood there was sufficient latitude under civil government, whether the name was there or not, to include any civil servant under any outside vote you desired to take him under, even

though the vote might have been passed. I am not an authority on these matters, but that is my understanding.

Mr. GRAHAM: You are usually right.

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry): I was not present when the item was called, but I am very much interested in this vote, and I know that the minister has great zeal for the advancement of dairying; so much so that he sent one or two of the officials of his department to New Zealand within the last two months. Has the report from those officials been made to him, and will he have it printed and circulated, so that the members may have it?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I have an interim report that merely gives a survey of the ground covered, and does not come to any conclusions. It was a preliminary report that I asked for prior to the budget debate. The report which will include certain recommendations is being prepared, and I hope will be ready possibly in the course of a week. I would not like to state that absolutely. You never can tell. Sometimes it takes longer to do these things than we anticipate. But just as soon as possible it will be submitted to the House, and if an order is passed it will be printed and distributed.

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry): Has the minister any plans for the future looking towards putting into effect any recommendations that his officials may make?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes. I was sorry that my hon. friend was out. One of them was with respect to the extension of the activities of the Finch factory, which is a combined factory for cheese and butter. We are enlarging that with the idea of providing for the pasteurization of milk for the manufacture of cheese. In the research in Australia and New Zealand, it was found that in those countries invariably the milk was pasteurized, and to that fact was attributed in some measure the high quality of their cheese. We are going to try that out in the Finch factory this summer, and then we shall be in a better position to know to what extent we can advise the construction of other large factories where it is deemed advisable throughout the country, especially in eastern Canada. We are satisfied that one of the reasons why the quality of our cheese has fallen behind is that it is made in a large number of small factories where the out-turn is so small and so varied, and where sometimes conditions are so primitive, that it is impossible to do justice to this industry.

[Mr. Motherwell.]

We want to get a little more information about the Finch factory and pasteurization before we are able to say specifically just what kind of a standard factory would be suitable to conditions in Canada. I do not know whether we can get a standard or not, but we may get an approximate standard that can be varied to suit different localities.

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry): Is the accommodation at Finch insufficient to take care of the milk that is being offered?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: For the milk that is being offered now it is sufficient, but we have not accommodation for the pasteurization. That takes a little room itself and a pasteurization plant would have to be erected. Not very much of an extension will be required, but an extension will have to be made. After that we hope to enlarge the activities of the factory and to take on any milk that presents itself, to the full capacity of the factory.

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry): If the accommodation is sufficient to look after the quantity of milk that is offered, will the minister explain why milk is being refused?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I did not quite understand my hon. friend. It is sufficient to take on the patrons that are delivering milk, but it is not quite sufficient for all applicants. That is one of the reasons why we are enlarging it. I signed a statement yesterday or the day before intimating to the people in that vicinity that after we got this enlargement made, and beginning with the first of the new year, allcomers' milk would be accepted up to the full capacity of the factory, and regardless of where the milk came from. The factory is not sufficiently large to take care of allcomers, and to decide who was to be given preference and accommodated has been a rather awkward situation to deal with. There is only one policy to pursue, regardless of who is hurt and who is not. This is a demonstration factory to show that it is possible to make a high-class product at a low cost when the out-turn is large, and you cannot do that without hurting some of the little factories in the vicinity. It is about time that some of them were hurt—not wilfully, of course, but in a progressive movement of this nature some of the older institutions have to go by the board.

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry): I approve the minister's plans and I only hope he will carry out his good intentions.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I intend to do so.

Mr. KENNEDY (Glengarry): I know that in another branch of the department the minister is carrying on some work, and I must commend him for that also. That is in respect to grading of our dairy products for export. What progress is the minister making along that line?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I will state that very hurriedly because I have already gone over it. As my hon. friend knows, in the introduction of other reforms some objection is always raised. Possibly if we were to introduce a resolution that we were all to go to heaven to-night, somebody would object to it. No matter how admittedly good the grading system is, we had quite a number of, I will say, conscientious objectors to that system. My own view is that we should have had this about a quarter of a century ago, but these reforms sometimes come very slowly. Outside of a few localities the objection has not been serious, especially since the system has been put into actual practice and the benefits of it shown. I think the objection was largely raised because some people wanted to continue the old local activities of grading right near home, in the factory or in the car. There is a general antipathy to seeing your produce, instead of being handled in your own factories, sent down to a large factory at Montreal. You lose sight of it once it goes round the bend on the railway. Once the step is made the difficulty disappears; you wake up the next morning and you do not find very much difference. We hope, of course, to find a difference in the increased recognition of the product on the markets as a result of the grading. When the cheesemaker and the man who provides the raw material find they are paid on the basis of quality, they will have some inducement to furnish quality. I am glad that this commends itself to a practical dairyman like my hon. friend, and that he approves the Finch factory, which is a splendid plant, constructed some seven years ago, I think. I hope that under my administration we shall be able to carry out the expectations of the department in that regard. The factory at Finch is capable of splendid work, and the demonstration will be of exceeding value to the dairy industry of Ontario and, indeed, of the whole of Canada.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I noticed a short time ago that the Civil Service Commission sent out notices stating that ten dairy produce graders were required. Are these employed in connection with this work, and if so, at what points, in Ontario, at least, is the grading being carried on, in addition to Montreal?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: When the Dairy Grading Act was passed a couple of years ago, it was decided not to put it into force. At the same time a number of dairy produce graders were appointed, and they started on voluntary grading of dairy produce at the new cold storage plant as soon as it was opened in Montreal. All the co-operative selling agencies as a rule patronize that cold storage plant at Montreal, and during the last year or year and a-half produce contributed voluntarily by the owners has been graded by these dairy graders. By introducing the system gradually in a voluntary way, we have been enabled to extend the usefulness of it and to demonstrate its usefulness to those who have been objecting. The work at Montreal has been substantially extended since 1st April, and in addition to that there are a number of graders in the vicinity of Belleville where there is a cold storage where cheese can be taken care of locally until they desire to export it. They operate from three or four places, taking Belleville as the centre. Wherever there is cold storage accommodation, where the cheese or butter can be kept at a proper temperature, the grading is done. It is not done at the factories because that would be impossible, for it would require an army of graders; it would be impossible to engage a grader for each of some eight hundred cheese factories in Ontario; that is out of the question. Besides, it is considered that such a system would not be satisfactory.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Does the minister mean to say that it would require a grader for each factory? Surely a grader could attend to twenty-five, thirty or forty factories. The conditions that would attend the grading at the factories were so obvious to many that, I fancy, the chief objection lay in that direction.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: My hon. friend does not advocate that, surely.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: If the grading were done at the factory the defects in the cheese could be pointed out to the maker. I know that the objection has been very strong in the past when the inspection has been made by the purchaser, at the factory. So far as western Ontario is concerned I do not think there was any serious complaint against the old system, but in eastern Ontario there was vigorous protest against adopting it. The minister says that the grading has been carried on at the cold storage plant at Montreal and also at Belleville. What about western Ontario and other points? The minister might also tell us what has been the success of the

plant at Montreal. A very large cold storage plant has been constructed there, and the expense of operating it is very heavy, I should think. Can the minister tell us what the result has been so far, in the way of operating costs? And also what is being done in western Ontario? I should like to know, further, at what points grading is done.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The cold storage plant at Montreal is under the administration of the Harbour board. I had occasion to visit it last fall, when I went through it. It had been open less than a year and was three quarters filled and was doing good business. I suppose that it is now so well patronized as to be full all the time. That, however, is something I cannot speak about definitely; nor do I know what the revenues or the costs have been. As I say, it does not come under my department but under the Harbour board. I must say I admired the institution, and I believe it will fill a long-felt want; I should not be surprised if it were filled to capacity by this time. I gather from what my hon. friend says that he is half-disposed to favour the grading in the cheese factories. As a practical creamery man he must surely know that this would be impracticable. I do not need to enter into the reasons, one outstanding one being that, even taking one grader to two or three factories, you could not engage a large enough staff of them to cover all the factories. And in any case, the grading can be better done in the way proposed. So far as western Ontario is concerned, London is one of the centres, and the work is being done as requirements demand.

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, item 42, page 21 of the Estimates, was under consideration. Shall the resolution carry?

Mr. STEVENS: I was not in the chamber when the committee rose. Will the minister state briefly what this item covers?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: As British Columbia is rapidly becoming a dairy province and has acquired some fame by producing a cow that has made a world record, perhaps a few moments devoted to an explanation of this item may not be out of place, even if I have to indulge in a little repetition. In a general way, dairying is becoming of more importance to agriculture throughout Canada as time goes on. Some years ago it was looked upon as confined entirely to eastern Canada, but as the western provinces have found some form of diversification necessary they have seriously taken up dairying, even in the prairie provinces, where it had not been looked upon with very much favour. In British Columbia, because of the high cost of dairy products, the people have been encouraged to go into it to the full capacity of their pasture and of their feed. This involves additional expense in the way of educational work, cow testing, the new system of grading, and so on. That, in a general way, is what the vote is for: more money and a larger staff are required for the purposes of administration.

Mr. STEVENS: I assume that under this item the expenses of Mr. Duncan Marshall will be paid in connection with his trip to the Old Country. Just what are his duties there at the present time?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: If my hon. friend will be satisfied, I suggest that as soon as we pass this vote and take up civil government, there will be an opportunity to discuss Mr. Marshall from any aspect that may be deemed in the public interest. He is not paid out of this vote; it would be irregular to enter upon that discussion now, and I think that these proprieties ought to be observed. If that would be agreeable to the committee as a whole, I am sure it will be agreeable to me.

Mr. STEVENS: The minister is unnecessarily alarmed; he is exceedingly sensitive. I was going to make a very innocent inquiry, and I think about two minutes would have satisfied me. I have no bone to pick, nor have I any particular criticism to offer; I was a humble seeker of a little further information. But the minister bristles up; he seems to sense a serious attack of something of the kind. Why, I am the last person in the world, he ought to know, to precipitate anything of that kind. But either Mr. Marshall or someone else is in the Old Country picking up some thoroughbred stock with the idea of improving Canadian herds. I myself am interested in farming; I would like to know just what the department is doing, and certainly that comes under this item of dairying. I am not particularly interested in Mr. Marshall's salary; in fact, I think I know what it is; it is reported to be $6,000. So that the minster need not worry about the civil government item so far as I am concerned.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: My hon. friend is probably thinking of Mr. Archibald, who went

over there during the winter months and brought back some valuable pure-bred cattle, hogs and sheep. That comes under the experimental farm vote. Now, since my hon. friend is in an amiable frame of mind, and I am myself, if the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) feels similarly disposed, I do not care whether it is on this vote or on another that Duncan Marshall is discussed. I may add, however, that we discussed the subject for something like three-quarters of an hour before six o'clock, and I did not know whether my hon. friend was merely continuing it until the arrival of reinforcements.

Mr. STEVENS: Again my hon. friend is frightfully sensitive on this subject. I have not spoken to any of my colleagues about the matter. It just shows how correct we must be —how our minds must run along the same channel.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Well, I myself want to fit in with that desirable state of mind.

Mr. STEVENS: It would be very difficult for the minister to fit into the groove he would find here. But it just shows there must be something in the back of his mind, a sort of subconscious sense of guilt which he does not like to admit. There must be a feeling on his part that he did not do exactly the right thing in appointing Mr. Marshall; that perhaps it was his personal desire as well as the interest of Mr. Marshall, that dictated the appointment. The circumstance arouses suspicion even in my mind, which I am sure my hon. friend will admit is usually free from such things. Still, the minister has not answered my question about what Mr. Marshall is doing in the Old Country. That is all I want to know.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: If I am in order, Mr. Chairman, in replying to such an eminently respectable question put in such a very nice spirit, I shall be delighted to do so. Mr. Marshall has just completed negotiations with respect to the removal of the embargo on breeding cattle, and at the request of the Duke of Devonshire that question has been suspended until the meeting of the Imperial Conference in London this fall. He has been instructed to superintend in the meantime the arrival of a shipment of chilled beef which is being sent by this department from Montreal, and to compare the values of cattle slaughtered on this side and sent over in the form of chilled beef as against cattle slaughtered immediately on arrival in England, and as against another bunch that will be sent over and sold for stockers; that is, he is going to compare values in three different sales, cattle slaughtered on arrival, cattle slaughtered on this side and sent over in the form of chilled beef, and cattle sold for stockers. Mr. Marshall has been asked to remain there and superintend this shipment, to inspect it, and note the condition in which it arrives and how it is received on the market, because it is an entirely new work so far as we are concerned. Something of a similar nature was conducted by the Harris Abattoir Company this year, but what we know ourselves we will know, and we thought it advisable at this time to conduct such an experiment entirely under the supervision of our own experimental farm system, with a representative in Great Britain to report on all the details. That is what he is doing at the present time. The cattle will arrive there in about a week. Previously he had been reporting on the arrivals of the stockers. There has been some difficulty in Great Britain with regard to the classification of our cattle, the British government taking the ground that a lot of these animals ought not to be classified as stockers but as fat cattle, and that they should be slaughtered immediately on arrival. There has also been some difficulty as to what ports are eligible for the slaughter of these cattle on arrival, whether it should be Birkenhead or Glasgow, or both. These are matters that Mr. Marshall is looking after at the present time with the British authorities pending the arrival of this shipment. After that is over he is returning to Canada as there is nothing further to be done in regard to the embargo until the Imperial Conference this fall.

Mr. MARTELL: Does not the minister think it would be advisable to keep a permanent official in England to superintend our shipments of cattle and of chilled beef with a view to protecting the Canadian shipper and his market in Great Britain? I do not think we should take what they say in England. We should have some competent official permanently stationed there who would inspect all cattle on arrival, and I would like to know if the Minister of Agriculture has such a step in contemplation.

The CHAIRMAN: The debate is getting much out of order on this particular item.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: If I am not too much out of order, Mr. Chairman, I may say that I have such a step in contemplation, and I propose to recommend to my colleagues the appointment of just such an individual to be located in Great Britain for

the purpose of reporting back constantly and correctly on the condition in which our various agricultural products arrive on that market. We have been working on that for some time, but it takes some time to get an appointment through. I started some months ago and I cannot say when we will succeed in terminating our efforts with an appointment, but it has got to a certain stage. It is nobody's fault in particular that the appointment has not gone through more rapidly, except the law under which appointments are made. I have to comply with that law, and we are going as rapidly as the terms of that law will permit. I think my hon friend's suggestion is a very good one, and I may say for the information of the committee that we have not got Mr. Duncan Marshall in mind particularly, and it would not do any good if we had, because the appointment is made by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. STEVENS: In that case there is not much chance of his appointment, I presume.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I do not know about that. I think I have more faith in the Civil Service Commission than my hon. friend.

Mr. STEVENS: I was going on what my hon. friend himself just intimated, that there was not much chance.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: There is only one primary complaint I have against the Civil Service Commission—and as a matter of fact it is not against them at all, but against the act by which they are governed and must be governed, the act by which we are all governed—and that is the desperate, interminable time it takes to get an appointment through. We only pass through this world once, and we want to live while we are living. We do not want to make these appointments in eternity but to make them in time to have the men to do the work.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: We must all admire the minister's ability to get around the Civil Service Act and the Civil Service Commission when he desires to have his own way.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: We are all like that.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: The activities of Mr. Duncan Marshall, the Acting Commissioner of Agriculture, were discussed a year ago when this particular item for the dairy industry was before the committee, and some inquiries were made as to his qualifications for the mission which it was then anticipated he would be appointed to fulfil, that of a trip to South America to develop the live stock industry as between Canada and South America. Consequently the activities of Mr. Marshall since that time and down to the present have been in the public eye more or less. At that time I believe he was passing the winter at a seaside resort in Florida, and some inquiries were made upon that occasion with regard to his activities there. I believe the minister intimated that he had been loaned for the time being to the Minister of the Interior to promote immigration to this country, and he was delivering some very effective addresses in Florida during the winter. Early in the present session I made inquiries as to the result of his operations there, and I was informed that no apparent results had been secured, or at least that there had been no immigration from Florida to Canada so far as was known. Mr. Duncan Marshall was in the public eye at that time by reason of the fact that his appointment had been made not by the Civil Service Commission but by order in council. Immediately upon the prorogation of parliament, in fact, the very day that parliament prorogued, Mr. Marshall landed in the constituency that I represent and on that day he addressed a gathering of the Liberals of that constituency, and had a very enjoyable time, I have no doubt. I have no fault to find with Mr. Marshall appearing at a gathering of the Liberals of South Oxford or of any other constituency, but so long as he is being paid by the people of this country to perform certain duties I think it is well that he should attend to those duties and not devote his time to political matters.

There was some misunderstanding when the estimates of the Department of Agriculture were before the House upwards of three months ago. From that time down to the present no opportunity has been afforded to discuss this question. Before six o'clock the minister stated that he was quite agreeable to having the item discussed under which Mr. Marshall's salary would be paid. There is no record of that item in Hansard. It apparently slipped by the committee on that occasion without the knowledge of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN: I cannot permit the hon. member to say that. It appears in the Votes and Proceedings and with two officers of the House certifying to it over their signatures. It did not slip past the committee.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: With all due respect to your ruling, Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to delay the committee by quoting what was quoted before six o'clock, but I

was sitting in the House here and other members were in the House and made similar inquiries to the ones I made, and they at least did not know that the item had been passed by the committee, and Hansard does not show that it was passed by the committee. There is no reference to the item in Hansard. The minister recognizing this stated on that occasion that he had no objection to the matter being re-opened and discussed on any item, and immediately before six o'clock he again very graciously consented to the matter being discussed, so I presume that we are at perfect liberty to discuss it on this occasion. Now, Sir, I wish to make a few remarks with regard to Mr. Marshall's operations since that time.

The CHAIRMAN: I rule that Mr. Marshall's operations are not relative to this item. They may be in order in connection with estimates for civil government but they are not relevant to this item. Mr. Marshall is not an officer who is in any way connected with the vote under this item and any discussion with respect to his movements is therefore irrelevant.

Mr. MEIGHEN: May I ask the minister if Mr. Marshall is Commissioner of Agriculture generally or only commissioner as respects certain branches of agriculture?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: He is not Commissioner of Agriculture at all. He is a commissioner to inquire into certain agricultural matters but he is not Commissioner of Agriculture.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What are the agricultural matters that he has to inquire into?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: One of them was the Agricultural Instruction Grant. That was primarily the purpose of the appointment. he investigated that subject very fully and made a report on it which was tabled some time ago. The next subject was this: The Fordney tariff was on the point of consummation and it created almost an embargo, as we thought at that time, against our cattle. However, our animals were able to climb over it, high as it was. But at that time, as I say we were confronted, as we thought not only with an American embargo, but we were deprived of the British market, and it was thought that by having a competent stock man like Duncan Marshall available for any of that class of work—either to go to South America or anywhere else—he might be able to help us in solving temporarily at least, these problems until some more permanent solution was found. That is what we had in mind. It was about the blackest outlook that we had for our cattle for the last thirty years, and I could not find then, nor am I able to find yet, a more competent man for that kind of work than Duncan Marshall. Now, as to that I may be mistaken; we all have our opinions about the competency or fitness of men. The fact that he and Dr. Grisdale, accompaning two of my colleagues to England last autumn, succeeded in terminating the embargo should at least be some indication of the value of his work in connection with this line of activity.

Mr. MANION: Did the minister notice that Mr. Drury, as reported in this morning's press, claimed that Manning Doherty terminated the embargo?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes, that is something like the claims that are set up in connection with the winning of the war. As my hon. friend knows a good many countries claim the credit for winning the war. I have said on several occasions here that as far as I was concerned I was willing to distribute any credit that was coming among the public men who were identified with the movement for the elimination of this embargo, and there is some credit coming to Manning Doherty and also to the right hon. leader of the Opposition and his colleagues.

Mr. MANION: Mr. Drury claimed all the credit, I notice.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Mr. Drury possibly requires all the arguments he can muster.

Mr. MANION: Oh probably; I will agree with that.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I have a very warm feeling for Mr. Manning Doherty and maybe there was necessity for provincial activity at that time. A quick, short stroke sometimes does the trick.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister got lost in his own verbosity—

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Thank you.

Mr. MEIGHEN:—and did not answer my question. I understand Mr. Marshall was appointed by an order in council. I asked what the objects of the appointment were as stated in that order. I do not presume the Fordney tariff was referred to in it; I doubt very much if the cattle embargo was. I would like a list of the objects of his appointment as set out in the order to find out whether, for example, it includes the handling of dairy stock down in South America.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: He did not go there. I tabled that order in council; I do not carry it around with me all the time. I

remember the primary object was to have a thorough inquiry and investigation into the workings of the Agricultural Instruction Act, which it was thought at that time would possibly be renewed. There had been suggestions made from time to time as to the best way to amend it and this investigation was the primary object of Mr. Marshall's appointment. Since then he has been busy at various things that have occurred from time to time; and the last activity he has been connected with is the embargo. I have already indicated to the committee the purposes in retaining him there. Possibly it will be another two or three weeks before he will return.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Did he go to South America in connection with dairying?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No, Mr. Dryden went there.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What did he go there for?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Is there any possibility of Mr. Duncan Marshall being back in Ontario before the elections take place?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Well, he is not operating on a time fuse and I do not know. The provincial elections take place on the 25th June, do they not? Well, Mr. Marshall's activities are not timed by the Ontario elections. It was left to my hon. friend to think of that. I may say in answer to the leader of the Opposition that Duncan Marshall did not go to South America. It was Mr. Dryden who went there. It was a long journey on which to send two men. Mr. Marshall was spoken of in that capacity but he was required elsewhere at the time. Mr. Dryden went at the request of some breeders in Ontario who know him well. I understand Mr. Dryden has some knowledge of South American conditions, and has some acquaintances there, and it was thought that he would be a very good man for that purpose. His report has also been tabled.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: As to the work for which Mr. Marshall and Mr. Dryden were employed, I believe the committee were led to understand that in addition to the beef breeds the pure-bred dairy stock were also to be taken under consideration. As the minister does not appear to have the order in council under which Mr. Marshall was appointed, I may as well read it. I think that notwithstanding the efforts that have been made to prevent a discussion it will be clearly shown that the administration of the Agricultural Instruction Act is largely connected with dairying in Ontario. This is the order in council in question:

The Committee of the Privy Council have had before them a report, dated 1st February, 1922, from the Minister of Agriculture, submitting that the Agricultural Instruction Act under which the sum of $1,100,000 annually has been granted to the Provincial Departments of Agriculture for the purpose of aiding agricultural instruction in the provinces expires March 31st, 1923.

The minister states that in view of the extraordinary and exceptional conditions in the agricultural world it is highly desirable that an investigation be made into the advisability of the continuation, discontinuation or emendation of the provisions of this act; the amounts to be paid, and the methods of calculating such amounts in the event of its extension; and the scope of the work of the provinces to be undertaken with the assistance of funds provided thereunder.

It is considered advisable that a commissioner be appointed under section 38c of the Civil Service Act as amended by chapter 22 of the Statutes of 1921, to conduct the investigation indicated above, and to inquire into such other agricultural problems as may be desirable and necessary.

The minister, therefore, recommends that Mr. Duncan Marshall, of Olds, Alberta, be appointed as a commissioner for the above purpose, and to perform such other duties of a cognate nature as may be delegated to him.

The minister further recommends that Mr. Marshall be paid a salary at the rate of $6,000 per annum, said salary to be paid from the appropriation provided for the administration of the Agricultural Instruction Act and that this appointment date from January 15, 1922.

The committee concur in the foregoing recommendations and submit the same for approval.

With reference to this the former leader of the party to my left in the session of 1922 questioned the minister. He said:

Am I to gather from my hon. friend's remarks that this question is not a permanent one?

Mr. Motherwell: It is a temporary appointment.

Mr. Crerar: How long is it expected to last?

Mr. Motherwell: About six months, probably.

Upwards of a year has elapsed since that time and we have had for some time the report of the commissioner who was appointed on that occasion, and his subsequent activities clearly indicate, I think, that he is not acting on behalf of the dairying interests while he is in the Old Country. In fact many of the agricultural journals of this country show Mr. Marshall to be engaged in the very opposite direction. You can scarcely pick up an agricultural paper without finding articles by Mr. Marshall in which he is referring to the conditions which prevail in the Old Country. A few days ago I picked up an agricultural journal in our province, dated May 12, and I found an article appearing there—I do not know how many pages it covers—by Mr. Marshall, with reference to the landing of the first Canadian cattle since the embargo was raised.

The CHAIRMAN: I would like to draw the hon. member's attention to the fact that it has been stated—and he himself has just stated—that Mr. Marshall is not engaged in dairying; his salary does not come under this item, and the discussion is not relevant to this item, No. 42.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I do not wish to be persistent, but I thought from the statement of the minister that a general discussion was to be allowed with regard to this matter. However, if the chairman rules to the contrary, and if we are going to have an opportunity under civil government to discuss this item, I do not wish to persist, but I do desire to point out that when these matters regarding dairy produce were being discussed a year ago, and when they were being discussed upwards of three months ago, this question was brought up, and we fully expected to have an opportunity of discussing these matters on the Main Estimates. We are now given to understand that it is desired to have the Main Estimates go through. I was informed on a former occasion that these things did not come under the head of civil government, after being led to believe that they were under civil government. After the vote was passed, I was informed that they did not come under the head of civil government, but that they were covered in the item which had been passed, which does not appear in Hansard.

The CHAIRMAN: I think the hon. member will remember that it was stated that, while the vote for Mr. Marshall's salary came under an item that was passed, still the matter could be debated under the item of civil government, because it related to some of the members of the staff of the Agriculture department.

Mr. IRVINE: If Mr. Marshall's salary and expenses do not come under this item, would the chairman tell the committee definitely under which items they do come?

The CHAIRMAN: Well, the vote may be discussed, I understand, under the item of civil government. Mr. Marshall was a temporary official, but notwithstanding the fact that civil government relates to permanent officials, the debate may take place with regard to temporary officials.

Mr. IRVINE: I would like to know about it.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: It comes under item No. 50.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, passed on the 23rd February.

Mr. IRVINE: If it has been passed, do I understand we have the privilege now to discuss Duncan Marshall under this item?

The CHAIRMAN: Under civil government, comparing it with salaries of other officials, yes, but not under this item.

Mr. IRVINE: When will the item under which Duncan Marshall may be discussed come up?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: In a minute.

Mr. BRETHEN: I have here a booklet, "Dairy Produce Act and Regulations Administered by the Dairy and Cold Storage Branch." On page 9, I read:

> The owner of the cheese or butter shall arrange in a suitable place and open all boxes or packages for inspection.

This has to do with the grading of cheese and butter. I would like an explanation of that regulation, in view of these conditions. In our district we have at least two cheese factories from which butter is shipped direct to Scotland; nobody sends to Montreal or any of these grading points, and it would certainly be inconvenient for the owner, or any employee connected with that factory to go to the point of grading. What shall be done under those circumstances?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: It will depend upon who the consignee is. Very little of this produce is sent on what we call consignment. It has to be purchased first and the consignee sends it to whatever cold storage plant is most convenient to him for the purpose of grading. He cannot grade it without exposing it. This provision, as my hon. friend knows, is just in its second month; I have been asking my staff as to how it is working, and I understand it is working quite smoothly. If my hon. friend knows of any hitch in the matter, I should be very pleased to hear about it. No doubt in the introducing of an entirely new law like this some little difficulties will arise, but we will be very pleased to iron them out. What is the particular difficulty he has in mind?

Mr. BRETHEN: I quite understand that in the working out of a new regulation like this there will be some difficulty. The cheese factories referred to are in Peterborough county and my attention was drawn to this by the owner of one of these factories. I undertsand there is an arrangement by which the season's make is sold direct to a dealer in Scotland at a price in advance of the local price.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No consignee can send cheese or butter without having it previously graded. One of the terms of the act provides that both must be graded. When I was in the cold storage plant last autumn in Montreal the graders were at work there. Obviously each parcel has to be exposed before the graders can get at it, with their stick or auger, and it is closed up after the grading is done.

Mr. BRETHEN: In view of the section which says that the owner or some person appointed by him shall open the boxes, how would you regulate such a condition as I have referred to?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: You will have some person there representing you. Suppose you want to send a consignment to Montreal, you must send it to some person who can perform the service for you. This paragraph says that the owner of the cheese or butter shall arrange in a suitable place, and so on. It may be in Montreal, Belleville, London or some other place. It is the privilege of the party owning the cheese to have it examined wherever he likes. The hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) seemed to be under the impression that we stipulated where the parcels of dairy produce would be examined. That is a matter for the owners of the produce to determine, they notify the government, and wherever the produce is sent we do the grading. If it happens to be in Montreal, we have a staff at Montreal to attend to it, because there is a great deal of produce going there. In other places the graders move about wherever cheese or butter is being sent. We have had that system in vogue in Saskatchewan for many years. Wherever there is a cold storage the produce can be graded. It is necessary to have a cold storage, because you cannot keep butter or cheese to-day without a cold storage plant. We had no difficulty under our system; we were notified by the owners of the butter in the West when they wanted it graded, and we would send a man to do the grading wherever the produce was located, Saskatoon, Battleford, Prince Albert, or Melfort—wherever it was desired. It is the same here. If you cannot go yourself, there is a man who will handle these matters with regard to inspection and then close them up.

Mr. TOLMIE: I would like to know if the minister has in mind any new dairy policy that he intends to bring down at an early date, with a view to improving dairy conditions, increasing our output and getting a better share of the British market in the near future. In 1880, we exported about nineteen million pounds of butter. During the same year the little country of Denmark with three million people exported about twenty-seven million pounds of butter. In 1921, our export had shrunk to nine million pounds and the Danish output had increased to a hundred and ninety-nine million pounds. As all hon. members know, we produce all our grain and concentrates within our own country. Our conditions for producing this grain are, perhaps, second to none, while the Danes import a great deal of concentrates from other countries, particularly from the United States and Canada. Apparently there must be something wrong with the dairy industry in this country with a population of nine million people and millions of acres of land as compared with the very small country of Denmark with a population of only three million. Perhaps some of our oleo friends will say that this is due to our having oleo manufactured in this country since 1918. As a matter of fact, the Danes introduced oleomargarine factories in 1882, and they have been manufacturing oleomargarine in that country ever since that time, with the result that during the past year they ate forty-eight pounds of oleomargaine per capita of their population, while we were carefully protected against oleomargarine prior to 1918. Therefore, that cannot be the cause of the backwardness of the dairy industry in Canada. Is it due to the quality of the product? The Danish cow produces 160 pounds of butter fat per annum as compared with about 125 pounds produced by the Canadian cow. I understand that our products are not received with as great favour as the Danish products in the British market on account of lack of flavour, keeping quality and colour. Is that due to poor grading on this side or to better grading in Denmark? These all appear to be questions that should receive the careful attention of the government at an early date, because this is one branch of agriculture that should be developed to its greatest possibilities. We, I understand, are supplying only a very small proportion of the butter consumed in Great Britain and imported from outside points. Has the minister any new policy in view to meet this situation?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Only the importance of the work and the interest that my hon. friend has taken in it, both combined, tempt me to go over some of the same ground that I have gone over now two or three times; but as I said before, possibly it will bear repeating. I have discussed already at some length,

at the request of various hon. gentlemen as they have arrived in the committee, certain phases of this subject, but there are a number of matters to which my hon. friend has referred that have not yet been taken up. So I am sure he will excuse me if I confine my remarks to those new problems to which he so properly refers.

One of the works we intend to take up is the establishment of a research laboratory. I do not think I have referred to that before during this session. Some hon. members will remember the excess acidity and bacteria that were found in some of our cheese in the British market. This created quite a stir there, and the cheese was traced back to the factory in which it was made. We were not, however, able to locate the bacteria. That teaches us that we have a great deal to learn about acidity and bacteria in cheese. In that cheese there was evidently some bacteria that was noxious to public health because it caused sickness, and a few incidents like that might seriously affect the standing of our cheese. Fortunately this did not occur because there was only one incident of this kind. We have $20,000 set down for the establishment of that laboratory. Nobody in this House knows better than the hon. member for Victoria City (Mr. Tolmie) the importance of research work, either along the lines of veterinary practice, or, as I intimated, in connection with this creamery work.

In order that we may be able to report quickly back to the Department of Agriculture the condition particularly of our dairy products as they arrive in Great Britain, it is proposed, if my colleagues and also the Civil Service Commission are agreeable, to appoint a representative in Great Britain for the purpose of looking after the condition of our dairy products on their arrival there, to see that they get proper recognition and proper advertising, and to report back any defects so that we may remedy them at the earliest possible moment. During the war a certain amount of carelessness was discoverable, not only in Canada but in all other countries, with respect to the condition of farm produce. Because of the urgent demand, everything in the form of fats went. A hog was a hog. To some extent the same conditions applied to butter. During those years the quality of our labour deteriorated, and this had its effect on the quality of our produce. Now we have to pull up. New Zealand and Australia are making remarkable strides towards improvement. The size of their factories, their large turnover, their large herds, render them capable of getting good managers and paying them good salaries, thus enabling them to produce a high class quality. They are able to make this business more or less of a specialty, just as we in this country make a specialty of growing wheat, although that is no reason why we should not diversify our interests. They make a specialty of dairy products; they put their whole thought into the business; they are prepared to submit to almost any kind of governmental supervision or restriction in order that they may get the best results possible. Because of that they have surpassed us in quality, and as regards dairy produce we have encountered competition that we have never before experienced in the history of Canada. We must do our utmost in order to meet that competition. We must develop that Finch factory with which my hon. friend is familiar, enlarge it and make accommodation in it for pasteurizing milk, for that is one of the reasons why they are able to make such high class cheese in Australia and New Zealand. We are extending that factory for that purpose, and at the end of another year we shall be able to know just what will be the value of a larger factory to the dairy industry of Canada as it has proved so advantageous to the dairy industries in our sister dominions.

Another matter is the importance of testing out our cows, the development of the testing system, weeding out the scrubs—that is what this means—weeding out what we familiarly call the boarders. The average man with a bunch, say, of ten or twelve cows, if half of them are poor, will find that it takes the good ones to carry the poor ones, and at the end of the year he will be about where he began. It is only by the use of the scales that you really can realize the difference between a good testing cow and a poor one. That work will be carried on with greater activity than ever, because the very first requisite to successful dairying is to get the proper kind of cows. If you do not do that, all your subsequent activities are of little avail.

I think I have covered most of the questions which my hon. friend raised. There is one more matter to which I might refer, and which I am sure the committee will be interested in. The butter we are making now in eastern Canada is largely produced for home consumption; it is salted to suit home consumption, and that does not suit the taste of the British market. Out in the West we have started a system of grading and manufacturing largely with the object of suiting the British Columbia taste. The British Columbia taste is very much the British taste, and so the farmers and dairymen in the West

have been trained to produce a butter that will also meet the requirements of the British market. The three prairie provinces have taken the initial step in the exporting of products direct to the United Kingdom. The butter is graded out there, and an arrangement has been made between the Dominion and the provincial graders whereby the provincial grading is accepted. I believe it is a good grading, because it was established on the same basis as the Dominion grading; and the creameries being larger units with a more uniform turnout, they found last year that the shipments from the West brought five shillings per long hundred more than any eastern butter. By making large export shipments from the West, where we have adopted that grading system, we can relieve the pressure on eastern butter, a great deal of which was shipped formerly, and can send the butter from the West direct to the British market. In this way we can hold our home market for eastern butter and thus maintain our reputation at a high standard. I do not know that it is anybody's fault that butter has fallen away in eastern Canada. The fact is attributable, I believe, partly to war conditions and partly to the circumstance that the quality demanded for home consumption is different from that of the British market.

Mr. CALDWELL: Is it not a fact that the British market demands butter that contains less salt than butter intended for Canadian consumption?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Surely; and the bulk of the New Zealand butter is shipped without any salt at all, or at least with very little.

Mr. CALDWELL: Is not that the main reason why eastern Canadian butter is not in demand in the British market?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: That is partly the reason.

Mr. CALDWELL: It is not because of the poor quality of eastern Canadian butter, but because it contains too much salt for the British taste.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: It is due in part also to a dividing of interests between butter and cheese; my hon. friend (Mr. Caldwell), I think, knows what the reason is. It is due to the fact that a lot of cream is over ripe or over fermented, whichever you like, before it gets to many of the central creameries in Ontario, and that tends to injure the whole reputation of the country. We have a cool climate in the West, and while sometimes coolers are not an advantage in midwinter, nevertheless our cool nights are a decided advantage to dairying in that part of the country. Besides that, there is the fact that we have nothing to unlearn. Not long ago we were starting at the bottom of the ladder in dairying and, without anything to unlearn, we adopted proper grading methods at the very outset. It is far easier to start right than to get right after you have been forty years wrong; and that is the condition of affairs in the West. I say that, of course, absolutely without any disparagement of eastern Canada. The dairymen in that part of the country have been satisfying the requirements they have had to meet, and that is all that any dairyman can be expected to do. The export was small while the home demand was large, and there is no kick from the consumers in eastern Canada. But there is an old saying, that what is one man's meat is another man's poison, and butter that suits the taste of eastern Canada is not suitable to the British market.

Mr. CALDWELL: Now you are on safer ground.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Possibly; but we were trained in the West to fill the market of British Columbia in competition with New Zealand, and the taste of British Columbia in this matter is that of the British market. The result is that the British Columbia market is now very largely filled by local supplies, except at certain times of the year. Our aim is to ship co-operatively direct right through to the British market with a view to getting the highest possible return for our produce; and, at least for the time being, until the dairymen can get more assistance, for the further purpose of stemming the downward tendency of our butter in comparison with other countries.

Mr. TOLMIE: What proportion of our export butter is pasteurized?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Nearly all the prairie butter is pasteurized, and that makes a great difference in its keeping qualities. We began out there without any pasteurization. I went up to the manager of the Co-operative Creameries of British Columbia shortly after our activities began, and visited the wholesale dealers in Vancouver, to find out what kind of butter they had. I wanted to know whether the taste of the people was in any way finical, or whether it was just like that of ordinary people. But whatever it was, the idea was to produce an article that would satisfy it. There is no use undertaking to educate people to a different taste; if you can meet their demand that is the

wisest thing to do. I discovered that what they wanted was a mildly salted butter, and that is what they have been supplied with. Our produce dealers have all been strongly advised to establish pasteurizing plants in connection with every creamery in the province, and that policy has been put into force. I do not know whether it has been completed yet or not, but in every factory of any size I believe that such a plant has been established, because it is absolutely necessary to preserve the keeping properties of butter. Furthermore, it is necessary in the manufacture of cheese.

9 p.m.

Mr. TOLMIE: Has the cheapness of salt, as compared with the price of butter, anything to do with the super-salting of our butter?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Just a trifle.

Mr. CALDWELL: I rather object to that, because I do not think that the fact that our butter is not in larger demand in the British market is due so much to the poor quality as to the fact that we put a good deal of salt into it.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The salt does not cost nearly as much as butter and it does not do any harm to salt it, with weight in view. But under our new act I do not think that anyone will be able to put more than 4 per cent of salt into his butter, so that there will be a limitation in that direction anyhow. On that point, however, I think there is a great difference in the kind of salt that is used. It is very important that the best salt be put into butter, and we have found that the Australians have undoubtedly discovered the right kind of salt that is necessary. That, however, is a commercial question which I think it would be well for us to refrain from discussing.

Mr. MILLAR: In a discussion that occurred some time ago we heard a good deal about hogs contracting cholera from feeding on whey. I want to ask the minister this question: If whey will give disease to hogs, does it follow that the cheese or the butter manufactured from the same milk would be affected?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: That is an open question. So far as tuberculosis is concerned, it might, but I do not know about cholera.

Mr. MILLAR: I have in mind any disease at all.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The whey in factories has been pasteurized right along to kill all germs in it so that there might be eliminated any risk of contagion to the animals that fed on it. That is one of the arguments why you might as well pasteurize milk in the first instance as to pasteurize the whey afterwards.

Mr. MILLAR: The minister does not catch the point. If the whey is affected, does it follow that the cheese or butter manufactured from the milk itself is likely to be affected too?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The hon. member means, I suppose, if it is unpasteurized?

Mr. MILLAR: Yes.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Oh, well, as regards unpasteurized milk, I do not care whether it is from an accredited herd or not, there is always a certain amount of danger to be feared, because you cannot keep continually testing it, and there is a time in the interval between tests when tuberculosis will manifest itself. When the milk is tested, of course, the risk is reduced to the minimum. We sometimes hear of certified milk being advertised. I do not think there is any such thing unless accreditation is supplemented by pasteurization. If you have unpasteurized milk in the case of cheese, or unpasteurized cream in the case of butter, there is danger of the tuberculosis being passed on to the butter. As a matter of fact it is bacterial action in the butter after it is made that conduces to its non-keeping properties. There is no question that there is a certain element of danger of communication of the tuberculosis; the only absolutely safe way, in the case of either milk or cream, is to keep the herds as clean as possible by testing, and to supplement that by pasteurization. The very best authorities in the world hold that view.

Mr. TOLMIE: There is no question about the possibility of butter from tubercular cows, particularly cows with infected udders, being infected with tuberculosis. It seems to be an entirely wrong policy to pasteurize the whey or the buttermilk and feed it to the hogs, and not to employ pasteurization in the case of the butter consumed by the people. That is one important feature of the dairying industry that might be carefully looked into with a view to making progress along these lines. The result would be not only to improve the keeping qualities of our dairy products, but also to protect human beings from the ravages of tuberculosis. It has been shown in our packing houses that in recent years the percentage of hogs infected with tuberculosis has increased from about 10 to 22 per cent in a very short time. It is a fact also that hogs affected with tuberculosis have come to

the packing houses in largest numbers from those districts where dairying is carried on and where they are raised on the dairy by-products showing clearly that tuberculosis is transmitted by these products without any difficulty whatever. By carrying on pasteurization we are taking a decided step toward the eradication of tuberculosis, particularly in the hogs of this country.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): The minister made a remark with regard to certified milk. What guarantee does certified milk carry?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: It certifies that the cows from which the milk is drawn are free from tuberculosis.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I understood the minister to say that that was worth nothing if the milk was not pasteurized.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No; I said there was no absolute certainty about it, for this reason: The period between tests is usually about six months. We will say there is a herd of five cows; they are all tested and there is no reaction. Six months elapse, and upon testing there is found to be one reactor. From the day in that six months' period when that animal became a reactor, up to the time of the second test, milk has been taken from a tubercular cow. There is not very much chance during that period of clinical symptoms developing, and there is not much chance of infection, but there is some; therefore, I do not think we are safe in looking upon any raw milk as absolutely sure; the only way to make sure is to pasteurize it.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Does the minister assure us that pasteurization is a guarantee against tuberculosis?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes, if it is properly done. Pasteurization, like anything else, can be improperly done.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Does the minister mean that it is a 100 per cent guarantee? If so, at what temperature is the pasteurization carried on?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: At an average, in this country, of about 150 degrees Fahrenheit. That is looked upon as the correct temperature, provided you maintain it long enough; if it is just flashed on carelessly and then flashed off, there will not be time to permit permeation of the whole of the product. The temperature should be maintained for at least twenty minutes; half an hour is safer. Our representatives who were recently in New Zealand brought back the information that in that country they pasteurize at a much higher temperature than we use—165 degrees or more. If they are right, then we can make assurance doubly sure by getting up to the maximum temperature that can be attained without destroying the food properties of the article. I understand that a temperature of even as high as 200 degrees can be employed.

Mr. TOLMIE: What is the highest temperature that can be applied without seriously flavouring the product?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I think that is one of the things in connection with which our research men will bring out some further information. But the fact is that in New Zealand they run from 30 to 40 degrees higher than we do, and turn out a much better product. The fact that New Zealand and Australia stand first in the world in the matter of butter is an indication that the flavour of the product is not injured by the high temperature employed in pasteurization.

Mr. TOLMIE: Is it the opinion of the minister's experts that the New Zealand butter for export is of better quality, and better flavour, than good Canadian butter?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes, they are quite satisfied that New Zealand has the "edge" on Canada so far as the quality of butter is concerned.

Mr. TOLMIE: Out in British Columbia we do not admit that. We think the fresh Canadian product, made in our creamery where the cream is carefully graded, is much better in flavour than the New Zealand butter, —and we are constantly in competition with the New Zealand product on the coast.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Of course, tastes can be cultivated. The British market prefers butter made of sweet cream, and not too highly salted; that is their conception of what is good butter. Now, in New Zealand they pasture their cattle outside the whole year round, and everyone knows that it is easier to make good butter out of stabling season than during stabling season, so that they have an advantage in that respect. After all, it is uniformity the year round that is required, and a constant supply on the market. The question has been asked out in the prairies: "If we all go into dairying, if we all go into butter making, is it going to be the old story that as soon as we have something to sell the prices drop?" I assure the committee that not only do you require a good article on the British market in competition with the world, but you require to have that article on the market the year round. The

customer does not want to go to a retailer to-day, ask for Canadian butter and get it, and then find the next day that he cannot be supplied. The people want to know what they are getting and they want to be able to get it when they want it. If we have butter on that market part of the year and none the rest of the year, we shall never get a proper grip on the market. Last year we supplied 2½ per cent of the butter imports of the British people; we send them two and half pounds out of every hundred that they import. Under these circumstances the more butter we make in the lifetime of this generation the better position we will occupy on the British market because of the continuity of supply that we shall keep there.

Mr. BRETHEN: With reference to a statement of the minister a few moments ago regarding the gratifying of the British palate in the matter of butter, I heard a statement with regard to Canadian pork by a noted authority who had just returned from Britain. He said that the reason for the preference for Irish and Danish bacon was also largely a matter of salting. I would like the minister to investigate that.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: That is correct. They are so close to Britain that they can send their products over with very mild salting, and very often with no salting at all. In addition, they do not use saltpetre.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): In regard to what the minister has said with regard to the tuberculin test, I should like to ask him what good he thinks this large amount of money that is being spent on the test at the present time is doing to the agricultural portion of this country and to the people at large.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I think it is doing incalculable good. If there was no check on the disease it would get worse and worse all the time. It is not in the incipient stages that there is very much danger, but only when it reaches the stage when there is a reaction to the test that there is risk to the human family from the milk. Take Great Britain herself, I think her cattle run about forty per cent tubercular. Their proportion is very much higher than ours at all events. Any country that neglects the testing will certainly soon find her animals pretty well honey-combed with tuberculosis, especially where there is so much stabling to be done as in Canada. It is a stable disease just as tuberculosis in the human family is a house disease. While I do not think the last word has been said with respect to the best test obtainable, for I think science will yet discover something better than the tuberculin test, it is the best thing in sight at the present time, and until we get a better I think we should continue using it.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I quite agree with the minister that there is an object to be gained, but this hit-and-miss game we are playing at the present time is to my mind of very little use to the country at large. There is no endeavour to make it complete in any one part of the country, and there is consequently no advantage to the man who submits his herds to the tuberculin test, because his milk is mixed with the milk of other men who have not had the test made, and in that way the public has no guarantee that the milk is free from disease. There are only a few people in this country who have been able to get the benefit of these tuberculin tests, and I can see but little good to be derived from the amount of money spent on the test so long as it is not made general. I quite agree that if it was made general we could gain something, but as it is now we are not gaining anything. You might just as well not make the test as let the milk from cows that have been tested be mixed with that of cows that have not been tested, because there is no guarantee at all as to the purity of the milk. There is no protection against tuberculosis in such a system, and the campaign at present being carried on is to my mind of little use to this country.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I think we are a little beside the mark. Possibly my hon. friend was not in when we were dealing with the vote under the Health of Animals branch. I draw his attention to it in order that we may get some information along the lines he has suggested. We have applied the tuberculin test in three municipalities in Manitoba. We have tested every bovine animal in those three municipalities, and have found that they run about five per cent tubercular. The idea is to get some information as to what it is going to cost. It is going to mean a big cost and when the public is prepared for a campaign of that nature, by undertaking this work we shall have the information as to what it is going to cost. I have pointed out that possibly we shall be able to get public sentiment sufficiently active that the federal and provincial authorities and possibly the larger municipalities will join hands in a campaign such as my hon. friend suggests, but it is going to cost something, and it is well to know the cost before we start out

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I was in when that discussion was on. I should like to know how soon a campaign of that nature will be conducted.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I do not know. It will depend on public sentiment.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): It should be more than public sentiment.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I appreciate the difficulty in proceeding with the testing of all the herds in the country at one time. As the minister states, it would be a very expensive work. It seems remarkable that there should be an effort made to eradicate disease from the pure-bred herds while the dairy herds that are supplying milk for human consumption are not receiving the same attention. In the two or three municipalities referred to in the province of Manitoba you may be able to show what can be done by taking a whole section and subjecting it to this test, but there are undoubtedly great difficulties to be met with by reason of the fact that people are constantly buying and selling and there is a mixture of the healthy animals with those that are not free from the disease.

To my mind one of the greatest dangers that we have to-day is the great increase in tuberculosis in the swine of this country. It is really startling to those who are engaged in the business to realize the prevalence of tuberculosis among swine, and I believe it is very largely the result of their consuming dairy products. If anything can be done by pasteurization of the products to remove this menace I think it should be done.

With regard to New Zealand the minister has stated that the high quality of New Zealand butter is so apparent that it is noticeable to every one. I notice that dairy cattle in New Zealand run out the year round or are practically grazing the year round, and consequently I do not suppose they would be subject to anything like the same degree of tuberculosis as Canadian cattle, which are stabled for six and often eight months in the year, and very often in unsanitary stables which must be conducive to breeding this disease. While you may eradicate the disease from a herd, in order to keep the herd free from disease, it is absolutely essential that sanitary conditions should prevail in the stables, otherwise the disease will break out again and conditions will be nearly as bad as before. It is such a big problem under present conditions that I realize how difficult it is for the minister to proceed with the work as rapidly as he would like, but I think that the herds which are supplying milk for human consumption should receive a little more attention than they are receiving at the present time.

Mr. TOLMIE: With regard to this question of tuberculosis I believe it is generally accepted throughout the world wherever testing of cattle has been carried on, that to adopt a general test of all the herds in a country at one time would be too great a proposition financially and in other ways to be practicable. Therefore, when the accredited herd system was introduced in the United States and then in this country, the idea was first to get tubercular-free herds which would perhaps lead later on to tubercular-free centres, and in that way educate the people of this country to the value of cleaning up our herds from this disease. They have tried the cleaning up of whole states south of the line, first in the state of Massachusetts, then in Illinois, and then in New York but even there they found it not practicable, the expense was too great, and the work was given up. The state of Minnesota, after making an estimate of what it would cost to start and clean up the herds of that state, found it would involve an expenditure of $13,000,000 to make a reasonable start, and I do not think they went very much further with the project.

As to cattle running out in the open air, I do not think that is any guarantee of freedom from tuberculosis, because it has been clearly proven that tuberculosis exists not only in those herds that are housed up, but also in our range cattle. The disease has been discovered among cattle which have never up to the present been under cover and it can easily extend, particularly among range cattle which are fed continually on the same ground and in that way get infection through the digestive tract.

I think the accredited herd system is a very valuable method for beginning this cleaning up of tuberculosis throughout the country, but it would not be a wise policy to rush headlong into any very expensive scheme. You cannot hope to succeed without first thoroughly educating people along the required lines, and inspiring them with confidence in the test and in the value of eliminating this disease from our herds. In connection with that, I would like to refer for one moment to the research work. As I pointed out a few days ago, we might have a tubercular animal that would re-act to the test but would be perfectly safe for years and would not be a centre of contagion; whereas probably another animal that

would re-act to the test in the same way would spread contagion freely on all sides. We know enough as to research work to enable us to tell the difference between the animal that is slightly affected and will probably recover under favourable conditions, and the other animal, the spreader of disease, so that the latter can be put out of the way and no further risk encountered from that source. I would like to take this opportunity of impressing upon the minister the importance of carrying on research work in this connection.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Could the minister inform the House as to the percentage of those animals which do not show disease after having been condemned for slaughter. There must be a record kept of the animals that are free from the disease, and it would be interesting to show the accuracy of the test. There is a suspicion in the minds of a great many people that the test is not a very reliable one. If it were generally understood that the test was—I will not say infallible, but as nearly so as possible, it would remove a suspicion in the minds of many people.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Reports indicate that the amount of infection runs from the undiscoverable lesion up to the state where the inside of the animal is covered with tubercules the size of a pea. There may also be tubercules in the liver. They are found largely in the viscera. Under healthy conditions the tubercule becomes encysted; it is surrounded with a fleshy growth. It is sealed in there, and nature, under the most healthy conditions, takes care of it. That tubercule will be sufficient to make the animal re-act although it may be in perfect looking health. I do not want to dilate too much on the system but it is the best we have got yet. I think the percentage where the disease is not at all apparent to the naked eye is somewhere between 6 and 8 per cent—I think about 8 per cent. It may be there to an extent sufficient to cause a reaction and yet not sufficient to form into actual pustules or little tubercules.

Mr. BRETHEN: Could the minister tell us how many herds were under the accredited herd system three years ago and how many now?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: There are about 700 herds all over Canada now. I read out the number for each province.

Mr. BRETHEN: Is that fully accredited?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Those are the fully accerdited herds, and then there are about 500 in the various stages.

Mr. BRETHEN: Could you tell us how many there were two or three years ago?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: None three years ago.

Item agreed to.

Civil government—Agriculture—salaries, $717,925; contingencies, $135,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have taken occasion to look into the question of the power of the government to make the appointment of Mr. Duncan Marshall since I was informed to-night by the minister as to the methods they devised to do it in order to get around the provisions of the Civil Service Act. Now I commence with this assertion: The government's appointment of Mr. Duncan Marshall is plainly, obviously and brazenly illegal. They had no power to appoint him whatsoever. I have before me the order in council under which the appointment to-day exists. It was passed on the 7th of February, 1922, not long after the government came into office, just long enough, I presume for the importunities of Mr. Marshall to have reached their full height. The minister recites in his recommendation to council that parliament has set aside $1,100,000 for the purposes of the Agricultural Instruction Act. Then he proceeds to indicate the plan by which that sum can be invaded and turned over, in part, to Mr. Duncan Marshall. Let me quote the language of the order in council:

> The minister states that in view of the extraordinary and exceptional conditions in the agricultural world—

I presume that instability in Europe that required the Minister of Finance's statement as to the vital necessity of stability in our tariff to hold it steady—

> —it is highly desirable that an investigation be made into the advisability of the continuation, discontinuation, or emendation of the provisions of this act; the amounts to be paid, and the methods of calculating such amounts in the event of its extension; and the scope of the work of the provinces to be undertaken with the assistance of funds provided thereunder.
>
> It is considered advisable that a commissioner be appointed under section 38c of the Civil Service Act as amended by chapter 22 of the statutes of 1921, to conduct the investigation indicated above, and to inquire into such other agricultural problems as may be desirable and necessary.
>
> The minister therefore recommends that Mr. Duncan Marshall, of Olds, Alberta, be appointed as a commissioner for the above purpose and to perform such other duties of a cognate nature as may be delegated to him.
>
> The minister further recommends that Mr. Marshall be paid a salary at the rate of $6,000 per annum, said salary to be paid from the appropriation provided for the administration of the Agricultural Instruction Act, and that this appointment date from January 15, 1922.

His appointment was to date a little more than five weeks before he was appointed. He had evidently set to work—if you call it work—five weeks before the government hit upon this scheme. I cannot congratulate the government upon either the ingenuity or the plausibility of the scheme they adopted to turn some of the public funds to Mr. Marshall. Here are funds that parliament voted for the carrying out of the Agricultural Instruction Act. After parliament votes that money for that purpose, and that alone, the government comes along and turns $6,000 a year, as well as expenses, away from the object for which parliament voted the money, and says that it is doing it under the authority of section 38 (c) of the Civil Service Act. That section of the Civil Service Act gives no authority to anybody to do anything—none whatsoever—and does not pretend to. This government had not one atom, not one line, not one letter, not one figment more authority after section 38 (c) was passed than it had before. What did that section say? It reads:

Nothing in this act—

That is the Civil Service Act.

—shall affect—

What?

—shall affect the powers of the Governor in Council with respect to the appointment of any commissioner or other member of any royal or other commission or board, or any deputy head.

Nothing shall affect the powers that now exist to appoint a member of a royal commission. If there had been an act before to enable the government to appoint Duncan Marshall under the Agricultural Instruction vote, to be paid any way in the world, those powers were not affected by this act, they were neither added to nor subtracted from, but the power never existed before—never did exist. The government had power under the Inquiries Act to appoint somebody for a specific inquiry within the terms of that act, and this section says that wherever the government has had the power before, this act does not take it from them and give it to the Civil Service Commission. Under this section the government has no added power whatever. It does not purport to give it any added power. The thing is so simple that I really cannot understand the government exercising—I do not know how to describe it—venturing to use this section, or pretending to use this section, to appoint one of their favourites to office. Whatever powers the government had before in respect of the appointment of a royal commission or any member of it were not affected by the Civil Service Act amendment of 1921, but if the government did not have the power before it did not get it under this section. Let me put it in another way. If there was doubt in the mind of anyone that the provisions of the Civil Service Act, as they existed, put into the hands of the Civil Service Commission powers that formerly were the government's powers, to appoint a commissioner under the Inquiries Act, or any other act, this section made it clear that there was no change. The government still has the power and not the Civil Service Commission. But nobody could suggest, to say nothing about arguing, that any appointment could be made under that section. It cannot be made. The government must make its appointment under some other act, and, if at the time that section was passed it had power, under another act, it could use that power and appoint a man. But it did not do that, and why? If it had it under the Inquiries Act, it had it for the purposes of the Inquiries Act, and subject to the restrictions therein embodied. I do not know of any other act under which it could have done it. It could have made an appointment under the Inquiries Act of a royal commission, but it could not do it under this act. I venture to say that, Dnucan Marshall's appointment being based on the provisions of this order in council, he is being paid illegally every dollar he receives, and I say that no matter what the Auditor General has done and without the slightest doubt in my mind. I hope I have made myself clear. If there was power in the government under any act to appoint a commissioner at the time this section was passed, that power the government still has, and the Civil Service Commission did not get that power, but it had to appoint him under the act that existed, and, of course, subject to the provisions of that act. If it had appointed him under the act that existed, he would not be there now. But these hon. gentlemen want to get round that and to make him a salaried officer, so that they affect to do it under the act which gave them no power whatever. That is the extent to which the government has gone to reward a political favourite. I would like the minister, or anybody, to bring down the submission of this order in council, if it ever was submitted, to the Justice department and the ruling of the Justice department upon it. I frequently asked for those things

and never got one yet. I venture to say the hon. gentlemen cannot get a ruling from the Justice department that there is any power whatever in the government, under the Civil Service Act of 1921, to appoint any commissioner at all.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I am glad that we have got to this—I shall not say fight—but to this question. I am not versed in the law, Mr. Chairman, but I assume that when a party is taken into the employ of the government, and paid regularly, it must be in accordance with some law. I know that the Auditor General is there for a purpose. He is not a figure head; I do not know anybody who could put very much past him, and I certainly am not trying to put anything past him, and there has never been a question of doubt as to the legality of Mr. Marshall's appointment. When the advisability of his appointment was first taken up, I did not know what the custom was. This Civil Service Commission was new to me. I was familiar with one commission in the West, and, I might say I believe in the Civil Service Commission. I believe it is necessary to have one, but I knew something of this from hearsay and from reading in the papers, and after I had made inquiries from my deputy and others as to the propriety of calling upon the Civil Service Commission I did so in connection with this, the first appointment I was interested in. I had an interview with them in their board room and I told them something of the situation. I do not know whether hon. members are familiar with all the intricacies of getting an appointment of this nature made. We first have to establish the position and then send to the Civil Service Commission for its classification. After they arrive at that stage, they send it back, with the signatures of two members of the commission on it, to the minister who is interested, and it is intimated that if the minister agrees with it, he can sign it. That again goes to the government, and after the government put their O.K. on it, it goes back to the department and then to the Civil Service Commission again in order that they may advertise the position. We discussed every phase of this appointment, and everything was agreed upon with the Civil Service Commission, I may say to my right hon. friend. Even the salary was agreed upon, the amount of salary that such a position was worth and that was necessary to secure an appointee who would be capable of carrying on the work satisfactorily. The question of salary had to be decided upon in connection with the classification, before advertising could be done. At that time I was not familiar with how long the advertising would take. It was arranged with the commission, first that such an appointment was necessary, second that the classification should be worth $6,000 per annum, and that was arranged satisfactorily with the commission. Then I found out that it was going to take an interminable time to get the appointment put through, and also that the advertising would take from two to three, and sometimes four weeks to complete. After the advertising there is the usual rating and examination, and I wanted the appointment filled then, not at some indefinite date in the future. I had been told by my deputy that he had experienced delays. He has not very much complaint to make against the Civil Service Commission; the only complaint he makes is in connection with the time it takes to make these appointments, and time means everything, especially in connection with farming operations. What farmer would be anxious to buy a seed drill in the middle of harvest or the fall when he wanted it in the spring? That was exactly the position I was in. I did not want this appointment filled after I was dead; I wanted it filled then. I did not want the appointee to go out cutting wood next winter.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister does not mean that he wanted the position filled after Mr. Duncan Marshall was dead.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Let my right hon. friend sit down. I may say further that I do not lay any particular blame at the door of the Civil Service Commission. My judgment was borne out in my subsequent experience as to the length of time required, and again I am blaming, not the commission, but the act that determines the actions of the commission and of the rest of us. As the committee is aware, the regulations with respect to hog grading came into force last October. It took ten solid months from the initial step until we got those ten hog graders appointed. The hogs could have been killed, eaten and gone out of sight altogether in those ten months and a new bunch of hogs could have appeared on the scene, been fattened and made ready for the knife while you were getting your graders appointed. I had made an arrangement with Mr. Arkell; I had told him that I would like to see the ten new members of my family. They were assembled at Toronto, and I met them there. This was the first work of this kind ever un-

dertaken on this continent or anywhere else that I knew of, to grade live hogs for the market, and consequently I wanted to see these new appointees. I did not know one of them from Adam; I had never seen them before; I met them in Toronto; I had an hour's talk with them, and I gave them some instructions in regard to their duties. As I say, it took just ten months from the beginning of the operation to get them appointed, and the hogs they graded were not born at the time I started operations. That is what we have to go through in connection with getting appointments made. I do not want to exaggerate this, or I could tell the committee very much worse instances than that, even in my short experience. It is no wonder that anyone who wants to administer a department properly chafes under such conditions. Let me say again that the blame lies, not with the commission, but with the act by which they have to be governed, and these are some of the results. Having regard to that, having regard to the further fact that the necessity for the appointment was agreed upon by the commission and the salary was agreed upon, I say that the only thing left was the time it would take to get the appointment put through. Is there anybody in the country who will say that Mr. Duncan Marshall is not a proper and qualified man for the position? If he cannot, there is no point to all this discussion. If anyone has a recommendation to make on behalf of someone who will better fill the duties that have devolved upon Mr. Marshall, I shall be delighted to have his name and to give his qualifications my best consideration, because I want the very best men obtainable in the Department of Agriculture. Hon. members from Saskatchewan will, I think, admit that when I was administering the department there, I let nothing stand in the way of getting the best obtainable men in my department, and any success obtained there was obtained through that policy. My desire is to pursue the same policy here; but what is the use of making appointments for a particular purpose, if frequently you cannot get them made until the expiry of the time when you really desire them most? Right at this time we want a most important position filled immediately. This will be worth more to us in the next few weeks than if two or three months elapse before the appointment is made. We have, however, to go through the routine; the hands of the Civil Service Commission are tied, and they have to go through it too. That is one of the reasons why this appointment was not made by the Civil Service Commission. Why was it not? The leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) says that it was made illegally. If it was, I must be a wonderful individual who can jam a political friend through all these devious ways and get him appointed in spite of the law. I would be some mover if I could do that. There is a proviso—my right hon. friend has read it himself—by which a commissioner can be appointed. The conditions stipulated are all justified; they are all true.

Just for fear that this might be overlooked, I may say that a few remarks have been made about the qualifications of Mr. Marshall. If there is in Canada any man better qualified for the work he is doing, I want to find him and I will look upon it as a favour if any person will send in the names of men who are better qualified, either as platform men or as live stock authorities, because we want a man of just such qualifications as those of Mr. Marshall. I have in my hand an Old Country paper, the Live Stock Journal, which discusses the embargo situation. This is not what I say about Mr. Duncan Marshall at all, because I might be prejudiced in his favour. This is a journal that has no object in being prejudiced; it is printed in the Old Country, in London, and it is recognized as one of the leading live stock authorities. Under date of May 4—and this was just at the time when there was a good deal of anxiety over there about getting the balance of the embargo off our breeding cattle—this is what it says, at a time by the way when some of the very extreme friends of Mr. Duncan Marshall were trying to make out that he was not exercising his duties properly just at that time. I am not going to read it all unless I am requested to do so, because it is a two-column article. Anyone can call for the paper, and I am not excluding anything derogatory to Mr. Marshall because there is not a line in it of that nature. The article reads in part:

> There is a distinct grievance against Canada in seeking to raise this new point of the admission of breeding cattle. It is to be feared that Dr. J. H. Grisdale, the Deputy Minister of Agriculture, and the Hon. Duncan Marshall, Canada's Live Stock Commissioner—

By the way, that is still a new title, which he has not received any more than Commissioner of Agriculture.

> —know their business too well for the "amateurs" whom our system of government place at the head of our various departments.

You see, they are playing politics here just as the Opposition do in this House even on a question of agriculture.

> In any case it is thought that they have managed to steal a big march—and an unfair march—on British breeders. Home industries appear to be held as of no account. Surely those who are responsible for this new

move have not paused to think of what the result is to be of the dumping of vast numbers of breeding cattle in this country to which—the irony of it all!—every country has to come for stock to help to improve their own cattle.

That is one paragraph. Then the editorial quotes some remarks made by Dr. Grisdale in his report as published in the Canada Gazette:

We quote from Dr. Grisdale's report:—"Inasmuch as it was quite apparent to Mr. Marshall and myself, the advisory part of the Canadian delegation, that there was likely to be a very strong demand for grade females, particularly for milk production, the Canadian representatives were most urgent in their demand for better terms in connection with admission of stock of this kind. Finally, it was stated that the very most the Imperial government could concede was that Canadian breeding stock should be admitted, provided they had passed the tuberculin test within thirty days of embarkation, and that they should be subject to the same conditions of inspection as the stockers (stores) and spayed heifers, but that the three-day quarantine should not apply."

Then the editorial commented:

Truly, it is lamentable with what ease British agricultural interests can be sacrified, and are sacrificed, to suit others! Little wonder Dr. Grisdale states in his report that "there was evident on the part of both the Imperial representatives and the officials taking part in the conference the very greatest desire to meet the wishes of the Canadian representatives . . . I cannot speak too strongly of the evidently sincere desire on the part of the Imperial delegates and officials to meet the recommendations of the Canadians, or modify their own proposed conditions in such a way as to comply, as far as possible, with the changes suggested by the Canadian delegation."

One wonders what further modifications could have been made, or what changes could possibly have been suggested by the Canadian representatives which were not granted by the Imperial representatives, whose compliant dispositions are so warmly commended by Dr. Grisdale. The tuberculin test and a sixpenny inspection, but no quarantine either before or after shipment! Did British magnanimity ever surpass this. And to think it was all done in the interests of an industry to maintain which has necessitated special parliamentary legislation!

Now, here is the highest possible commendation of the two expert delegates that went over with two of my colleagues in connection with this matter, and the fact that those four gentlemen were able to consummate this long drawn out controversy is surely some testimony to the fitness of Mr. Duncan Marshall for this work. I am still open to receive any suggestions as to where we can get a better man.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister has not even touched the subject; he got within distance of it once, but the rest of the time he was telling us what a wonderful platform speaker Mr. Duncan Marshall was.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I did not say anything about that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister read something from some foreign paper.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Foreign?

Mr. MEIGHEN: An English paper, as I understand.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Is a British journal a foreign paper?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is pretty foreign from here, yes; not foreign in interest or sentiment, although I think the Minister of Marine (Mr. Lapointe) at one time so described it.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I never did; that is another mistake.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But all this is utterly foreign to the subject. I may inform the minister (Mr. Motherwell) that, aside entirely from the qualifications or disqualifications of Mr. Duncan Marshall, there is a law in this country, notwithstanding that he gets up and in his own style says, "Surely I can not break the law; I must be a great man if I can break the law." It does not take a great man to break the law; there are other law breakers besides the minister. But we expect better of governments, who are the authorities for the enforcement of law in the country. There is no Auditor General now; this government has deliberately avoided the appointment of an Auditor General for months. While I do not know the condition the Auditor General was in when this matter went through, I am aware that the Auditor General who then was living had been a very sick man for a long time. Consequently this matter has not had the supervision of the proper official that it should have had, and apparently the minister took care not to get an opinion of the Justice department upon it. Anyone reading section 38 would know that it gave no powers to anybody; it simply declared that any powers that heretofore existed to appoint a commissioner were not taken away and given to the Civil Service Commission. If the minister is right, then all that the government has to do to appoint anyone to any job at all is to call him a commissioner. He may be an accountant; he may be a hog grader; he may be a wanderer to Tampa, Florida, for immigrants; he may be anything at all. But if you call him a commissioner then the Civil Service Act is repealed and the minister can appoint him. That is precisely what he has done, but that is not the law of the country; and it is an affront to the intelligence of any person to suggest that it is. Mr. Duncan Marshall has drawn

10 p.m.

every dollar illegally that he is in possession of to-day out of that vote of $1,100,000, and to-night I call the attention of those who are taking the place of the Auditor General of this country to the cheques that are passing to Mr. Duncan Marshall, and ask that the law be followed by the government in office.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I think I was justified in quoting from this editorial because my right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) made the statement that this $6,000, had been diverted from the public treasury to be handed out to a political favourite. He makes the statement, in the first place, that the money was illegally paid; and secondly, that it was given to one whose only qualification, at least inferentially, was that he was a political favourite. I wanted to show that the gentleman was a qualified man, and what I have read is I think ample testimony to that fact. I think therefore that I was justified in reading the editorial, which is a very much better authority on these questions than my right hon. friend.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is not the question I am raising.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I beg the right hon. gentleman's pardon; I have here a note which I took of what he said. He declared that the money was given as a reward to a political favourite. But if the political favourite has the qualifications that eminently fit him for the position to which he has been appointed, is it a sufficient ground for his being disqualified because he happens to be on a certain side of politics?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Whether I am right or wrong, I understand that this man is not Commissioner of Agriculture, although he has been so styled. Now, I have here the Scottish Farmer, an agricultural journal printed in Glasgow, and this particular copy is of the issue of January 27 of the present year. Referring to a sale of pure-bred cattle which had taken place in Scotland some time previously, the article states:

> Lawton's champion Shorton bull was not exported by the man from Stranraer, but by the other Marshall —the Hon. Duncan, the man from the Northwest.

It is well known that four months after parliament prorogued Mr. Marshall and Mr. Dryden were in the Old Country attending auction sales of pure-bred shorthorn cattle; that purchases were made by Mr. Dryden, and that the animals were brought to this country. A question was asked when Mr. Marshall's appointment was under discussion in the House a year ago with regard to his action as a breeder of beef cattle. The hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) asked:

> Is not Mr. Duncan Marshall himself a large grower of beef cattle, and will he be prohibited from doing business on his own account while travelling as a representative of the government? He might have an eye for the main chance, and the minister might say whether there will be an express prohibition against his doing business in his own behalf.

The minister stated:

> I understand from the newspaper reports that Mr. Marshall has sold out his live stock and has rented his place. He is therefore completely at liberty to represent the government.

Now, he has evidently been very active in attending the auction sales of pure-bred shorthorn cattle in Scotland and elsewhere since he went over to the Old Country. I believe he has made several trips across the Atlantic since the House prorogued in June last and it is rather significant that we have not been able to deal with the matter up to the present time. In view of the statement made by the minister regarding the appointment and the difficulties experienced in connection with the Civil Service Commission, I took occasion some time ago to place some questions on the order paper as to the salary of these two commissioners, who, we were informed, were expected to go to South America to develop a live stock trade between the countries there and Canada. In answer to that question it was stated that Mr. Marshall's salary and expenses to date amounted to $8,952.08, and that Mr. Dryden had received an advance for expenses of $2,000. I would like to know from the minister when Mr. Dryden's services began and when they ended, and whether he was in the employ of the government when he and Mr. Duncan Marshall, according to Mr. Duncan Marshall's own newspaper reports were attending these sales of pure-bred shorthorn cattle in the old land. And according to the report of the Scottish Farmer, Mr. Marshall was not only attending these sales but was making purchases thereat. Is that a proper position for the Commissioner of Agriculture, representing the Department of Agriculture, to take? Was it a proper course for a man drawing a salary, appointed illegally, as my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition has stated, to go into the constituency that I represent and attend a political meeting immediately after the prorogation of parliament last year? Mr. Marshall has been a prominent man in this country for a great many years. I remember when he was a candidate for election nearly twenty years ago in an Ontario constituency, on which occa-

sion he was defeated by a very substantial majority. He went out to western Canada, and if my memory is correct he was defeated in the provincial election there in 1921. He was also, I believe, a candidate in the federal election of the same year and was again defeated by a very large majority, something in the neighbourhood of 2,500; so that the people who know Mr. Duncan Marshall very well have apparently not as high an opinion of him as the Minister of Agriculture would lead this House and the country to believe. I am not going to sit quietly by and see an official paid by the people of this country attend a political gathering when he ought to be attending to the duties for the fulfilment of which he was appointed. I think the minister has not been as careful in supervising his officials as he should have been, if this is the practice in the Department of Agriculture.

I touched upon some matters before six o'clock that I do not wish to repeat, but I want to point out, in connection with Mr. Marshall's attendance at this political meeting to which I have referred, that the press report had the following to say respecting the remarks of the president of the Liberal Association of the constituency on that occasion:

> W. C. Brown, of Tillsonburg, South Oxford, representative on the Ontario Liberal executive, occupied the chair in the absence of M. G. Dean, president of the South Oxford Reform Association, he having suffered an automobile breakdown which delayed him. Mr. Brown, in a brief and eulogistic address, introduced the speaker of the day, Hon. Duncan Marshall, who was asked by Premier King to appear at the picnic on his behalf, as he himself was unable to come.

So he came there with a pretty high recommendation. The Toronto Globe of June 29 reports the meeting and refers to the Commissioner of Agriculture as having addressed the Oxford Grits at a picnic on June 28. There is a special despatch to the Globe to this effect. Now, he is advertised as the Commissioner of Agriculture attending a gathering of that kind, as is intimated by a member of the Liberal executive for the province of Ontario, at the request of the Prime Minister of this country. We are told to-day that he is drawing money illegally in connection with the position he now occupies. Early in the session a year ago, when we were discussing his appointment, we were told that he was putting in his time at a seaside resort in Florida and that he was expected to proceed to South America. He proceeded across the Atlantic, and he has been doing the work I have indicated. He has also been continually writing articles to the press in which he refers to himself as "Hon. Duncan Marshall" well knowing that he is not entitled to that prefix. The Canadian Countryman of May 12 contains a couple of pages from the pen of "Hon. Duncan Marshall." Among other things are photographs taken of the landing of the first cattle from Canada after the embargo was removed. You remember that the press despatch we received on that occasion stated that the first boat was going to land at Glasgow but that it was delayed and landed at some other port. They had the stage all set with a red tape across the gangway and the Hon. Duncan Marshall was going to lead the first Canadian steer and have him breast the tape to show the Hon. Manning Doherty that he was the man who had broken down the embargo. But unfortunately for Mr. Marshall the steer had too much respect for himself to allow any such impression to go abroad; he breasted the tape and he dragged Hon. Duncan, who became entangled in the rope, according to the reports we received. The photograph here has the caption:

> Wm. Henderson and Hon. Duncan Marshall dressed in white market coats, beside the steer as he steps off the gang plank on to Scottish soil.

Mr. Duncan Marshall must have got on his feet in order to enable the man with the camera to take a snap, for it is quite apparent he has been through a trying experience because he is bare-headed, while Mr. Henderson is not. Surely this farce has gone far enough, when an active politician can come here, as he did, immediately following the election and make demands upon the government and get those demands granted. He receives a salary of upwards of two thousand dollars more than he could have received had he been appointed by the Civil Service Commission. That is quite a consideration. The salary to be paid to the Commissioner of Agriculture under the Civil Service Act is $4,000 a year, yet being appointed as he was Mr. Marshall draws the salary of $6,000 a year and expenses. I would ask the committee if they consider that is a proper course for the government to pursue? The fact of Mr. Marshall's receiving the handsome salary he draws to-day may have had something to do with the government's desire to evade the Civil Service Act in making the appointment, because otherwise he would not be receiving that salary. Now if there is need for economy in this country, and there is every need, if Mr. Marshall can render good and valuable service to this country I have no objection to his doing so but, I do object to him acting in the capacity in which he has been acting since his appointment. He should devote his attention to the work for which he was supposed to be

appointed, and not devote his time to politics nor associate himself with the purchasing of live stock in the Old Country, which is what he did if what this newspaper report indicates is correct.

I have another paper here of a little earlier date which shows that a large number of cattle had been purchased at a sale by one of those commissioners and imported into this country. These are serious statements to have made against a man occupying any position in the civil service of this country. I hope that the minister will look into this matter and not be misled by the glaring reports which are evidently emanating from the pen of the gentleman himself, because I cannot imagine for a moment that these articles in the magazines and the press of this country are appearing without some remuneration being given for them. As to the correctness of that I have nothing whatever to say.

As to Mr. Duncan Marshall's ability I know nothing. I have never met him but I do know something of his record as a politician in this country, and I know from the fact that he was defeated in his own constituency in the provincial election in 1921, and defeated again in the same year for this parliament by somewhere in the neighbourhood of 2,500 votes, he was not held in the very highest esteem in the province of Alberta.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I do not know whether these statements of my hon. friend deserve very much attention or not, but inasmuch as they have been made and there has been a good deal of sniping on this question all winter, possibly I had better pay a little attention to them.

Mr. Duncan Marshall when he was over there with Mr. Dryden did not purchase any cattle for himself or anybody else. I presume it is correct that he attended some sales, which would be a most natural thing for any live stock man to do. I cannot imagine the hon. member for Victoria City (Mr. Tolmie) going over to the Old Country and not attending any popular sale of live stock that was being held. It is one of the most interesting events of the day, a sale of pure-bred cattle or of live stock of almost any kind, and it is just the thing I would expect him to attend. Is that a crime, Mr. Chairman? If it is, I guess Mr. Marshall has committed it. But it is no crime, and it is nonsense to make a complaint about it. Mr. Marshall did not buy cattle for himself or anybody else.

As to the letter to the Canadian Countryman, I saw a number of Mr. Marshall's letters, and among others one that he wrote to the Toronto Globe on the question of hog and bacon grading, and I never saw a better put letter on that question. He reported just where Canadian bacon fell short of Danish bacon, went into the question in minute detail, and I made the remark at the time having in mind one of my hon. friend's observations, that article alone was worth his entire salary for the year. I believe that still, and if he wrote an account for the British and Canadian journals of the landing of the first cargo of Canadian cattle in Great Britain after they had been debarred for thirty-one years, do you not think that was a very good way to let the people of Canada know just what happened in connection with that notable and historic event? Why, only the other day the whole Agricultural committee of this House, every one of whom had the privilege of inviting two friends, went down to the old historic city of Quebec and saw the first cargo of Canadian cattle shipped from that port via the Canadian National Railway all through. That was an historic event and one that we should commemorate. They did not write it up perhaps as picturesquely as Mr. Marshall might have done, but they gave it due publicity, and I think we should have been derelict in our duty if we had not been there.

My deputy and myself and one or two others went down to Montreal and saw the first cargo of Canadian cattle loaded there for shipment via St. John. Our presence was required there because there was a hitch as to whether they could be shipped via the Canadian Pacific, which went through United States territory part of the way, and we decided that it was not advisable to ship via the Canadian Pacific, which passes through part of Maine. We did not want any hitch over some technicality, but apart from that we were desirous of being there to celebrate that notable event. I do not know why we should make one law for ourselves and another for Mr. Duncan Marshall. We do not want him to hide his light under a bushel.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: No danger.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I am sure my hon. friend has read Mr. Marshall's articles with a great deal of pleasure. Mr. Marshall, it appears, has committed the heinous offence of being defeated twice in politics. Well, Mr. Chairman, if that were a hanging matter a lot of us would be missing here, and if my hon. friend from South Oxford lives long enough it may be he will suffer a defeat himself, and then he will be a little more charitable to those of us who have experienced it not once but several times. That is what we call small potatoes and mighty few in a hill—to make a statement of that kind about a man who had

the misfortune to be defeated twice in the same year. My hon. friend should rather have felt charitably and sympathetically disposed towards a once fellow public man. But they have to talk about something, Mr. Chairman, and they have not got much on this yet.

As to Mr. Marshall being down in Florida, I thought I dealt with that last winter. That was an exhibition where the Department of the Interior had an exhibit, and that exhibit was run all through the Conservative regime, and I think through the preceding Liberal regime. The leader of the Opposition was very hilarious over the exhibition in Florida to which we sent an exhibit. I do not think he knew that that same exhibit was being run there while he was Prime Minister of this country. At an exhibition of that kind where you get a large concourse of people in great big auditoriums, it is an advantage to a country to have a man with Mr. Marshall's capacity for filling a building and occupying a platform acceptably. I have been at some of these gatherings with him, and I do not know anybody who can better captivate an American audience than he can. I attended the International Dry Farming Conference at Colorado Springs and Billings with Mr. Marshall, and I can tell my hon. friends that he was the lion of the day with the guests; there is no question about that, and what is more, we have direct information that a number of immigrants came to Canada as a result of Mr. Marshall's address at that meeting in Florida. I saw in the Department of the Interior whole sheets of clippings from American papers reporting that meeting, and if we had had to pay for that advertising space in cash it would have cost us $10,000. That was the speech he made at a place where we have been holding exhibits for ten or twelve years, and yet all kinds of ridicule were heaped upon Mr. Marshall for this globe trotting as if it was the first time we ever had an exhibition in Florida. I do not think the leader of the Opposition knew anything about where our exhibitions were being held. He never dreamed of one being held in Florida or he would never have made the foolish remarks he did with respect to Mr. Marshall's speech there.

The hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) says he does not know anything about Mr. Marshall's qualifications. Well, should not that be the chief consideration? Should it have been my first duty to have inquired how many times he was defeated at the elections before I opened negotiations with him, or should I have suggested, as is done in some cases "If you will apply to the Civil Service Commission you will at least have a chance of getting through?" Should I have sent in a blank form to be filled in and returned to Mr. Foran, the Secretary of the Civil Service Commission, or should I have inquired into Mr. Marshall's qualifications to fill the post? I think that his qualifications were the first consideration, and no one has yet challenged his fitness to do the work that has been allotted to him since his appointment—not one challenge has been made. Therefore I think this talk on the part of my hon. friends, while it may be quite justifiable from their standpoint, is done for the purpose of raising a little hurrah so that they may get it featured in a spectacular way in the press in the hope of making the public believe that there is something doing on their part by reason of their stand on this question. That is all this talk is for; there is no challenge as to Mr. Marshall's fitness. It seems to me that if we placed a gentleman at this work who did not know the A.B.C. about politics and was otherwise disqualified the mere fact that he was never in politics would certainly not overshadow his ineligibility. I say again, the first essential consideration is service on the part of Mr. Marshall for the money he gets. I submit that Mr. Marshall is earning his salary as fully and efficiently as any hon. member in this House or any other official in the public service.

Mr. IRVINE: The Minister of Agriculture has said that he has been unable to see any point made in this contention with regard to the appointment of Mr. Duncan Marshall. If I were in the position of Minister of Agriculture I think I should be inclined to take the same attitude. It is better not to see the point; that is convenient for the minister. The leader of the Opposition has made a charge that the appointment of Mr. Duncan Marshall to this unmentionable position—no one seems to be able to name it—was illegal, and that the salary he has been receiving ever since has been illegally given. Not only has the leader of the Opposition made that charge but, I think, he has very successfully proven his case. The only answer the Minister of Agriculture has been able to make to that point was the reading of an article from some English paper. Personally I fail to see the connection between the editorial he read and the charge made by the leader of the Opposition. It is said in this editorial, among other things, that Mr. Marshall was a live stock commissioner. The minister himself denied that. That means that the article was wrong in the first place with regard to the position and suggested, to me at least, that it may have

been wrong in many other things with which it dealt. Another thing the article said was that the mission of Mr. Marshall to England was to "steal an unfair march" on the British people. I do not think that is a very high recommendation for Mr. Marshall, if it was a high recommendation that the minister sought to convey through the reading of the editorial. But I am not so much interested in the legal phase of this question, although I can see that a very important principle is involved in it. As to the capacity of Mr. Marshall to do the work, I assume that he ought to be able to do it because the job in this case was made for the man, and the government surely ought to have been able to make a job that would fit the man so that he would be able to do it well. I can quite understand how that could be done. I believe it might be possible for the minister to even create a job that I might be able to fill although he might not be disposed to agree with me on that.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No chance.

Mr. IRVINE: But that is not a recommendation for Mr. Marshall. I wish now to enter a brief and emphatic protest against this appointment. I should have done this last year, but I refrained for two reasons. In the first place we were given the assurance that the appointment of Mr. Marshall was temporary, that it would not last more than six months. I, of course, took that assurance seriously; I thought it was true. A year later I find it is not. In the second place I did not protest last year because I happened to be the opponent of Mr. Marshall in the last election, and I know it is difficult for some people to disassociate any attack that I might make in regard to his appointment from political propaganda. I do not suppose that I will be able to avoid that implication by some hon. members even now. But even at the risk of that I want to make a protest against this appointment because it violates principles, and principles which the government have from time to time avowed they were the protagonists of. It has not been made clear, by the Minister of Agriculture, not even to this date, what services Mr. Marshall is giving this country for the salary of $6,000 and, I presume, many times more than $6,000 in expenses. I do not know what his expenses will amount to. I would not be surprised if, since he took his office they might run to as high as $30,000. That we do not know; we have to wait until the minister tries to find out just exactly how much Mr. Marshall has cost the country. But he was appointed at this salary and was given this office shortly after the last election. I think the minister said to-night in reply to someone, that it was "far easier to start right" than it was to get right after forty years of doing wrong. I am sorry that the minister did not himself start right in this regard, because he may have considerable trouble now in getting right. I do not know if it will take him forty years to do it. But Mr. Marshall, as you all know, was a candidate in the last election. He was on the platform with the right hon. the Prime Minister, and the chairman on that occasion when announcing Mr. Marshall referred to him as the next Minister of Agriculture. Of course in the campaign, Mr. Marshall who is an excellent propagandist, made very good use of that prophecy. I do not know whether it could be called a promise. Certainly it was a promise from the chairman's viewpoint and I suppose the chairman had some authority for making the statement. Well, Mr. Marshall, like any other man, might have been defeated in the election. I am certainly not holding that against him in any way. I presume most of us have been defeated and very likely will be defeated again.

Mr. GRAHAM: Some of the best men have been defeated.

Mr. IRVINE: That is not the point. Seemingly Mr. Marshall was very disappointed that he was not made Minister of Agriculture and so after his defeat he speedily hied himself to Ottawa, and I presume got into close contact with the present Minister of Agriculture; I would not be surprised if Mr. Marshall nearly succeeded in convincing the Minister of Agriculture that he (Mr. Marshall) would be a better Minister of Agriculture than the present one, and that if he did not get the appointment , or some similar appointment, there might be trouble. I, of course, have no means of knowing the exact conversation which took place or how things went, but of the fact of his appointment alone in this regard are we sure. He was appointed to this job, I understand, as a kind of consolation prize. The Minister of Agriculture, I think, will admit that Mr. Marshall and he are bosom friends and that they drink out of the same cup, so to speak. That is all right. There is nothing wrong with that, but I think perhaps he would not be so ready to admit to us that their relationship to which I have referred had much to do with this appointment. Mr. Marshall at that time was appointed Commissioner of Agriculture. That position was considered by the former government as being unnecessary—at least, I under-

stand that they did not appoint any one to fill the position, and I believe abandoned the office. Although there has been a great deal of criticism of the late government—and I have no hesitation in saying that I have done my share of the criticizing—yet I think we will have to admit that there were two things at least—there may be more—for which we have to give that government credit. In the first place it took a very decided stand against patronage, and in the second place, I believe that it was fairly efficient in its administration, however wrong it may have been in its policy, from some people's point of view. That government, abolishing patronage, and trying to be efficient, said to themselves "We will not waste the public funds by appointing a man to this position". So the office was there, but they did not fill it because they considered it was unnecessary. When the present government came into power and Mr. Marshall was defeated, he happened to be a bosom friend of the Minister of Agriculture, and patronage was brought back by the appointment of Mr. Marshall to this position. It was an appointment over the head of the Civil Service Commission. The present government while in opposition criticized fearlessly and mercilessly the order in council method which it was alleged was adopted by the former government. Yet when something of this nature occurs the present government do not hesitate to utilize this valuable instrument, the order in council, as a means of gaining their end. Now, by an order in council they appointed Duncan Marshall to a position which was not necessary at a salary of $6,000 per year, and with a probable expense account of somewhere in the neighbourhood of $30,000. That went on, I understand, for some time. He held the position as Commissioner of Agriculture. Then, feeling that they could not long justify this appointment as Commissioner of Agriculture, the government merely dropped the agricultural part of it, and called him a commissioner. But as commissioner, I do not know what commission he has. I believe that one of the phases of Mr. Marshall's commissionership is to make recommendations as to redistribution. I believe that Mr. Marshall came to his old friends in Calgary, looked over the ground, set down the stakes of political gerrymandering divisions, made out his plans, and sent them to some representative of the present government. I do not know whether that is part of the commissionership or not, but if it is I have no doubt the gentleman is earning his salary, and earning it just about as well as anybody in this House.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Will my hon. friend supply us with some evidence that Mr. Marshall was doing anything in connection with redistribution?

Mr. IRVINE: As the hon. minister himself said to-day in answer to a question that he did not carry the order in council in his pocket, so I do not happen to carry this evidence in my pocket, but if the hon. minister will give me time to do it, I think I can produce the evidence.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No time like the present.

Mr. IRVINE: That is unfortunately true in this particular regard, but if the minister is very anxious to get the evidence and will give me ten days' time, I think I can procure at least enough evidence to justify the statement which I have just made.

The main point I want to make is that this country cannot afford to have two Ministers of Agriculture. If it takes two Liberal statesmen to make one minister then I suggest that they get one salary between them. I think that is a fair proposition. But if one of them is to be discharged I will leave it to the hon. minister himself to say which one of them should be Minister of Agriculture. They are the Siamese twins of agricultural administration, and I would move that they be operated upon and separated. I understand that with such close affiliation, death usually results from an operation. Even if this operation should cause the political death of these gentlemen, Canada might possibly get along. I have no intention, of course, of causing them political death, but I do insist on their separation, because we cannot afford to pay two cabinet ministers for the one service, and if Mr. Duncan Marshall has the ability which the present Minister of Agriculture attributes to him—and I have no doubt he has a great deal of ability—then let him be minister. If he can do it better than the present minister, by all means let us bring him here. I insist however that we cannot afford to have two Ministers of Agriculture, unless they decide to get along on the one salary. If it requires them both to make one Minister of Agriculture let them divide the salary between them, that would be the only alternative to discharging one of them.

With reference to the great qualifications of Mr. Marshall and as to what he has been doing in Britain I have no remarks to make. As I say, the job having been created for him,

no doubt he will be able to perform the work. If he cannot handle that job, he will never be able to fill the position. In view then of the fact, first of all, that this appointment was illegal, as was shown by the right hon. leader of the Opposition, and secondly in view of the fact that this is a continuation of patronage which we have been struggling to get away from, and thirdly because it is not necessary and is a waste of public money, I move that this item be reduced by the amount of $5,999. I am leaving one dollar there to send over a cablegram to Mr. Marshall with one word in it—"Fired."

Mr. GUTHRIE: There is, in my opinion, a serious aspect to this question, which the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) seems to misapprehend or, for his own purposes, seeks to evade. The case as presented by the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) is, to my mind, a serious case and one in respect to which the committee is entitled to some explanation from the government. If the Minister of Agriculture does not see fit to give the explanation or is unable to give it, then I must appeal to the law officers of the Crown or the Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin), sitting in this House at this time, to explain to the committee how it comes about that a man is appointed to the service of the Crown upon what appears, on an examination of the statutes, to be in direct opposition to the letter and spirit of the law, why also that man for the past sixteen or seventeen months has been drawing his salary through the ordinary channels through which salaries are paid, and I presume that the cheques representing that salary have likewise passed through the Auditor General's office. If the statement of the law and the facts are as my right hon. friend has stated them, the committee is entitled to a very clear and definite statement by the government how this matter came about. We find an order in council passed on the 7th February, 1922. The new government, the present government, took office, if I remember rightly, on the last day of the preceding year, so that about five weeks had elapsed before the order in council in question was passed. The order provides for the appointment of a commissioner in these terms:

> It is considered advisable that a commissioner be appointed under section 38C of the Civil Service Act as amended by chapter 22 of the statutes of 1921, to conduct the investigation indicated above and to inquire into such other agricultural problems as may be desirable and necessary.

Then the order enacts:

> That Mr. Duncan Marshall of Olds, Alberta, be appointed as a commissioner for the above purpose. . . and further that Mr. Marshall be paid a salary at the rate of $6,000 per annum, said salary to be paid from the appropriation provided for the administration of the Agricultural Instruction Act and that this appointmen date from the 15th January, 1922.

The appointment has been made under a statute definitely and clearly stated in the order. It is section 38C of the act of 1921 amending the Civil Service Act. First let me point out to the committee that under the Civil Service Act there is no power to appoint a commissioner. That is clear and definite. Is there under the amendment? This is the amendment cited, section 38C:

> Nothing in this act shall affect the powers of the Governor in Council with respect to the appointment of any commissioner or other member of any royal or other commission or board, or any deputy head.

Meaning in plain, clear language that any power which existed in the Governor in Council to appoint commissioners should be retained by the Governor in Council notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act. The language is clear and express. What power is there in the Governor in Council to appoint a commissioner? What power ever was there? There is no such power under the Civil Service Act. There was power under the Inquiries Act and it is the only power whereby a commissioner can be appointed or a royal commission can be issued. If a commissioner is appointed under that act, that act prescribes the procedure, limits the authority, directs how the investigation shall be conducted. But he is not appointed under that act at all; he is appointed expressly under section 38C of an amendment to the Civil Service Act which confers no right upon the government nor the Governor in Council to appoint a commissioner for any purpose whatever. Mark this also, Mr. Chairman. If the commissioner is appointed under the Inquiries Act, he is paid under that act and according to the terms of that act; but under the order in council in question it is said that he is appointed under section 38C which I have read, and he is to be paid, in violation of the vote of this parliament, from money appropriated for investigations in regard to agriculture. This parliament expressly voted a certain sum of money, $1,100,000, for a specific purpose. The appointment and payment of a commissioner was not one of those purposes, and there is no power under this order in council legally to pay Mr. Duncan Marshall one dollar of salary. How the matter has slipped through the Auditor General's office, I cannot imagine. How it has slipped through the Justice department, I cannot imagine. I appeal to the Minister of Justice to make

this matter clear to the committee. What we say is that there has been a misapplication of the agricultural grant in this case; there has been a misappropriation of this money. There has been, under the order in council, a payment of salary that is not warranted under the laws of this country. That is the serious objection that I take, and the minister has not attempted to answer that objection. He deals with Mr. Marshall's qualifications. They may be well and good; they may be in every respect satisfactory. That is not the point which the leader of the Opposition made, nor which the opposition is trying to make. The point we are making is that his appointment is illegal, the payment of his salary is illegal, the use of that money granted for agricultural instruction in payment of Mr. Marshall's salary is a misappropriation of that fund. It is not justifiable; it is illegal, and it should not be paid. Of course, if it has been paid and paid illegally, it can be recovered, and the government will have to take the necessary action in that respect.

The only other criticism in regard to Mr. Marshall which weighed with me was that the government has clearly allowed this commissioner to break another very well recognized law of this country, passed by a resolution of this parliament, that paid servants of the Crown shall not be electioneering agents. The evidence is produced here to-night from the columns of the Toronto Globe that in June of last year, when Duncan Marshall was a paid servant of this government at the rate of $6,000 per annum, he went, as he himself announced to the audience, as the representative of the Prime Minister of this country, to a Liberal gathering in the constituency of South Oxford, and made a political speech in direct contravention of the spirit and letter of the resolution of this parliament that public servants shall not do so. That charge has not been answered; that charge has been absolutely avoided by the Minister of Agriculture. We have had no word from the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), whose name is brought into prominence in connection with this matter. These are the two objections we take, and take most pointedly. In regard to one we demand a reasonable explanation. We want to know why the appointment was made, what justification there was for it in law, and why the Auditor General allowed those cheques to be paid if he allowed that.

The next point that should be cleared up is why this servant of the Crown has been enabled to go to political gatherings in South Oxford to represent the Prime Minister of the country, as stated in the extract read from the Toronto Globe, without a rebuke from the government,—a government that talked of appointing a royal commission shortly after election to inquire into the political activities of certain civil servants. Here is a glaring case of a civil servant, whether he be called Commissioner of Agriculture or anything else, who is attending political meetings on behalf of the government. We ask the government now to act on the information they have and displace Mr. Duncan Marshall if he is guilty of the offence charged.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The hon. gentleman would not expect me, I am sure, to deal with the legal aspect of the question. I do know however that the Civil Service Act makes provision for the appointment of a commissioner, and he was appointed. That is all I can say. As regards the duration of the commission, it was anticipated at the time that it would be quite temporary, probably, as I said, six months. But many things have occurred in connection with the Agricultural Instruction Act since that time. The life of the act has expired since then and the question has arisen as to whether the grant itself should be discontinued. It was found that the grant under the Highways Act would also expire next year, but many persons thought that it would be a good idea to defer the discontinuance of the grant until the highways question was under consideration so that both matters could be dealt with together. What with one thing and another, time has passed and Mr. Duncan Marshall has been kept on, but he has given good and faithful service to the Dominion of Canada. My hon. friend (Mr. Irvine) made the straight statement that the job was made for the man. Was that right? I wonder whether he knows that the job had been in existence for years and years.

Mr. SHAW: Was it vacant before?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: It is at least ten years since the Agricultural Instruction Act was passed, and the position of commissioner was provided for under the terms of the act. The first appointee was the late Mr. C. C. James, whose salary for ten years was $5,000. So far as the salary paid Mr. Duncan Marshall goes, I do not think that any hon. member would suggest for a moment that $6,000 to-day is any more than $5,000 was at that time. So much for that. As to the duration of the commission, I am not going to justify the extension of the period past six months except on the ground that I have stated. I might point out, though, that there have been com-

missions in Canada which have lasted very much longer than that; I have in mind the Lake of the Woods Commission and the International Waterways Commission; the terms of which were indefinite. There is no finality, shall I say, in regard to the duration of any commission, so far as I know.

Mr. SHAW: But considerable stability, I suppose.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Well, so long as any commission lasts I trust it will be stable. With reference to the assertion that Mr. Duncan Marshall went to political meetings, I must confess that I have no knowledge of the matter, although the question has been up in this House before. I am confident, however, that if he went to a political meeting he certainly did not make a political speech. I know that whatever speech he might make would be an agricultural address, and until I have evidence to the contrary I shall refuse to believe that he made any speech of a political character, either in Oxford or anywhere else. The onus of proof so far as this question is concerned rests with those who make the charge.

The intimation has also been made that patronage has been brought to bear upon this appointment. Now, what is patronage? As far as I can understand the term, it implies that some useless man is appointed to a position because he happens to be a friend of the government in office. Does that definition hold in this connection? Has anyone challenged the fitness of Mr. Duncan Marshall for this particular position? The term "patronage" has always been associated with the appointment of a misfit, but there has not been a single tittle of evidence to support the suggestion that such is the case in connection with this appointment. Unquestionably, there has been no patronage in the matter.

Mr. IRVINE: Is the minister giving a definition of patronage to suit the occasion, as he made the job to suit the individual who got it?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: By no means. My hon. friend's experience in politics does not go as far back as that of some of the rest of us, and I know very well that the term "patronage" got its significance in the way I have described. Another absolutely unsupported statement is that Mr. Marshall was interested in the redistribution of Alberta. That is wholly without foundation and is therefore valueless as a charge. It is stated, next, that there are two ministers of agriculture. I do not think there are. As a matter of fact, if I had the making of appointments there would be more ex-ministers of agriculture in my department; but inasmuch as I have not I have to take what I can get. The member for Calgary East (Mr. Irvine) has moved that the salary of Mr. Duncan Marshall be reduced to one dollar. Mr. Marshall's salary is not under consideration; there is no item before the House concerning it; therefore I am afraid my hon. friend's motion is out of order.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: With reference to the remarks of the minister that no one has challenged Mr. Marshall's ability to perform the work deputed to him, that may be quite true, but we really do not know the extent of the work which he has undertaken. As to the question of patronage and the minister's suggestion that the onus of proof is with those who make the charge, I might point out the significance of a certain incident that occurred in the riding I represent. The position of postmaster became vacant through the death of the incumbent, and the gentleman who acted as chairman at the meeting and to whom I have referred—he was a member of the executive of the Liberal Association for Ontario—was in Ottawa and as a matter of fact, I believe, went back with Mr. Duncan Marshall. This political gathering was held at the point where the vacancy had occurred some time before. A good deal of pressure had been brought to bear to have appointed the man who had been acting as deputy, and after Mr. Marshall's visit to the constituency an active politician was appointed postmaster at this place. He had not been identified with the post office at all, but was a man of sixty-six who had been a farmer all his life; and to aggravate these circumstances, his sight was bad, as was also his hearing. Indeed, I am informed that it was found necessary to enlarge the numbers on the boxes so that he could distinguish them. All this occurred immediately after Mr. Marshall's visit to the constituency where he addressed a gathering of Grits, as the Globe states. Possibly he has been carrying out the instructions of the minister, who no doubt wants a real handy man, an experienced politician who can handle the situation as it should be handled.

11 p.m.

I brought this matter up on the Orders of the Day with reference to the question of a commissioner. I understand from a reading of the act that it is not within the power of the government to appoint a commissioner. I read in the press early in the session a report that a commissioner had been appointed from the constituency I represent to investigate

charges of government officials taking part in political matters. When I noticed that in the press, I called the attention of the government to it and asked if the commissioner was being appointed to investigate the case of Duncan Marshall, and I was informed that that was not the case. Now, this commissioner has evidently been appointed to investigate cases of this nature. I have nothing personally to say against the man who was appointed to this postmastership; he is a good citizen and all that, but he had been an active politician all his life. The person who had acted as deputy and had performed the work for several years was turned down and the recommendation of the party executive in the constituency was carried out in defiance of the Civil Service Act. I would ask the minister if he does not consider that is worthy of investigation; or has Mr. Duncan Marshall looked into it and decided that it is not necessary to make any further inquiry? Mr. Brown, chairman of the meeting I have referred to, had been in Ottawa a few days previously, and he informed the audience that Mr. Marshall was there by request of the Prime Minister, who was unable to go there himself.

The minister made some rather sneering remarks regarding the history in connection with the shipment of live cattle from this country. Anyone who knows anything about agriculture in Canada knows that cattle have been shipped from ports in this country across the water for years back. All the embargo affected was store cattle being shipped to inland points and fed there; they could be kept for a certain length of time at the port of landing, and that actually was done. So far as fat cattle are concerned, I do not think the embargo amounted to very much, and in view of the difficulties experienced and the conditions which now prevail I am just a little doubtful whether its removal will be of much benefit to those who desire to ship store cattle. The minister seems to have the idea that we should have sworn testimony here to show that Mr. Duncan Marshall was taking an active part in politics. Well, I have quoted the Toronto Globe; I can quote other papers. I have given the reports that were in the press, and I point to the fact that in the village in which he spoke there was a vacancy in the postmastership and that an appointment was made almost immediately after he was there. The man who was appointed was given the position in defiance of the Civil Service Act; he was sixty-six years of age; he had no special qualifications for the work—and this is going on all over the country. It is all very well to sneer at the Civil Service Commission. If you can get around the Civil Service Commission, as the minister evidently has done with regard to Mr. Duncan Marshall and with regard to the postmastership to which I have referred, I do not know where the end is to be.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I have nothing to do with the post office.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Apparently the minister has not much to do with a good many things that Mr. Duncan Marshall is doing; I quite agree with that. The very fact that Mr. Marshall was on the ground here almost immediately, and that during the campaign he was referred to by the speakers in that place as the coming minister of agriculture, is rather significant. It is well known that some of those who have been associated with him were here in Ottawa and were urging on the government that Mr. Marshall should have been appointed minister of agriculture, even before my hon. friend the present minister was appointed.

Mr. FIELDING: Mr. Chairman, I am not presuming to discuss all aspects of this question; in fact, I have not heard all the discussion. But I think it is only due to Mr. Marshall that I should bear testimony to the very valuable service he rendered in London in his capacity as Commissioner of Agriculture in connection with the conference regarding the cattle embargo. Mr. Marshall was, I do not hesitate to say, one of the most capable men present, and there were numerous officials of the British government there. I am sure that my colleague the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe) will join with me in saying we appreciated the good service he rendered. He knew his job thoroughly; he was constant in attention to the work, and in every respect he was a most admirable official to advise the government and the commissioners. If there has been any success attending the conference I desire to say that I believe it was in large measure due to the energetic work of Mr. Marshall.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend says he did not hear the discussion.

Mr. FIELDING: Not the first part of it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I can understand that, because the objections so far made have not been made against Mr. Marshall's personal character or his qualifications; they have been directed against the absolute disregard of law, against illegal payments and illegal actions by the Auditor General and by this government. It is idle to expect the Minister of Agriculture to know anything

about law; he does not, and he was quite right when he said he could not discuss the matter from that point of view. I am going to ask the Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin) what is the possible justification in law for this appointment. So far no answer has been made one way or the other. He is the hon. gentleman who can tell us whether there is any answer; we do not think there is. Surely we should hear from him.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: My hon. friend wishes me to express my opinion with regard to his view that the appointment of Mr. Marshall was illegal. I understand that the Minister of Agriculture, who had to appoint a commissioner, went to the Civil Service Commissioners, and consulted with them. After such consultation we came to the cabinet and recommended that Mr. Marshall be appointed commissioner, which he had the right to do. That recommendation was accepted. As to the appointment, I do not suppose there can be any discussion; the irregularity, according to my hon. friend, would be in the payment to Mr. Marshall of a salary which was not authorized. This question, I understand, was considered by the Auditor General, who is very careful in such matters and who knows the law. He decided that the appointment was regular and that the salary could be paid out of the item which had been voted by parliament for agricultural purposes, I cannot but accept the opinion of the Auditor General. If this is not satisfactory to my hon. friend, I would have no objection to considering the matter further than I have done after listening to the discussion, but I have not heard any argument which would convince me that anything irregular was done in this matter.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: May I ask the Minister of Justice whether any authority is given to the government under Section 38C of the act to appoint a commissioner by Order in Council? My hon. friend has the act before him, I think.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: No, I have not the act before me, but from the reading I have heard of it I think the Governor in Council has that right.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Well, then, we will have to debate it. I really thought there was nothing to debate; I thought it was perfectly clear that the act meant just what it said. Now, I am going to read it again—and I am referring to the section that is referred to by the order itself. I am not imputing to the government the use of a section which they had not considered; I am dealing with the order exactly as the government itself adopted it, and the section I refer to is this:

> It is considered advisable that a commissioner be appointed under section 38C of the Civil Service Act as amended by chapter 22 of the Statutes of 1921.

And that act reads as follows:

> Nothing in this act shall affect the powers of the Governor in Council with respect to the appointment of any commissioner or other member of any royal or other commission or board or any deputy head.

I would ask my hon. friend if he thinks that gives power to the government which the government did not have, and I think with this section in front of him he will agree with me that all that that does is to reserve to the government such rights as the government had before the Civil Service Act was passed.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): May I ask the hon. gentleman if Mr. Marshall was appointed a commissioner under the authority of the Governor in Council. I have not heard the debate, but I would just like to know that.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Yes.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Just a commissioner?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: A commissioner.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I think I can tell my hon. friend the purpose of that section because I had something to do with it. That clause was drafted expressly to declare that the Civil Service Commission should not have the appointment of members constituting a commission. I remember the thing very distinctly.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That is quite right. In other words, it was to reserve to the government powers that the government before had. They parted with general powers of appointment, but they reserved the appointment of commissioners.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): It precluded the appointment of a commissioner or of a commission by the Civil Service Commission.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Yes, it reserved the right to the government, and I think the Minister of Justice when he has that section before him will agree with the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean).

I would ask another question, now that we have that cleared out of the way. What were the other powers of the government? Do either of these hon. gentlemen suggest that the government has inherent power to appoint com-

missioners? On the contrary, do not both agree that the power to appoint commissioners is given the government by acts of this House? Is there any doubt about that? Can there be any question about that? I pause for objection if objection there be. I do not think there can be one. We all know it is not so. We all know that the only right that the government has to appoint commissioners is fixed by the legislation of this House. I will come to that statute in a moment, but digressing for one minute, the hon. Minister of Agriculture says: This is no new job. He says: There was to be a Commissioner of Agriculture before. He is quite right. There is no doubt that the late Mr. James did act as a commissioner in connection with agricultural matters, but not the kind of commissioner that Mr. Duncan Marshall is at all one way or the other. Mr. James was a commissioner working here in the office and advising with the minister and the deputy head, looking after business, and appointed so far as the Civil Service Commission is concerned. The hon. Minister of Agriculture, if his memory is good, is going to agree with this too, that he found he could not get the right under the act to appoint such a commissioner. That was merely a name given to certain definite duties in the office. It was not a commissioner. Commissioner James was never a commissioner under this section, never a commissioner under the Inquiries Act. He was an officer of the Department of Agriculture, a regular officer, regularly maintained, and my hon. friend the Minister of Justice found he could not make that appointment because if that appointment were to be made it had to be made through the regular Civil Service Commission routine. So much for that, and again I do not hear any objection. We might just as well clear away the deadwood as we go.

Now I take up the act which gives the government the right to appoint commissioners, and that act is the Inquiries Act, chapter 104 of the revised statutes. There are two parts to that act. There is the Public Inquiries Act, and then there is the Departmental Inquiries Act, and I will take it that in so far as Mr. Duncan Marshall is concerned, although it is immaterial one way or the other, that the section which would apply to his case would be the second part. Now I want to point out to the committee that the powers of such a commissioner are conferred by that statute, and they are defined, and I want to submit that the fact absolutely is that Mr. Marshall has never done one single thing that is called for by that Inquiries Act, not one thing. Why, the subterfuge is too plain, it is too simple. That Inquiries Act was for the purpose of making just what we all understand inquiries to be. It is for the taking of evidence, the examination of witnesses and books and the like, and the making of a report; that is what it is. It is not supposed to cover the case of a man that gets a job at an annual salary in the Department of Agriculture or any other department. Is there any possible question as to that? Because if there is, I wish we could get it now? Is there any possible question as to what the Inquiries Act means, that is, that under that Inquiries Act commissioners may be appointed to inquire into specific matters placed in their hands, examine witnesses and books and report upon the subject matter of that inquiry? I ask my friend is there any other act under which this man could be appointed legally? Is there anything else? If there be, let us discuss it again.

I am going to take another matter up with my friend the Minister of Justice. I am going to ask him whether it is in the power of the government to take moneys voted by this parliament for one purpose and apply them to another. Is there any question as to that? I would ask my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, who is very familiar with the subject: Does this government claim it is within their power to take moneys voted by this parliament for a specific purpose and apply those moneys to another purpose?

Mr. FIELDING: If there was any doubt about the matter I would ask my friend the Minister of Justice.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Of course, I know my hon. friend is even an older politician than he is a Minister of Finance, but I know he has been Minister of Finance long enough to know that that is not right, that it is illegal, that it is thwarting the will of parliament, that it is an unauthorized use of public money. Does my hon. friend object to that statement as being too strong? I pause again for an answer.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I will answer my hon. friend when he has finished his remarks.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then I will take it for granted—

Sir LOMER GOUIN: No, do not take it for granted.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: —that we have a right to rely on the votes of this House being something that binds the government and binds the Treasury, and that the moneys voted cannot be misapplied. I am going to rely upon that. Now I point this out, that in so far as the bit we have been able to learn of Mr. Duncan Marshall's activities, none of them can by any stretch of imagination be said to be properly connected with the vote out of which he is paid. Why as to this educational business, the minister has the order in council before him and he will correct me if I am wrong. The aid towards agricultural instruction that is given to the provinces is the thing referred to, imprimis. What on earth have Mr. Marshall's activities in England to do with that question? That is, that in connection with instruction by the provinces aid will be given by the federal authorities. How can it be said that has nothing to do with the question? Of course, my hon. friend knows it cannot be said. It is true the order in council goes on to say the commissioner may look after other matters that may be referred to him. But how can those other matters have anything to do with that vote of $1,100,000. What possible justification is there for the switching of public moneys to meet political contingencies?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Yes, I ask what justification there is for it. I sympathize with the Minister of Agriculture. He had a fight on his hands out in the West, and at one of his meetings he promised the people of Regina that he was going to be the next Minister of Agriculture. At Calgary his great protagonist, Duncan Marshall, was also running his "I am to be the next Minister of Agriculture" campaign. Something had to be done. Hon. gentlemen say they do not know which of these two gentlemen, both of whom were to be Minister of Agriculture, got here first. Well, the Hon. Mr. Motherwell made good his pledges to the people in that one regard; he got the job. Mr. Duncan Marshall consequently could not make his pledge good. Something had to be done for him and something was done. That is the whole reason we have the statutes flouted and public funds misapplied. Perhaps it is not fair to ask the Minister of Justice to finally pass upon this question at the present time, but I think the House has the right to ask that the Minister of Justice, who advises in these matters, shall look into this question and that it shall stand until he has had a chance of so doing.

[Sir Lomer Gouin.]

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I have nothing to discuss with respect to Mr. Marshall and I do not intend to enter upon any such discussion; I only wish to answer the question that was put to me by my hon. friend. He wished me to express my opinion upon the legality of the appointment of Mr. Marshall and the payment of his salary. Well, I have before me the order in council which appointed him and this is what it says:

> The Committee of the Privy Council have had before them a report, dated 1st February, 1922, from the Minister of Agriculture, submitting that the Agricultural Instruction Act under which the sum of $1,100,000 annually has been granted to the Provincial Departments of Agriculture for the purpose of aiding agricultural instruction in the provinces expires March 31st, 1923.
>
> The minister states that in view of the extraordinary and exceptional conditions in the agricultural world it is highly desirable that an investigation be made into the advisability of the continuation, discontinuation or emendation of the provisions of this Act; the amounts to be paid, and the methods of calculating such amounts in the event of its extension; and the scope of the work of the provinces to be undertaken with the assistance of funds provided thereunder.
>
> It is considered advisable that a commissioner be appointed under section 38C of the Civil Service Act as amended by chapter 22 of the Statutes of 1921, to conduct the investigation indicated above, and to inquire into such other agricultural problems as may be desirable and necessary.
>
> The minister, therefore recommends that Mr. Duncan Marshall, of Olds, Alberta, be appointed as a commissioner for the above purpose, and to perform such other duties of a cognate nature as may be delegated to him.
>
> The minister further recommends that Mr. Marshall be paid a salary at the rate of $6,000 per annum, said salary to be paid from the appropriation provided for the administration of the Agricultural Instruction Act and that this appointment date from January 15, 1922.
>
> The committee concur in the foregoing recommendations and submit the same for approval.

If I refer to chapter 22, of 11 and 12 George V, I find that section 38 C reads as follows:

> Nothing in this act shall affect the powers of the Governor in Council with respect to the appointment of any commissioner—

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Quite right.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Well, Mr. Marshall was made a commissioner to study the problem of agriculture, and it was provided that he should be paid out of a fund voted for agriculture. My hon. friend wants me to give my opinion on the legality of the appointment and the payment of the salary. After reading that order in council, reading that section 38 C, and referring to chapter 104 of the revised statutes I say without any hesitation that the appointment is perfectly legal and the payment of the salary to Mr. Marshall regular.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the minister—I want to be fair to him—answer this question? Will

he tell me what power is given—I emphasize the word "given"—what power is given by section 38 C that he has just read?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: The power to appoint a commissioner.

Mr. MEIGHEN: To investigate?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not at all.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I read it so.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the minister will read it he will see that he is wrong.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I have read it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is no question at all about it, there is a reservation but there is no power given. I hope the minister is, with unprejudiced mind listening to what I say. There is no power whatever given by that section, and the minister could not, I will venture to say, bring the authorities of his office to say there is. There is a power reserved to the government, the intention of the act and the wording of the act being that the power is to reside there and is not by this act transferred to the commission. Now let me emphasize this again, and I hope the minister will grasp it. There is no power whatever given to appoint anybody or to do anything. How could the word "affect" be used if there is a power given?

> Nothing in this act shall affect the powers of the Governor in Council with respect to the appointment of any commissioner.

Assuming that there were powers, which there were, this act does not affect those powers. Consequently the Governor in Council is thrown back upon the powers that there were. He is not given any more powers and he must exercise the powers that there were because no further powers are given. If the minister would just reserve this and take a little time to think it out there is no question but that the matter is not even debatable because no powers are given at all. The Governor in Council has to take all the powers there were, and those powers are reserved to the Governor in Council. The act makes quite clear that they are not affected and not transferred to the commission. What powers were there before? There were powers under the Inquiries Act. The government might have exercised those powers, but in the exercise of them they could not have made this appointment. They could not under the Inquiries Act have appointed a commissioner and paid him out of the Agricultural Instruction vote. They had to pay him out of the vote applicable to the purpose. That is where there is a misappropriation of funds. The miscellaneous vote of parliament is applicable for a purpose. They did not want to go to that vote. Perhaps there were no moneys there. The only way they could appoint a commissioner was under the Inquiries Act, under the powers given them prior to the passing of section 38 C of the Civil Service Act. Further, had they appointed under the Inquiries Act, the inquirer would have had the powers given by that act and no other. All the restraints and restrictions of that act would have applied. That is the only kind of a commissioner they could have appointed. The powers to appoint that commissioner were reserved by section 38 C, but no new powers were given. If the minister had had time to go into it, and had given full consideration to the actual meaning of the English words, I think he never would have expressed his opinion as a lawyer that they had the power. I suggest that he consult the officers of the department and bring an official opinion to this House. I confidently say that he cannot get them to give an opinion that any powers whatever are given to the government by section 38 C of the act.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: The hon. member did not ask me to give him the opinion of the officers of my department. He asked me for my opinion and I gave him an answer, taking section 38 C, the Inquiries Act and the order in council in conjunction—I gave my opinion candidly.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That what?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: That we had the right to make that appointment, and the payments we made.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think the minister means that his opinion is that a commissioner could be appointed under the Inquiries Act for the purpose of carrying out the object of that act, but he will not find any one of those objects have any connection with this man's work. He will find he has not called one witness and he will find that he has made absolutely no report, as called for by that section.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: That is another question, but if you read section 2 of chapter 104 of the revised statutes, you will find that the Governor in Council may, whenever he deems it expedient, cause inquiry to be made into and concerning any matter connected with the good government of Canada or the conduct of any part of the public business thereof. I do not know what Mr. Marshall has done or

omitted to do, but as to the legal point which has been raised, I consider that the appointment was regular and that the payment was also regular.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: But I think the minister is referring to just exactly what he read, namely the kind of inquiry called for under the Inquiries Act.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I agree with that; there is no question about it, but this is not under this act. There was the power under that to have the inquiry as called for by the act, and that has not been done and is not being done. It was never thought of. The job was thought of and the job is still going on. The minister has not answered what, to my mind, is the most vital thing. Here we have an order in council which, I agree with him, can only be supported under chapter 104. What right or what power is there in the case of a commissioner appointed under that section, to charge the expenses and cost to this agricultural vote?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Because it was an investigation in regard to agricultural matters.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It may possibly be, although I do not think so, that under the Audit Act, which has to do with our appropriations, we could charge to a specific vote the cost of an inquiry which had to do absolutely with that one particular vote. But that is not the case here at all. We have here a concrete vote of $1,100,000 in connection with the Agricultural Instruction Act. It is not pretended that Mr. Duncan Marshall was engaged in England in connection with that matter. It is not pretended that he went down to Florida in connection with that. It is not pretended by the minister in charge of this department that there is a word of truth in the suggestion that he was acting as a commissioner to find out something in connection with the Agricultural Instruction Act. He went to Florida for the purpose of getting immigrants to come to Canada.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: That is a matter of fact. I was not questioned on the facts. It was on a point of law and it is on that question that I have given my opinion.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Perhaps I should not press my hon. friend any further on the point.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Before the vote is taken, may I point out that the salary of Mr. Marshall is not taken out of this item, but out of another item?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It has just as much right to be taken out of this as out of the other one.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It has not.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The matter as to where the government may choose an item to misappropriate money is not a matter of concern to this House. The government has no right to take it out of either vote—none whatever.

Mr. BUREAU: There are two items; one is for a grant to the provinces of Canada for the purpose of assisting and encouraging agricultural instruction, grants to be made on a proportionate basis. That is item No. 51.

The CHAIRMAN: Item 14 on page 8 of the estimates is the one under consideration.

Amendment (Mr. Irvine) negatived: Yeas 39; nays 82.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the minister is confident of his opinion, will he undertake to grant a fiat that this matter may be tested?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, no.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: A fiat for what?

Mr. MEIGHEN: A fiat to test the validity of the payment to Duncan Marshall under this appointment by order in council.

Mr. BUREAU: That is childish. Take your medicine.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We will get the medicine first, and then we shall see who takes it. Will the minister undertake so to do?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I will not undertake that to-night. If I have a petition to that effect, I will consider it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister should have considered the matter before he gave his opinion to-night.

Item agreed to.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the House adjourned at 11.45 p.m.

Thursday, May 31, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

REPORT

Seventh report of the Select Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills.—Mr. McGiverin.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

GOVERNMENT PRINTING

Mr. McMURRAY:

1. What amount of money was paid by the Dominion government for printing, to firms in the city of Winnipeg, during the years 1920, 1921 and 1922?
2. What amount was paid by the Dominion government to the Winnipeg Saturday Post, Limited, for printing, during the above mentioned years?
3. Who are the directors and shareholders of Winnipeg Saturday Post, Limited?
4. What amount of money has been paid to firms in the city of Winnipeg by the Canadian National Railways, for printing, during the years 1920, 1921 and 1922?
5. What amount of money was paid by the Canadian National Railways for printing, to the Winnipeg Saturday Post, Limited, during the years 1920, 1921 and 1922?
6. Are all contracts for the said printing submitted to tender?
7. If not, what amount is open for tender?
8. Is all printing for use in Manitoba printed by firms in Manitoba?
9. If not, why?

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK: Dropped.

SCHOONER CARRIE L. HIRTLE

Mr. HANSON:

1. Was the schooner Carrie L. Hirtle seized by the Customs authorities during the present year? If so, what were the grounds of the seizure?
2. Was the said schooner ordered to be sold by public tender?
3. If so, were tenders received both at Lunenburg and Ottawa, when did the tenders close, where, and by whom were they opened?
4. How many tenders were received, (a) at Lunenburg; (b) at Ottawa?
5. What are the names of the various tenderers, the amounts of their respective tenders and what tender, if any, was accepted?
6. What steps, if any, were taken to advertise the said tender?
7. Were tenders advertised in the public press? If so, in what newspapers and for what length of time?
8. If not, why were public tenders not called for in the press?

Hon. Mr. BUREAU: I have spoken to the hon. member about this question, and I think we can arrange it without the question being answered.

Question dropped.

CANADIAN GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS—FIXED CHARGES

Mr. CAMPBELL:

1. Have the fixed charges against the Canadian Government Railways been added to the public debt?
2. What is the total capitalization of the Canadian Government Railways to the present date?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Capital expenditures on account of what are known as Canadian Government Railways—Intercolonial, Prince Edward Island, Transcontinental and Eastern Branch lines—are dealt with in the books of the government of Canada in the same way as other public works of the Dominion, consequently, fixed charges are not allocated nor interest charges debited against these railways.

2. Capital investment at December 31, 1922, $414,905,912.47.

THE KING'S BIRTHDAY—ADJOURNMENT

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) moved:

That when this House adjourns on Friday, the first of June next, it stand adjourned until Tuesday, the fifth of June next.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York): May I ask the Prime Minister if the birthday of His Majesty has yet been fixed as a public holiday in Canada?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes, for Monday.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York): How is it fixed, by proclamation or by statute? I could not ascertain by consulting the calendar whether it was a public holiday or not.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The date has to be fixed by proclamation. I may quote from the Interpretation Act—the King's birthday is in the list of holidays. The act reads:

The birthday or the day fixed by proclamation for the celebration of the birthday of the reigning sovereign.

The birthday of His Majesty coming on Sunday, the government by proclamation made Monday the day to be observed.

Motion agreed to.

PUBLIC SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved that the House to-morrow go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, That it is expedient to extend for one year the operation of the Public Service Retirement Act, chapter 67 of the statutes of 1920, as amended by chapter 49 of the statutes of 1921, and by chapter 39 of the statutes of 1922.

He said: His Excellency the Governor General, having been informed of the subject matter of this resolution, recommends it to the consideration of the House.

Motion agreed to.

CANADA COLONIZATION COMPANY

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. J. S. WOODSWORTH (Centre Winnipeg): It is stated in a press despatch from Winnipeg this morning that the Canada Colonization Company is being re-organized with representation from both the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canadian National Railways. The despatch goes on to say that there is an arrangement by which the Canadian National will pay $100,000 for the period of five years. I should like to ask if the government has any information to give us in regard to this arrangement.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING—(Prime Minister): This is a matter, I think, the Minister of the Interior would like to answer, and I would be obliged if my hon. friend would permit it to stand until another day when the hon. minister is in the House.

INQUIRY FOR RETURNS

On the Orders of the Day:

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): A large number of orders for returns have been made by the House that have not yet been complied with by the government. I desire to call attention to some selected from the others because moved by hon. gentlemen of the party behind me. On the 12th February, an order passed for the production of correspondence, and a statement of regulations, conditions, and so forth, entered into between Canada and Great Britain in connection with imports of Canadian cattle into the United Kingdom. That was moved for by myself, and why it is not down I cannot imagine. On the 19th of the same month, on the motion of the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. McKillop) an order was made for a return showing the number of appointments to the Civil Service during 1922 and the number of returned men so appointed. This return is not yet down, at least it was not on the 26th of this month. On the 21st February, the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Charters) obtained the order of the House for correspondence relating to the overcharging of immigrants at Quebec. The same remark will apply to that. On the 5th March, the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) obtained an order regarding the dismissal of officers and employees of the government from the 1st January, 1922, to date, and the names of the persons now occupying their positions. To this order the like remarks apply. On the 11th April, the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Boys) secured the approval of parliament to an order for the production of orders in council ratifying purchases or sales of property by the Canadian National Railways and the Grand Trunk Railway. This order has not been complied with. On the 16th of the same month, the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) had an order passed calling for correspondence regarding the transportation of liquor over the Canadian National Railways. So far as I can ascertain there is default with regard to this order also —there was, at any rate, on the 26th of May. The same hon. member on the same day obtained an order showing the earnings and expenditures of various individual vessels of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine. which order is not yet down. On the 25th, of the same month the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Church) obtained an order for the production of documents regarding the sale of the Toronto Suburban railway to the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario or the city of Toronto. That is not complied with. On the 7th, of this month, now more than three weeks ago, on my motion, a very important order passed for a return showing the sales and purchases of real estate properties by the Canadian National Railways and the Grand Trunk Railway since October 4, 1922. No production has been made of these returns. There were three more orders passed on the 7th of this month, the same date—two by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Church), and one at the instance of the hon. member for York-Sunbury; and none of them are down yet. Quite a number of orders have since been passed, but I pass them by. Some of the orders of which I have spoken are three and a half months, and more, old, but no attention seems to have been paid to them by the government.

Hon. A. B. COPP (Secretary of State): I may explain to my right hon. friend that these returns come from my office and I am continuously urging the officials to get them down as promptly as possible. There have been a very large number of returns called for this session, some of them very voluminous. I thank my right hon. friend for bringing this matter to the attention of

the government, and I will notify the officials concerned to hurry the preparation of the returns as quickly as possible.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think the number of returns ordered this session is unusually large, I think it is unusually small.

Mr. COPP: I did not say the number was unusually large. I said there was a very large number.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The staff in other years have brought down many more.

DAIRY ACT, 1914, AMENDMENT BILL

On the order: Second reading of Bill No. 186, to amend the Dairy Industry Act, 1914.—Mr. Motherwell.

Hon. W. R. MOTHERWELL (Minister of Agriculture): Owing to certain changes having been made by parliamentary counsel in the drafting of this bill which, while not changing the meaning of the measure, make it different and more difficult to explain, I move that the bill be discharged from the order paper with a view to possible redrafting and resubmission to the House.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): Will the minister explain how the bill is more difficult to explain if the meaning is not changed?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: As drafted by parliamentary counsel portions of the former bill were inserted that were not in the bill submitted to me. That makes the bill appear quite different from what was contemplated, and the intention of the draftsman and counsel would be more difficult to explain.

Mr. DONALD SUTHERLAND (South Oxford): Perhaps the minister would not object to informing the House in what respect the bill has been changed? I understand it has been arranged for a motion to be moved this afternoon which will prevent this bill from going into effect this session. It depends on the result of the debate which takes place and the motion of my hon. friend from Cape Breton South (Mr. Carroll); and the minister ought to explain to the House whether he is a consenting party to having this part of the bill obliterated, and be dependent upon the result of the motion which is to be debated this afternoon.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: In compliance with the hon. member's request, I have in my hand the bill as redrafted, and an initialled copy got out by parliamentary counsel. The original draft reads as follows:

2. Section five of the said act is amended by adding at the end of paragraph (b) thereof the words "or less than eighty per centum of milk fat"; and by striking out, in paragraph (c) thereof, in the second line the words "what is generally known as", and in the third line thereof the words "nor add any milk or cream or butter".

The draft incorporated by parliamentary counsel and not to be found in the original act as submitted to my department and by myself to this House reads:

5. No person shall—

(a) manufacture, import into Canada, or offer, sell or have in his possession for sale, any oleomargarine, margarine, butterine, or other substitute for butter, manufactured wholly or in part from any fat other than that of milk or cream;

(b) mix with or incorporate with butter, by any process of heating, soaking, rechurning, reworking, or otherwise, any cream, milk, skim milk, butter milk or water to cause such butter when so treated to contain over sixteen per centum of water, or less than eighty per centum of milk fat;

(c) melt, clarify, refine, rechurn, or otherwise treat butter to produce "process" or "renovated" butter.

The parliamentary counsel takes the position that that makes the section more intelligible. I take the ground Mr. Speaker, that it makes the section less intelligible. However, parliamentary counsel is right in this respect; inasmuch as the Oleomargarine Act of 1919 and subsequent amendments suspend all these provisions of the Dairy Industry Act or amendments thereto, and I think counsel is strictly right. This particular section in the Oleomargarine Act says:

Section 3, Notwithstanding anything contained in The Dairy Industry Act, 1914, chapter 7 of the statutes of 1914, or in any other statute or law, the manufacture in and importation of oleomargarine into Canada—

Which, Mr. Speaker, would cover this law, if we had it as it appears now on the order paper. The section continues:

—shall be permitted until the thirty first day of August, one thousand nine hundred and twenty one; and the offering for sale, the sale, and the having in possession for sale of oleomargarine shall be permitted until the first day of March, one thousand nine hundred and twenty-two.

So that if the bill had gone through as it appears now on the order paper it would have been suspended by the provision of the Oleomargarine Act which I have just read. That was the position taken by parliamentary counsel. Notwithstanding that, however, on the face of it the bill as now drafted appears as if we were prohibiting the manufacture or sale of oleomargarine.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think that under section 436 a motion to discharge must be

unanimous. I could not agree to-day, as far as I am concerned. I am prepared to read over what the Minister of Agriculture has said and try my best to understand it, and if it constitutes a reason for the course he wishes to take, I will agree at a future date.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I would not expect my hon. friend to understand it, because it is pretty difficult to understand.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: With regard to the explanation made by the minister I would like to point out that section 2 of the bill is really the suspended section of the Act of 1914, and consequently, if this bill is withdrawn and the motion of my hon. friend from Cape Breton South should carry—

Mr. SPEAKER I must remind the House that the motion is not debatable because it can only be made by unanimous consent. As there is no unanimous consent, no debate can take place. Let me call the attention of the Minister of Agriculture to page 541 of Bourinot, where he says:

XX. Bills once introduced, not altered except by authority of the House.

While a bill is in progress in the Commons no alteration whatever can be made in its provisions, except by the authority of the House. If it should be found that the bill has been materially altered since its introduction it would have to be withdrawn. A clerical alteration, however, is admissible. If it be necessary to make any changes in the bill before the second reading, the member in charge of it will ask leave to withdraw the bill and present another instead thereof.

The leave must therefore be unanimous, and as it is not, the motion cannot be made to-day.

OLEOMARGARINE

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I beg to move that the House do now proceed to notice of motion No. 9, in the name of the member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Carroll), respecting oleomargarine.

Mr. DONALD SUTHERLAND (South Oxford): I rise to a point of order and would calle the attention of the House to Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules, section 423, which says:

A motion must not anticipate a matter already appointed for consideration by the House, such as the subject matter of a bill on the order paper.

The motion now before the House is one dealing with the subject matter of a bill which stands in the name of the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Consequently, I contend, it would be out of order to proceed with this resolution.

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. SPEAKER: I should like to hear the opinion of some of the older members on the point of order, but I feel inclined to declare the point well taken. If the bill introduced by the hon. Minister of Agriculture had been withdrawn, then under rule No. 36, the motion of the member for Cape Breton South could have been debated, but as the bill is still before the House and deals directly with the subject matter of the resolution in the name of the hon. member for Cape Breton South, I think that the point is well taken. Beauchesne's Section 423 under Rule No. 42 says:

A motion must not anticipate a matter already appointed for consideration by the House, such as the subject matter of a bill on the order paper.

The bill introduced by the Minister of Agriculture—

Mr. SUTHERLAND: On what date was the bill introduced?

Mr. SPEAKER: The bill was introduced on the 28th May and is still before the House. No action has yet been taken and I conceive the objection arising in the mind of the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland). This motion was put on the order paper before this bill, but no action was taken on it. It is still there. It could have been withdrawn any day by the hon. member. On the other hand the bill which deals with the same question, in one of its sections, was duly introduced in the House on the 28th May. Action was therefore taken on this bill, first by its being introduced, then by its first reading, and finally the second reading was fixed for to-day. Therefore it stands for consideration before the House. I find in that bill clause 2, which reads:

Section 5 of the said act is repealed, and the following is substituted therefor:

"5. No person shall—(a) manufacture, import into Canada, or offer, sell or have in his possession for sale, any oleomargarine, margarine, butterine, or other substitute for butter, manufactured wholly or in part from any fat other than that of milk or cream."

That is exactly the subject matter of the motion standing in the name of the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Carroll), and as that bill is not yet withdrawn and is, according to the rules, before the House, the motion cannot be debated to-day because it would be, according to the authority above quoted, "anticipating a matter already appointed for consideration by this House."

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals): Mr. Speaker, might I be permitted to say a word before you give

your ruling? I imagine the rules of the House are intended to be practical. If the rule was violated by any person, it was not by the hon. member for South Cape Breton (Mr. Carroll), but by the minister. If the ruling be correct that the introduction of a bill, after notice of a resolution, will prevent the discussion of that resolution, then any resolution introduced in this House can be stopped by some person introducing a bill. It seems to me that the priority in this case should apply to the resolution. I can understand the rule to mean that the bill could not be proceeded with so long as the resolution stood in the way, but I cannot understand the practicability of a rule which would permit any member of parliament to stop a resolution being discussed by merely introducing a bill.

Mr. CARROLL: And then withdrawing it.

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes, he could withdraw it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am pleased indeed to express my opinion, not meaning at all that it is thorough or mature. So far as I understand the resolution, I quite support the inclination of the Chair. The rule has been read, and it provides specifically that no motion may be made that affects the subject matter of a bill appointed for consideration. This bill has been dealt with by the House. Not only has leave to introduce been moved and passed; but a first reading has been moved and passed, and the bill has been appointed by the House for second reading. Consequently no motion, certainly no motion not heretofore dealt with, can be taken up that deals with the subject matter of the bill. The hon. member says that if anyone has broken the rule, it is the minister. Nobody has broken the rule.

Mr. GRAHAM: I mean the spirit of it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Nor the spirit of it. The minister has introduced the bill; he has had it dealt with; he has had it dealt with at a first reading. There is nothing in the rule which prevents that being done. Supposing what my hon. friend (Mr. Graham) says is right, any hon. member by the mere fact of putting a motion on the order paper can stop legislation; he can stop effective legislation. A motion gets us nowhere save to the conclusion of agreement or disagreement; it does not bring about legislation. An hon. member by placing a motion on the order paper and by holding it there until the end of the session, could prevent the House from moving by way of legislation. The rule takes care that that cannot be done, and consequently I think the point is well taken and should be upheld.

Mr. FIELDING: I do not rise to discuss the ruling at all. I concur in it. I submit this, that the question of oleomargarine must be discussed. Therefore, why cannot we waive the rule so as to let us discuss it and thus settle the matter?

Mr. MEIGHEN: We can discuss it on the bill.

Mr. FIELDING: The bill is wrong. The bill is withdrawn.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Correct the bill.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Owing to the fact that there is certain correspondence between parliamentary counsel and my deputy in connection with this bill, I think the House should be made aware of the contents of this correspondence. It is very short.

Mr. McMASTER: I rise to a point of order, as points of order seem to be raised all the time. It would be nice if we, down in this part of the House, could hear what is going on—

Mr. LAPOINTE: Do not sit there.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Come back to your old place on this side, and then you will be able to hear.

Mr. McMASTER: —and perhaps this might be of some use in the public interest.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I was asking for permission to read certain correspondence between the parliamentary counsel and my deputy with respect to this bill. After the bill had been sent to the parliamentary counsel in the form in which I have it in my hand—

Mr. SPEAKER: I thought the minister was speaking on the point of order, but I see that he is refering to another phase of the subject. He should have read that correspondence when he moved for the withdrawal of the bill.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Perhaps the House could get in line with the discussion, by the minister asking us to endorse what he has already moved, namely, the withdrawal of the bill. Then the discussion could go on.

Mr. W. F. CARROLL (Cape Breton South and Richmond): I do not pretend for a moment to know the rules of the House as re-

gards procedure; but it strikes me as a sort of commonsense man, that the objection of the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) is not just what I would expect from a man of my own calibre, that is, a man of common sense. May I point out to you, Mr. Speaker, that this is a measure that must be preceded by a resolution? I do not pretend to be in the same class as the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell), who will one day introduce a bill and then ask leave of the House to withdraw it—I am not saying that in any carping or criticizing way. But supposing that method were carried on in this House, does the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) think it would get us anywhere?

Mr. MEIGHEN: We did not let him withdraw it.

Mr. CARROLL: No, that is the trouble. My right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) has been criticizing more or less the action of the government in refusing to bring in the question of oleomargarine, and I would say, correctly so, if I were allowed to say that. He has the opportunity to-day, by consenting, by making the consent of the House unanimous, to allowing the Minister of Agriculture to withdraw his bill, of allowing us to go on if Mr. Speaker's ruling is right, and discussing the question of oleomargarine.

Coming back again to the question of the resolution, I think on two or three occasions questions of this kind have come before the House. The hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens), I think it was, on April 14, 1920, made a motion in this House regarding the Water Carriage of Goods Act, and he was told by the Speaker at that time that that motion would have to be preceded by a resolution. At that time there was on the order paper a bill dealing with that very motion much more advanced than is the bill of the Minister of Agriculture.

Then again, a gentleman who is now in the Senate, Mr. McCoig, on May 6, 1920, was balked in proceeding with a bill regarding the standardization of agricultural machinery. There was on the order paper at that time legislation in the form of a tariff resolution.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, what would be the result if your ruling in this particular instance were right?—I hasten to assure you, Sir, that I am not criticizing your ruling; but you desire the opinions of hon. members and I am simply giving my own humble view of the situation. My hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) has asked, I presume, with perfect sincerity, that he be allowed to withdraw his bill, and the House has refused to give its unanimous consent to that withdrawal. Now, Sir, I contend, notwithstanding the quotation you have submitted, that any hon. member may withdraw any bill standing in his name, and is not bound to proceed with it. The Minister of Agriculture says: I desire to withdraw my bill; I am going to bring in another one at some future time and therefore I shall not proceed with the one at present on the order paper. Who is the arbiter on that question? Is it the House, or is it the hon. gentleman who, having introduced the bill, finds that circumstances are such as to suggest the advisability of his withdrawing it? If he does not wish to proceed with his bill, and the House is not willing to give its unanimous consent to its withdrawal, is it contended that any hon. member is precluded from taking up a resolution which was on the order paper in his name long before the date at which the minister's bill appeared thereon? I ask, is it fair or just that an hon. member should be deprived of the opportunity of discussing a resolution, under such circumstances as I have just stated, simply because the Minister of Agriculture saw fit to introduce at a later date, a bill touching largely the same subject?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I would ask the hon. member this: How many times has this resolution been called since it was first placed on the order paper?

Mr. CARROLL: It has never been called except on a single occasion, and at that, it was called at five minutes to six on a Wednesday afternoon, when I naturally refused to proceed with the consideration of it. As a matter of fact, I think that certain hon. members in this House so calculated their time as to have my resolution called at that particular moment. As I say, I naturally refused to go on with a subject of the importance which I attach to this question; certainly I could not have done justice to it in five minutes, and no one could have expected to attempt to take it up on that occasion. I daresay that had it been discussed at all, the good judgment of the House would have favoured the manufacture of oleomargarine. The leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) has said that the minister's bill was appointed for second reading. Well, the minister's judgment was that the second reading should not be gone on with. He said, in so many words: I do not wish to go ahead with my bill; I propose to withdraw it. Under all the circumstances, Mr. Speaker, and with all due deference to what I consider the tenour of your ruling, I submit that it is absolutely unjust that an hon. member should be pro-

hibited—even though prohibition may be advisable in some respects—from exercising what I believe to be his right in this particular instance.

Hon. S. C. MEWBURN (East Hamilton): I think, Mr. Speaker, that we have had too much quibbling over technicalities in this House, involving too great a waste of time. While I bow to your ruling, I feel with the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) that the House should give its unanimous consent and concede to the hon. member the right to proceed.

Hon. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou, Acting Minister of National Defence): It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that under the rules the hon. member for Cape Breton South and Richmond (Mr. Carroll) would be quite in order in going on with his motion. Your Honour has cited the following rule:

A motion must not anticipate a matter already appointed for consideration by the House, such as the subject matter of a bill on the order paper.

What is the situation here? My hon. friend from Cape Breton South (Mr. Carroll) placed on the order paper at a certain stage in the session a certain resolution which, at that time, conflicted with no other motion before the House. The resolution when the hon. member placed it on the order paper did not anticipate any bill that had already been appointed for consideration by the House, and the hon. member therefore had the undoubted right at any time when opportunity offered to move the resolution. There is no authority that I can find either in Bourinot or in Beauchesne by which it can be contended that the later introduction of a bill can deprive an hon. member of the right to proceed with a motion which has precedence of it.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Priority obtains.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): The whole thing turns upon the point as to when the minister's bill was appointed for the consideration of the House. It was not appointed for such consideration prior to the time that my hon. friend's motion appeared on the order paper; therefore, that hon. gentleman had the prior right to proceed with his resolution. I submit, therefore, that hon. gentlemen, viewing the matter in the light of these circumstances, should give their unanimous consent that the hon. gentleman be allowed to discuss his motion.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): I wish to add a word, Mr. Speaker, on another point, I would observe, in answer to the hon. member (Mr. Macdonald), that the motion of the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Carroll) is now in reality only a notice of motion, no motion has been made at all; and the rule applies to a motion. The bill has been appointed for consideration by the words of the Speaker: "When shall the bill be read a second time?"—and the answer thereto: "At the next sitting of the House." That is the appointment for the consideration of the bill by this House, and consequently a motion cannot be made to deal with the subject matter of it. I only wish to say, so far as the question of technicalities goes, that there is no need for any interference with the rules of the House. All that has to be done is for the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell), representing the government on the subject, to move the second reading of the bill, get into committee ,and move all the amendments he desires. But his present action is merely an effort on his part to shift responsibility from the shoulders of the government. If the minister would move the second reading of the bill, the motion could be discussed, the House could go into committee on the bill, the minister could move whatever amendments he liked, and two discussions might thus be avoided.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I have the right also to refuse to do what my right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) suggests. Here in my hand is a copy of the bill I introduced, and which I can send across to my right hon. friend if he desires; in it there will not be found a single reference to oleomargarine. I gave an assurance to the hon. member for Victoria and Carleton (Mr. Caldwell) and also the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Carroll) that the bill would not contain anything on that subject, and yet I find another bill on the order paper apparently prohibiting the manufacture of oleomargarine. Why should I not exercise my right to discharge this order and re-draft the bill?

Mr. SPEAKER: That must be by unanimous consent. The Speaker is the servant of the House and at the same time he must be guided by the rules established by custom, by precedent and by law. The House can at any time take upon itself to suspend the rules, but the Speaker being the servant of the House, and being bound by the rules, can only cite them in support of his rulings.

Mr. GOOD: May I ask the minister a question? I understood him to say that the bill he introduced had no reference to oleomargarine. I have here Bill No. 186 which does refer to oleomargarine. Are there two bills under consideration?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The custom is to issue a proof sheet of every bill for submission to the various members interested, and accompanying that draft in this case was a suggestion of parliamentary counsel that it would be re-drafted along certain lines. That re-draft is now on the order paper. I was not aware of that until twelve o'clock last night.

Mr. GOOD: Who inserted this clause that the minister did not want in?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The parliamentary counsel, Mr. Foran, changed the draft of the bill.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Having raised the point of order, I should like to call the attention of the House to the fact that when the Committee on Agriculture met yesterday the subject of this bill and the resolution were before the committee, and I took exception—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member cannot refer to a matter engaging the attention of a special committee until the report of that committee is before the House.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I took exception to the irregularity and consequently—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I simply wish to refer to the remarks made by the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Carroll) who claimed that in the event of his motion carrying it would have to be followed by a bill. There is a bill before the House at the present time dealing with the same matter, which the Minister of Agriculture asks to have withdrawn, and which is an exact copy of the suspended clause of the Act of 1914. Consequently, we would gain considerable time by proceeding with the bill rather than with the resolution. I would point out that the resolution lacks only two days of having been on the order paper for three months. Can a private member hold up legislation by a motion remaining on the order paper in this way?

Mr. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, with your permission, I may say I had one opportunity, and one opportunity only, of moving this resolution, as I explained to the House a few minutes ago.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Therefore—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I think this discussion has lasted long enough. A few moments ago, when the point of order was taken, I intimated that I inclined to the view that the hon. member could not proceed with his motion whilst the same subject matter was regularly on the order paper before the House. I have listened to the remarks made on both sides, and I still hold the same opinion, that if the motion was proceeded with it would "anticipate a matter already appointed for consideration by the House," such as the subject matter of the bill introduced by the Minister of Agriculture. The case is exactly in point and I am deciding according to parliamentary practice.

Let me remind hon. members that, technical as the objection may at first sight seem to be, and arbitrary as the rules may sometimes appear—and I do not wish to lecture hon. members—these rules are the result of centuries of deliberation. When one studies them every day, as I do, one finds that there is a profound philosophy in, and a raison d'être for, each and every rule governing our parliamentary procedure. They were enacted for the protection of the people and of parliament as well.

Coming back to the point of order, I affirm my ruling that this debate cannot be proceeded with this afternoon because there is on the order paper a matter already appointed for consideration by the House, similar to that contained in the motion made by the hon. member for Cape Breton South.

SUPPLY

MARINE AND FISHERIES

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

MARINE AND FISHERIES

Ocean and river service—investigation into wrecks, $12,300.

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries): Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that I could not be present the other evening to hear the last part of the speech of my hon. friend from Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill). He has imposed upon himself a great deal of work in connection with the investigation into the wreck of the Alaskan on the Pacific coast, and he is to be commended for the great interest he has taken in this matter. I shall carefully examine and consider the evidence which was brought before the Commissioner of Wrecks and the assessors, and their report thereon together with the remarks of my hon. friend.

4 p.m.

As far as the Commissioner of Wrecks is concerned, I desire to say that his main function is to find out whether the master or other officers are at fault in the loss of their

ship. During the course of the investigation there was nothing to show that the unfortunate men who lost their lives in that wreck were in any way responsible for the disaster. However, I promise my hon. friend that if the evidence adduced points to the fact that the owners neglected to comply with any of the laws and regulations governing shipping—for instance, if they failed to report the condition of the machinery of the Alaskan—instructions will be given for the necessary steps to be taken to bring them before the proper tribunal.

With regard to changing the mode of holding these investigations, and the suggestion of my hon. friend that an Admiralty judge could discharge the duties much more satisfactorily, I may say that masters, mates and pilots would be the first to protest against such a change. They claim that these investigations can be much better conducted by men of the craft, men who have had practical experience in seamanship and who know the difficulties which have to be overcome on the high seas. There is much to be said in support of their contention; and the fact that the investigator is a certificated master and has to be assisted by two assessors, also certificated masters, would seem to me to ensure a thorough investigation in all cases. Of course, mistakes may be made. However, the argument of my hon. friend will be fully considered. I think he has made a strong case for reducing the tonnage of vessels subject to inspection so far as the hull is concerned. This matter has been brought to my attention by my hon. friend personally many times, and I am free to admit that I have been rather impressed by the arguments he has put forward to obtain that change. The law we have now has been in force since 1882. Inspection is required for vessels over 150 tons, and of course, all passenger vessels whatever their tonnage must be inspected. There are objections, coming especially from the owners of the smaller boats, which are very numerous, as my hon. friend knows. There may be objections so far as the expense which the change would involve is concerned, but that is of secondary importance. It is my intention that there shall be a full revision of the Shipping Act next year, and this question will be one of those which will engage the attention of the government, and I can assure my hon. friend that his arguments will be given all the consideration they deserve.

As regards the question of clearing up the trail on the west coast and replacing the bridges, I shall be pleased to confer with my colleague the Minister of Public Works and try and get what my hon. friend has asked for in the matter.

So far as the life-saving improvements are concerned, I have already announced what was the intention of the department, and I am pleased to see that my hon. friend has declared himself satisfied with the programme we have in view.

Item agreed to.

Navigation schools, $8,000.

Mr. MARTELL: I should like to bring to the attention of the hon. minister the matter I spoke of last year, the remuneration which is paid to men like Captain Marshall O'Hara who are conducting schools for master mariners. I think I brought to the attention of the minister last year what an excellent officer Captain O'Hara was, and I prayed the minister to be good enough to consider the advisability of giving him an increase in salary. I should like to ask if that has been done.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Captain O'Hara is now receiving $1,860 a year, or $155 monthly. Of course, I should be pleased if there was an opportunity to increase his salary. I may say that there are many officers and employees of the department for whom increases are asked, but I find difficulty in increasing the amount of my estimates both in council and in parliament.

Mr. MARTELL: I am not criticizing the hon. minister in regard to that. I know there are many demands for increases of salary, but my impression is this, coming from a race of sea-faring men; "They that go down to the sea in ships, they that do business in great waters", as the Bible says, are not, in my opinion, getting adequate remuneration for services. It is all very well to ask for increases in a department where a great number of those concerned are landlubbers looking after the rights of master mariners and sailors. All I have to ask is that the sailor of this country get adequate return for the work that he gives. I represent a constituency which in days gone by built the largest sailing vessels in the world and produced some of the greatest mariners in the world, and I would like to see more men of that type in the minister's department.

Mr. LAPOINTE: My hon. friend may be sure that his representations will be fully considered.

Mr. McBRIDE: What salary does Captain Eddy receive, at Vancouver?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Captain Eddy is Supervising Examiner of Masters and Mates and gives lectures as well in the navigation school. His salary, which comes under another item, is $2,580.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Where are these schools?

Mr. LAPOINTE: At Halifax, Yarmouth, North Sydney, St. John, Quebec, Kingston, Collingwood, and Vancouver.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is $1,000 given to each?

Mr. LAPOINTE: No. Some of them run the year round, and others only for some months each year. The salaries paid vary according to the length of time these men are engaged. In Halifax and Yarmouth the instructors give their whole time; in North Sydney four months; in St. John their whole time; in Quebec four months; and I think it is whole time in Collingwood and Vancouver.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I suppose a study of the principles of navigation and of the chart and compass is carried on at these schools?

Mr. LAPOINTE: It is to provide instruction for seafaring men who want to qualify as masters and mates. Afterwards they have to pass their examinations for certificates as officers.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is this all that they cost Canada—just $8,000?

Mr. LAPOINTE: For these schools, yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I mean the training for masters and mates. This is all the Dominion pays for education of this kind?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes.

Item agreed to.

To provide for the temporary relief of distressed seamen, pay legal expenses and the cost of shipping books and forms, $5,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister has some resolution on the order paper about this, too. What is the relationship between the resolution and this vote?

Mr. LAPOINTE: This appropriation is to provide for the relief of destitute or otherwise distressed seamen in foreign countries and bring them home. The resolution on the order paper is applicable only to sailors working on Canadian ships.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Then I would think the minister could reduce this estimate if previously it has taken care of all of them.

[Mr. McBride.]

Mr. LAPOINTE: It has not always, because I see that in 1921-2 the expenditure was $15,991. We cannot fix a definite amount because it depends on the wrecks that occur and the number of people who may have to be helped out of this appropriation.

Mr. MARTELL: Was it formerly the case that the master of a wrecked vessel when taken to a foreign port could not be sent home at the expense of the Canadian people? The sailors were looked after, but I understand the master mariner could not be sent home at the expense of the Dominion. As I understand it, under the present resolution masters may be treated in the same way as sailors.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I do not know that any distinction was ever made in this respect between masters and seamen.

Mr. MARTELL: I might say, with all deference to the minister, the old rule was that the master of a ship was not in any way helped home. In the old days the sailors were taken charge of and sent home, but a master could not be returned to this country at the expense of Canada. I know that was the case, from facts within my own personal knowledge.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It may have been the practice, but there was nothing in the law to warrant differentiation in treatment as between masters and men.

Mr. MARTELL: Is that practice followed now? It is a bad practice.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It has not been followed of late.

Mr. McBRIDE: The master of a ship can claim from the owner of the ship the right to be brought home and to be helped in case of sickness, or any other difficulty he gets into. The sailors cannot do that, as I understand it.

Item agreed to.

Removal of obstructions in navigable waters, $5,000.

Mr. KYTE: Does this apply to the wrecks of sunken vessels?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes, it is especially for that purpose.

Mr. KYTE: Does the department undertake to remove the wrecks of sunken vessels in navigable waters in all cases, or is the unfortunate owner required to pay the cost of the removal?

Mr. LAPOINTE: We always try to recover from the owners the amount which the department has spent.

Mr. KYTE: I may point out that very often great hardship is worked in such cases. Very frequently men are engaged in the coasting trade when that employment is not very remunerative and when the vessels are without any insurance. In such cases if the master loses his vessel it seems to be an additional hardship to call upon him to pay for the cost of removing the wreck. I have one or two cases in mind, and I am glad to have the assurance of the minister that the department is prepared to pay the cost where the owner cannot afford to do so himself.

Mr. LAPOINTE: As a matter of fact, the usual custom is for the department to do the work and recover from the owners. The department has to see that the obstructions are removed as quickly as possible. In such cases we must pay the men we employ and we try to recover from the owners afterwards.

Mr. KYTE: I have in mind now a case where a vessel was lost in the mouth of a river in Prince Edward Island. That wreck is at the bottom, but the department has informed the unfortunate owner that he has to maintain a buoy there as a protection to other vessels that might encounter the obstruction. That is a continuing cost upon the owner that he can very ill afford to pay. I should like very much if the minister would take that case into consideration, and I will bring it to his attention later on.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I certainly will.

Mr. HOCKEN: Under this heading I should like to ask the minister if adequate measures are taken for the protection of navigation. This vote provides for the removal of obstructions. But we had lately the case of the wreck of the Marvale. What provisions are made in the shape of wireless equipment and other means to prevent that kind of thing? As I understand it is easily possible now for any vessel to ascertain exactly where it is in a fog. Devices were perfected during the war which enabled ships in the North Sea in a dense fog to tell their exact position. So that the wreck of the Marvale off the coast off Cape Race might easily have been prevented if the proper precautions had been taken. Is there an efficient wireless service there so that a vessel can ascertain its location? If not, I should like to know from the minister if some improvements could not be made in this direction for the protection of shipping in those foggy areas around Cape Race and the shores of Newfoundland.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I have no objection to answer my hon. friend now, though the matter will come up later under another item. In the specific case to which my hon. friend has referred if its position had been asked for by the Marvale it could have been given. All the necessary facilities exist for that purpose. There is a direction-finding station at Cape Race quite in the vicinity where this accident occurred. The station was in full operation and we are fully convinced that its direction could have been given to the Marvale.

Mr. HOCKEN: Then, do I understand the minister to indicate that the wreck of the Marvale was a case of neglect on the part of the master?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I do not say that. What I say is that the facilities for giving the directions to the vessel were there.

Mr. HOCKEN: I see, and he did not take sufficient precautions to ascertain through those facilities where he was.

Mr. LAPOINTE: He never asked the officers in charge of the station.

Mr. NEILL: I should like to call the attention of the minister to an obstruction in Seymour Narrows on the east coast of Vancouver Island. There is a rock there which is something like ten feet below the surface at low water, and there is a strong tide which runs at the rate of nine or ten miles an hour through the strait. The result is that the passage is made very dangerous for vessels passing through. While there is a good width of water on the east side the danger is very much increased because there is a channel on one side, also with a very swift current, which tends to drive the boats over to this rock. It was only a year or two ago—possibly two or three years now—when one of the big American boats—because this is in the direct line of travel from Seattle to Skagway—was coming down and the current carried the stern in and she struck this rock knocking a hole in her bottom. Fortunately, they were able to beach the steamer about a mile and a half or a couple of miles further down, and by that time she had practically sunk, otherwise there would have been a total loss of life. It is calculated it would only cost four or five thousand dollars to blow this rock up. It consists of two pin-

nacles and it would not cost a great deal to blow them up. This would mean safety of navigation to the vessels taking that route. If this is not done there is going to be a big disaster there some day, because the boats that follow that route may be carried away by this current and driven over on to this rock. I think some of the officials of the department will remember the disaster referred to. I do not recall the name of the boat. Had she not been beached in the way I have described the whole of her passengers would have been lost.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The suggestion of my hon. friend would not come under this item, not even under this department. This item deals only with obstructions caused by wrecks or sunken vessels. The removal of this rock would come under the Department of Public Works, but I shall be pleased to submit the remarks of my hon. friend to my colleague.

Mr. NEILL: I thought perhaps the Minister of Marine and Fisheries might prove more generous than the Minister of Public Works.

Item agreed to.

Inspection of live stock shipments, $3,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I presume this is the work carried on, according to the Minister of Agriculture, by Mr. Duncan Marshall, and we can discuss that subject. What is meant by inspection of live stock by the Marine department?

Mr. LAPOINTE: This item was in the estimates prior to Mr. Duncan Marshall being discussed in the Canadian parliament. This appropriation is for the purpose of defraying costs incurred in the inspection of live stock for shipment in vessels, as provided by chapter 130, Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906. Under that act ships carrying live stock cannot clear from port without a government inspection certificate. The additional $500 required for 1923-4 as compared with 1922-23 is to provide for the salary and expenses of an inspector at the port of St. John, N.B.—part time—and for salary increases for two inspectors at the port of Montreal.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It has been suggested to the minister that he should consider combining the work of inspection with the Department of Agriculture. We are told that we are going to have all our live stock shipments inspected by that department. Therefore, we should get rid of overlapping which seems to be unnecessary. Most of the information covered by the certificate is purely formal, and does not amount to anything at all, such as the seaworthiness of the boat and that sort of thing, because all that is looked after particularly in connection with passenger boats; so that the inspection of live stock should be dealt with by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. LAPOINTE: With the expansion which agriculture will take under the new regulations, I think the suggestion of my hon. friend might be accepted.

Item agreed to.

To continue subsidies for wrecking plants—Quebec and British Columbia, $35,000.

Mr. LEWIS: Are these under the supervision of the Department of Marine?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: How much was spent last year?

Mr. LAPOINTE: We spent the entire amount: $25,000 to the Quebec Salvage and Wrecking Company Limited, and the other $10,000 to the Pacific Salvage Company Limited, on the western coast.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is that by contract or services rendered?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Contract.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What work was done by the Quebec company last year?

Mr. LAPOINTE: The company salvaged $47,766 last year.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: How many wrecks did they look after?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Ten wrecks in the Quebec district.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is the wrecking contract given as the result of a tender, or how?

Mr. LAPOINTE: It was renewed. They are the only people who possess the necessary plant for that purpose. The contract was renewed twice, I understand, for five years, and it was renewed again last year for a similar period.

Item agreed to.

Unforeseen expenses, $5,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: How much was the amount spent last year?

Mr. LAPOINTE: It was $4,202.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What were the unforeseen items?

Mr. LAPOINTE: This is for expenses which could not be anticipated—legal expenses, criminal investigations, advice, assistance of experts, and so forth.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Has this item been in for many years?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The same amount?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes, $5,000. Last year the expenditure was $4,202 and the previous year it was only $2,186, but the amount asked for was the same.

Mr. MEIGHEN: How much the year before?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I have only the two years.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: A fair ratio of increased cost with the change of government.

Item agreed to.

Life-saving service, including rewards for saving life, $90,000.

Mr. LEWIS: Is this under the minister's department?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes.

Mr. LEWIS: And it is maintained by the department?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes.

Mr. WALLACE: It was brought to my attention that the life-saving station near the end of Long Point, Lake Erie, is not in a position to function properly. I have never been there myself, but I am informed that this station is greatly in need of a power boat equipment. It is located on the inside of the point, on the bay side, where no wrecks ever occur, or could possibly occur, because there is no navigation there. It is at least five miles away from the point where any wreck could occur. They are only equipped with a rowboat, and a power boat is needed. I think it would be an advantage to put the life-saving station on the outside of the point where wrecks are likely to occur. As it is at present, a power boat or tug could leave Port Dover and reach any possible wreck just as quickly as the life-saving crew could reach it by rowing there. I think it would be well if the department would look into this, and see if some improvement could not be made regarding this station.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I shall be glad to have the officers of the department investigate what my hon. friend has just said, more so because the station to which he refers is one where we are spending most money in Ontario. The maintenance is at a cost of $7,500 a year, and the others are at much smaller amounts. The amount spent last year to the end of March—that does not include the month of April—is $60,635.96. I mean that some accounts had not reached the department in April.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the minister himself decide who is to obtain money for saving life? That is, are awards made, or are these amounts merely for maintenance of the stations?

Mr. LAPOINTE: This is for maintenance of stations on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts and on the Great Lakes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Are any rewards paid?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes. The appropriation covers rewards for saving life on the high seas where exceptional bravery is shown and risks taken in rescues. These rewards are made to the crews of Canadian vessels making rescues or the crews of other lines who rescue lives from danger. Of course claims for such rewards are investigated by a branch of the department.

Mr. MEIGHEN: How much was paid for claims in that channel alone?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am afraid I cannot give my right hon. friend that information now.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is an order in council required for approval of a recommendation for the payment of a reward for life-saving, or does the minister dole out the money himself?

Mr. LAPOINTE: If the amount is small, the minister deals with the matter himself. That has always been the practice. But if the amount is a little large, the matter goes through the formality of an order in council.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No order in council is then legally necessary. I should like to know about how much is paid in this case, because this is really an extraordinary power.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am informed that it is possible that no money at all was paid last year for any reward of that kind, but I could not say that positively. I will try to get the information for my right hon. friend.

Item agreed to.

Hydrographic Survey and to provide for the maintenance and repairs of hydrographic steamers, $364,080.

Mr. LEWIS: I was wondering whether this is a work that needs to be repeated every year, whether it is maintenance work. Will the work ever be done and this amount decreased?

Mr. LAPOINTE: This is to provide for the continuation of surveys by ship parties on the Atlantic coast, in the lower St. Lawrence and on the Pacific coast, and by small land parties in harbours and sheltered localities; the maintenance of automatic gauges on the St. Lawrence and Great Lakes and the compilation of charts and other similar work in the nature of aids to safe navigation in Canadian waters. It is new work that is going on. There are a few vessels which are especially engaged in this work under a branch of the department under Mr. Stewart.

Mr. LEWIS: Is the increase due to statutory increases?

Mr. LAPOINTE: The increase of $14,080 is to provide for certain necessary repairs and renewals of plant and equipment. It is also proposed to keep the steamer Acadia in commission for the work of ice-breaking operation on the south-eastern coast of Nova Scotia. That will involve some additional expenditure.

Mr. MEIGHEN: On every boat that one sails on, they have to-day apparently the most perfect charts showing, not only every indentation and every rock, but a photograph of the surface of the water. These all seem to be very old, indicating that the variations, shiftings since, have not been very great. I really would think it was not necessary to maintain so expensive a service as this costing between a quarter and half a million dollars a year.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Still, we cannot grant all the demands which are made upon the department for new surveys.

Mr. MEIGHEN: You could never do that.

Mr. LAPOINTE: There are some especially for British Columbia at the present time. A large part of our coast has not been properly surveyed for the safety of navigation so far.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It seems very strange to me. I do not know anything they do not know; I have never heard any complaint that there was any uncertainty as to the character of the coast line or of the floor of the ocean. Is it not just possible that the primary incitement to more expenditure comes from those who get the money, and they utilize others to serve their own ends? That is the case in many parts of the service.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I may give my hon. friend a resumé of the work which it is intended to do this year.

As regards the Pacific coast survey, the main work in hand on the Pacific coast is a survey of the waters off the southwest of Aristazabel and Banks islands in the southeast entrance to Hecate strait, as well as the completion of the surveys of Seaforth channel and Lama passage. The fine weather of the season from about the middle of June to the beginning of September will be used for this work. During the earlier part of the season and the autumn months operations will consist of sounding in the entrances to Victoria and Esquimalt, a re-sweeping of First narrows, Victoria harbour, and surveys of Genoa bay, Perceval narrows, Port Blackney, Laredo channel, Surf and Cumshewa inlets. For this work the steamer Lillooet and the small tug Restless will be available.

As regards the Atlantic coast survey, as soon as the Acadia has finished fitting out she will be stationed off the west coast of Nova Scotia at the approach to the Bay of Fundy and will continue the off-shore sounding started last season, when the work showed considerable necessity for new soundings. Next winter it is proposed that she continue breaking ice for the harbours of the southeast coast of Nova Scotia.

As regards the Lower St. Lawrence surveys, the party on the Cartier will, during the coming season, work in the southwest approach to the channel north of Anticosti island where traffic has greatly increased during the last few years and through which more information, both as regards hydrography and magnetic declination, is urgently required.

As regards the Magdalen island survey, the steamer Bayfield has been thoroughly overhauled during the past winter and will take up again the work of charting the waters in the vicinity of Magdalen islands, which had to be discontinued during 1922 on account of the condition of the steamer.

As regards the St. Lawrence river, it is proposed to undertake an examination of the river from end to end for the purpose of locating recent improvements, buoys, lights and conspicuous marks to furnish necessary information for a revision of the present charts. This is a work that has to continue almost permanently.

Mr. MARTELL: Exactly at what time did the Canadian authorities take over this work from the Imperial authorities? For a great number of years the British authorities kept the cruisers on the Atlantic doing this work and making charts. I do not see them there now? I presume that the Canadian authorities have taken that work over?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I cannot give the exact date when it was done but the Canadian authorities did take it over.

Mr. MARTELL: They have taken over a lot of work in that connection.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I heard, during the minister's explanation, soft, sweet accents from that vessel the Restless. Is there not a history to that vessel?

Mr. LAPOINTE: This is not the same Restless that my hon. friend has in mind.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I thought I had struck one of the holes out of which this money went. Apparently there is another Restless?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am afraid I must confess my ignorance of the history of the former Restless.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh. However when we get to the right Restless—the government seems to be restless on both oceans—I shall have a few words to say about it. Whereabouts in the Estimates will this Restless on the Atlantic coast come in?

Mr. MARTELL: Under the Customs estimates.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It is not in my department at all; I was getting restless myself.

Item agreed to.

Radiotelegraph service and to provide for the building and maintenance of wireless stations and the general administration of radiotelegraphy throughout the Dominion, $454,900.

Mr. LAPOINTE: There is a mistake in the printed Estimates. An amount of $22,410 ought to be deducted from the total. Certain items that had originally been included in the vote were struck out in council before the estimates were submitted to the House; hence the mistake. The amount therefore ought to be $432,490, which should give a decrease of $7,910 instead of an increase as shown in the estimates as they appear to the committee.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What was the revenue from licenses last year?

Mr. LAPOINTE: On the east coast the revenue for the fiscal year 1921-22 was $16,931.28; for ten months during the fiscal year 1922-23 it was $2,141.34. The Barrington passage station was closed on August 15, 1922. This station had been opened during the war and was no longer necessary. On the west coast the revenue for the fiscal year 1921-22 was $37,065.93, and for ten months during the following year $28,263.51. On the Great Lakes the revenue in 1921-22 was $164.55; for the following year the figures are not yet available.

Mr. LEWIS: I notice there is provision for a building and maintenance for wireless stations. Would not this more properly come under the Public Works department?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Part of the government wireless operations, as a matter of fact, is under the Public Works department still, while there is a branch of it in the National Defence department. But the radiotelegraphic service generally is under the Marine department. The idea is rather to concentrate instead of separating, and I think that all branches of the service will be under the Marine department as soon as this can be conveniently accomplished.

Mr. LEWIS: I was referring to the building itself. Why should not this be under the Public Works department, so that we might know how much money was being expended for all buildings? If it were included under the Public Works estimates we could ascertain just how much was being spent for all public buildings, and it would be so much easier to find it all under the estimates of one department.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The building of wireless stations is rather a technical work, and I think my hon. friend will agree that it is better that the technical officers of the Department of Marine, who are specially qualified for this undertaking, should do the work under that department.

Mr. LEWIS: I know that the technical equipment must be installed by the special officers of the Marine department, but I was referring to the building itself. However, would the minister inform the committee where the new buildings will be erected?

Mr. LAPOINTE: The amount includes revotes in the sum of $19,500 for additions and alterations to the government system provided for last year but which it was considered desirable to hold over for a year. These include the installation of continuous wave transmitters at Dead Tree point and Digby island, British Columbia, and the erection of

a dwelling house at the Canso direction finding station. In addition to this provision is also made for the erection of a direction finding station at a point to be selected on the west coast; for the erection of a direction finding station at St. Paul's island; for the erection of beacon stations at Belle Isle, and Heath Point, Anticosti; for the conversion of the station at Cape Sable into a direction finding station; for the transfer of Cape Bear station to Charlottetown; of the Cape Lazo station at Powell river, and of the Dead Tree Point station to Queen Charlotte city; and for the installation of continuous wave transmitters at Estevan station and Gonzales hill station. There is a net decrease of $7,910 as compared with 1922-23.

Mr. LEWIS: This includes salaries?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes, everything.

Mr. WALLACE: What stations are along the north shore of lake Erie? Is there a station at Port Burwell?

Mr. LAPOINTE: There are stations at Port Arthur, Sault Ste. Marie, Midland, Port Burwell, Toronto, Kingston, and Tobermory. These are the stations in Ontario.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Perhaps the minister can tell us how much of the vote goes for salaries? That should really be under civil government.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I have not the information here, I am sorry to say. This includes operators' salaries.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Of course it does. I should have thought that my hon. friend would at least have the information of the major part of his estimates.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I thought I was well supplied with information, but obviously this is one respect in which I cannot answer my hon. friend's question.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Can his deputy not turn up the salaries? While my hon. friend's deputy is looking that up—I think he must have the information in that big volume—I should like to know what became of the radiotelegraph bill. I suppose it went through?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: When the bill was before us the minister told me I could get particulars of the receipts from licenses when this item was under discussion. Can my friend give me this information now?

[Mr. Lapointe.]

Mr. LAPOINTE: I think I gave all that information when the bill was before the House on its second reading.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then I was not present, because I was told I could get the information when these estimates were up.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I will have a statement prepared and present it after eight o'clock.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Perhaps my hon friend can tell me what has been done under that bill.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The only arrangement made has been with the province of Manitoba. In fact I said at the time the bill was before the House that it was the case of Manitoba which we wanted to meet. The fee for a receiving station was one dollar. We have increased it to two dollars, half of which will go to the province of Manitoba.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: If that basis is followed we will have no loss in fees.

Mr. LAPOINTE: No. As a matter of fact the number of receiving stations is increasing daily.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Oh yes. Then there is another matter I intended to bring up when the bill was called, but apparently I was out of the House. Has the minister taken this matter up with the military authorities? We spend a good deal of money on the instruction of signal men, and many people connected with the service are of the view that if these distributing stations were placed in the hands of the men who are being trained in our military camps and the like it would be the most practical way of teaching them. They could do the broadcasting just as well as private individuals and at the same time receive very good instruction. Has that been considered by my hon. friend?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Negotiations are taking place at the present time between the two departments to that end. But even now a large number of military men are employed in this work.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I suppose the item had better stand until we get the information.

Item 227 stands.

Tidal and current survey, $35,000.

Mr. LEWIS: What is the difference between this item and No. 226?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Provision is made for the enlargement of necessary operations, involving an increase of $5,000 as compared with last year. The work of the tidal and current survey is for the scientific investigation of tides and currents on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts, Hudson bay, and the Arctic ocean, and the prediction of tides and the determination of tide levels. This is an appropriation for the operation and maintenance of permanent tidal stations, the equipment of tidal stations during the summer months, the salaries of tidal and current observers and the preparation and publication of tide tables for the two coasts, comprising two complete series and three abridged editions—all for the safety and convenience of navigation. This information is also furnished for harbour construction work.

5 p.m.

Mr. LEWIS: This is permanent work?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes.

Item agreed to.

Public works, chargeable to capital, Marine Department, River St. Lawrence ship channel—maintenance and operating dredging fleet, $613,000.

Mr. LAPOINTE: This is for the maintenance and operation of the ship channel dredging fleet and for the necessary machinery and plant. The fleet is employed on the improvement of the St. Lawrence between Montreal and Quebec and then farther east to Father Point.

Mr. MEIGHEN: How is the Marine and Fisheries department in charge of this? I see it comes under Public Works?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes, but this has been under the Marine department for about twenty years. I remember when it was transferred to the Marine and Fisheries. I think it was under the late Mr. Prefontaine.

Mr. MEIGHEN: How long has the vote run at this figure? This is a very, very large amount. It appears we are dredging and changing the floor of the St. Lawrence all the time, and then spending more money to find out how we have changed it.

Mr. LAPOINTE: No. The amount is less than it was in former years. The item is to carry out the programme for a thirty-five foot channel. There are still many miles of dredging to be done. Dredging operations have been going on for the last twenty years and will continue until the work is completed.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Can the minister give us the expenditure—not the vote—for a few years back?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I have here only the expenditure for 1921—$614,619. That is about $1,000 more than the current vote. I think it is about the average.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister cannot give us what was spent the year before?

Mr. LAPOINTE: No.

Mr. MEIGHEN: A minimum of information is being furnished.

Mr. JELLIFF: How much dredging was done last year? I should like to have a record of what this money went for.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Do you mean the quantity of dredging or the expenditure?

Mr. JELLIFF: I mean the amount of work done.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I have the total amount of dredging which has been done so far towards the execution of the programme, the number of cubic yards done and remaining to be done, but I could not give my hon. friend the amount for last year.

Mr. JELLIFF: How much has it cost per cubic yard? Is this all done at the government's expense?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes.

Mr. JELLIFF: There is no contract?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Not so far as this work is concerned. It is all done by the government's boats.

Mr. JELLIFF: Has the minister any way of comparing the cost under the present system with the cost under contract by outside parties?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am informed that the officers of the department have figured that out, and that it is much cheaper to do the work ourselves.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Could my hon. friend tell me what he pays for wages under this item, and how many men he has employed?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I have here the names of the masters, junior officers and seamen on every boat and dredge used in connection with that work, and the salary paid to each, but I am sorry I have not got the total amount paid. It will take a long time to read the list if my hon. friend wants it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Perhaps my hon. friend can give me some idea of the total cost on the one hand, and the number of new appointees in the last year on the other.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The trouble is these men are constantly changing. They are not permanent but are engaged every spring, and those who are employed now are not in many cases the ones who were employed last year. They go to better vessels if they can find them.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is it a fact that there has been a clean sweep?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Not at all.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: How clean a sweep?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Of course, everything that was done was clean.

Mr. LEWIS: Can the minister tell us what is the difference between item 229, $613,000 for dredging, and item 164, dredging, Ontario and Quebec, $625,000?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Item 164 is in the Public Works department estimates.

Mr. LEWIS: Is there any overlapping? Are the two departments dredging in the same place?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Not at all. Our work is in the channel. The Public Works department is dredging at the ports and harbours. Our work relates only to providing a clear channel for vessels in the St. Lawrence.

Mr. SHAW: I understand—perhaps the minister will correct me if I am wrong—that there are three dredging services; the dredging of the St. Lawrence ship channel, for which this vote is asked; the dredging service of the Public Works department along the borders of the St. Lawrence river; and thirdly, the dredging service of the Railway department. Will the minister tell us the exact jurisdiction of each, and why it is necessary to have so many dredging services with necessarily heavy overhead costs? Is it not possible to combine all these services into one?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am afraid the only information I can give is as regards my own department. As far as the Public Works department is concerned, the work that is done is along the lines suggested by my hon. friend. As far as the Railway department is concerned, I could not supply the information. Perhaps their dredging is in connection with the canals. I do not know of any dredging done by the railways as a department.

[Mr. Lapointe.]

Mr. SHAW: How can the minister's department tell exactly where his jurisdiction begins as compared with the Public Works department?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Our work is on the channel of the St. Lawrence river.

Mr. SHAW: Is there no danger of conflict between his department and the Public Works department in determining what the channel is?

Mr. LAPOINTE: There has never been any friction between the two departments in that regard. I am only too glad, when somebody applies for some work that does not come under my department, to pass the buck, if I may use the expression.

Mr. SHAW: Then I want to call to the attention of the minister the sworn statement of the Deputy Minister of Public Works, in charge of that department which has to do with dredging the borders of the St. Lawrence river. He suggests, if my memory serves me properly, that the entire St. Lawrence dredging operations could be conducted far more efficiently under the Public Works department than under the two departments as now constituted. That is an argument which I think must commend itself to the minister.

Mr. LAPOINTE: He believes in his own effectiveness, I see.

Mr. SHAW: Quite right, I think.

Mr. MILLAR: What is the depth of the St. Lawrence between Quebec and Montreal?

Mr. LAPOINTE: It is thirty feet the whole distance now, but this work is being done to deepen it to thirty-five feet.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Does the minister know of a new port being opened on the southern shore of the St. Lawrence between Quebec and Montreal?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Where is that?

Mr. MACLEAN (York): On the south shore, some place near the Richelieu.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I will try to develop the port of Quebec before starting a new one.

Mr. MILLAR: Will this work of dredging the St. Lawrence be permanent when completed, or will the mud wash in again?

Mr. LAPOINTE: It is to be made permanent.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): What does the minister mean by permanent? Surely he does not mean that he is going to have a vote of this kind just for one or two years. Will not dredging have to be done continually in the channel.

Mr. LAPOINTE: This is to pay for the operation and the maintenance of all the boats, dredges and barges which are used on this dredging work.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): But it is a continual work going on year after year.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It will go on so long as the programme is not completely executed.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): What does the minister mean by the programme?

Mr. LAPOINTE: A thirty-five foot channel from Montreal to the sea.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I hope the minister will let one who is interested, myself, know when he has found a method of clearing a channel by dredging and maintaining it clear without dredging afterwards.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Of course, some dredging will be necessary, but not this considerable work, which will go on until the programme is completed.

Mr. GOULD: Under which department do the dredging operations at Fort William and Port Arthur take place?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Public Works. We have only to do with the St. Lawrence channel.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Has the minister considered some union of the dredging forces of the Dominion? There really seems no reason in the world why part should be in one department and part in another. I would think that by doing so, dredges otherwise discarded might be utilized for other services.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The suggestion deserves consideration. I claim that I am a reformer but I do not want to make changes without due thought. This division was probably made for good reasons, but I am quite willing to try and study what reasons influenced those who made the change. These operations were carried on in the same way during the time of the former government and also under different Ministers of Marine. I am quite willing to consider the matter and see whether it is desirable to make a change.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): On this very point, I heard a discussion only this week that we should have in this country at a very early date a Minister of Finance who would find out whether there could not be a consolidation of departments which would result in there being only one department for example, instead of three. We want a concentration of departments under one head, which would effect a great saving. That would apply to a great many departments of this government and that is where the economy is to come in the future. That is what is being argued now in the country and I think there is something in it. This government ought to have what they have in the United States, a special officer to go through the budget and see whether economies can be introduced as respects certain items of the different departments. We are all talking about economy, but if we adhere to the present system we shall never make any progress. The Prime Minister or the Finance Minister ought to get the ministers together and ask this one question: Where can savings be effected by consolidation, co-operation or co-ordination? A substantial reduction in the budget of Canada can be effected in that particular direction. There certainly will be a movement on the part of the people of this country in a very short time, in the direction of closer consideration of the requirements of all the departments in order to determine whether we cannot have economies whether it be by co-ordination or some other means.

Mr. LAPOINTE: As a matter of fact, one department, the Naval Service, has disappeared since last year. Part of it is now under the Department of National Defence and part of it under the Marine and Fisheries department.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not see very much disappearance myself.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I beg the right hon. gentleman's pardon.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Formerly it was under the Marine and Fisheries, now it is under the Minister of National Defence. The Minister of National Defence is given another name but the officers are all there. If the getting together of the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance would not bring any more results than the much vaunted amalgamation of the Naval Service with the Department of National Defence, I think we might save time in transportation. What might be done would be to bring all dredging, all really public works operations, under the Public Works department. Or, if you wish to consider them as marine matters bring them all under

the Marine department. Here we have today dredging operations going on under the Marine department, dredging operations under the Public Works department and I venture to say—I have not the least hesitation in saying—there is more going on under the Railway department, and the same thing obtains in the case of elevators. We have some public elevators operated by the Railway department, others operated by the Department of Trade and Commerce, others operated even by the Marine department, whose head could not keep out of it—I do not mean the present minister—

Mr. GRAHAM: His predecessor.

Mr. MEIGHEN: —and we have others operated by the National Railway Board, and I am not sure that I have completed the list yet. Anyway, they are scattered over the whole service just in proportion to the avidity of the minister and deputy minister of each department. Why that should be I never could understand. The progress of reform was somewhat rapid for years but it was not all accomplished. I venture to suggest to this government that in these days of peace, restfulness and tranquillity—when otherwise ministers are simply softening the cushions of office, watching for commissions to place their friends on, watching for vacancies in the Senate and scanning the mortality on the bench—

An hon. MEMBER: Providence will act there without any effort of ours.

Mr. MEIGHEN: —why could they not devote some attention to moving—even though it be slowly, at least moving—in the direction of real reform in the service. Get all these dredging operations together, get our elevators together, and have unity of control and economy of operation.

Mr. GRAHAM: My right hon. friend spoke of the naval amalgamation and said that the officers were all there. Surely he knows that is not the case. There is one deputy minister for two services, there were at least two deputies before.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They are there still but are called by other names.

Mr. GRAHAM: They are not, pardon, me.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Mr. Desbarats is there and Sir Eugene Fiset is there. I notice from a return that he is drawing $10,500 a year.

Mr. GRAHAM: My right hon. friend is playing on words.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am not, I am playing on dollars.

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. GRAHAM: My right hon. friend may be an authority on dollars sometimes but not an authority on cents. Sir Eugene Fiset has retired and is entitled to draw his pay until his leave of absence is concluded. Sir Eugene Fiset will not come back, there will be but one deputy minister where formerly there were two.

Mr. MEIGHEN: For the Department of National Defence?

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is Mr. Desbarats who will be called Financial Controller. He will enjoy the same salary with the status of a deputy.

Mr. GRAHAM: No.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is what he is.

Mr. GRAHAM: My right hon. friend is wrong.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is he now? He has the status of a deputy and he has the salary, without question. The minister cannot be right. I am not positive unless I know but I am pretty sure I read a return just lately to the effect that the retirement of Sir Eugene Fiset applied to one sphere only not to the two. I am no authority on this but it seems there is a military sphere and there is a civil sphere, and the one he has retired from is the least remunerative and also carries with it quite a pension allowance. The other sphere he still fills and intends to continue in. This is in a return I read very lately. I should not say I was astonished but I noted very carefully in my own mind the large amount that he will be drawing when this so-called retirement takes effect.

Mr. GRAHAM: My right hon. friend, I hope, will allow me to put him right. Sir Eugene Fiset has retired on a pension which takes effect on the expiration of his leave of absence.

Mr. MEIGHEN: When will that come?

Mr. GRAHAM: At the end of this year, I think; I forget the exact time. Then he will be out of the service and drawing the pension to which he is entitled under the act. The legislation passed provides for one deputy where there were two before. We are getting away from this item I am afraid. If my right hon. friend will remember there was a full discussion of the legislation which was introduced when he learned something with respect to the inability of anybody to mix the navy with the militia to any great extent, and the proposition to retain Mr. Des-

barats as deputy of the Naval Service as a separate branch of the Defence department. One of the branches of parliament refused to acquiesce—

Mr. MEIGHEN: That was right, it was not the minister's fault.

Mr. GRAHAM: —and that department will only have one deputy instead of two as heretofore.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will there be a controller or anybody else with the salary of a deputy?

Mr. GRAHAM: The department has a controller who is altogether distinct from the deputy. I think the Department of Defence should have a controller—and I think some of my hon. friend's colleagues approve of that—in charge of all finances, as has the Railway department and other departments. I think, perhaps, that department requires it as much if not more than the others. There will be a controller, but he will not have the status of a deputy minister.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What salary?

Mr. GRAHAM: He draws $6,000 a year, but he will not have the status of a deputy minister.

Mr. MILLAR: Referring to the St. Lawrence river, what effect will the completion of this drainage have on the price of transporting grain? Recently, considerable grain is going by water to Quebec. I found out last year, or at least during the shipping season of the year, that no grain leaves Quebec by water. I infer that some of the larger boats cannot go from Quebec to Montreal, but after the completion of this work all the boats large and small will be able to reach Montreal, and it may perhaps lower the rate on grain. Is there any reasonable grounds for expecting a lower rate?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I do not think the larger ships will go beyond Quebec. That is my candid opinion.

Mr. MILLAR: With thirty-five feet depth of channel, will there not be more ships going to Montreal than at present?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes, certainly more, but with some danger. In many places the channel is narrow and there will always be a certain element of difficulty between Quebec and Montreal. One of the main objects is to try to obtain reduced rates of insurance. When a route is safe for navigation—and this applies below Quebec as well as between Quebec and Montreal—it is hoped, and we even have the assurance, that the rates of marine insurance will be reduced, which will go a long way towards meeting the views of my hon. friend.

Mr. MILLAR: After this work is completed, what will be the reason why the larger boats will not be able to reach Montreal? Will it be because of the width of the channel or the depth of it or what? Will it be because thirty-five feet is not sufficient?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Because the length of the larger boats is great and the width of the channel will not permit them to go through, particularly at certain times of the season, to Montreal without a certain amount of danger.

Mr. SHAW: The triplication of dredging services, as appears to be the fact, leads one to the conclusion that if considerable saving is to be made in the public service, then we must obtain, so far as government services are concerned, some co-ordinating factor. I remember reading a report of Sir George Murray, written some ten years ago, in which he suggests that it would be a great thing to have co-ordination in the public service. Just at this point I want to suggest that the British Treasury Board has been empowered to do that particular work. Our Treasury Board, as I understand it, is not empowered to undertake the work of co-ordination, not by statute in any event. It seems to me that something has to be done along that line, if a saving is to be effected, and I am positive that that is the method which will result in the saving of perhaps hundreds of thousands of dollars to this country every year. I think it is along that line that exploration must be made if we are going to have not only an efficient public service in the country, but also an economical public service.

Item agreed to.

To provide for the maintenance and operation of Sorel shipyard, $125,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This is where the minister has effected the greatest slaughter, I understand.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I do not think so.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He has slain both his thousands and his tens of thousands here, and I notice an extra charge of $35,000. Is that a life-saving allowance to the minister for protecting his favourites?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I do not know what my hon. friend is referring to when he speaks of slaughter. I am a man of peaceful disposition. Everyone agrees on that point. The $35,000 shown as an increase over 1922-23 is simply a transfer from the appropriation for the St. Lawrence ship channel, and does not indicate any enlargement of operations at the shipyard. The transfer was made as a matter of convenience, and to enable certain expenditures to be accounted for directly that were previously accounted for indirectly through the ship channel appropriation. Expenditures for 1921-22 and 1922-23 are included in ship channel expenditures. Hereafter expenditures for the shipyard will be shown separately. As a matter of fact nothing more will be done at Sorel. It is a mere matter of bookkeeping.

Mr. MEIGHEN: How many men have been dismissed from the Sorel yard?

Mr. LAPOINTE: As few as possible. There is no pleasure dismissing officials from the public service. I do not know the number.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister must have had an exceedingly painful year and a half, judging from my own mail which was laden down with tales of woe of the minister's operations in the Sorel yard. He has made it a veritable patronage paradise.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It was my good fortune, on acount of the kindness of heart of my colleague, to be away at the time those things occurred. But I am quite willing to take the full responsibility, because I have to. Still being away, it was less hard for me to bear it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Who was the actual executioner?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I do not know.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister must know who was in his place when he was away.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The Minister of Customs (Mr. Bureau) was acting minister, but I have to take full responsibility for everything. He is the best man in the world, and I know he must have suffered very much when he had to perform his duty in that connection.

Mr. MEIGHEN: How many returned men were fired?

Mr. LAPOINTE: No one that I know of.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh, yes.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I do not know of any.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Perhaps the minister would give particulars. What is the wage bill paid this year?

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. LAPOINTE: I have that. My memorandum reads as follows:

1. To provide for the payment of the salaries for; Office staff, composed of one director, secretary, typists, assistant director, one accountant and staff of nine bookkeepers, one storekeeper and staff of seven clerks, one mechanical draughtsman and staff of four draughtsmen, one timekeeper and clerk.. ..	$33,600
2. To be applied to the maintenance and payment of salaries of fourteen shop foremen and their clerks..	29,160
3. To be applied for the payment of salaries of five watchmen, one gate-keeper, four firemen, one messenger and six pumpmen.. ..	19,000

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is that the whole list?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Suppose we take the first lot, $33,600; how many of those men are new appointees of my hon. friend or of his substitute?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I have not the details to give my hon. friend that information.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I will ask the minister to let it stand until he can get the details.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am informed that six employees were dismissed. I may say to my right hon. friend that after 1911 the whole staff was changed.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister did not take much of a look at the operations of his substitute if he suggests six.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Out of item number one mentioned by my hon. friend.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think this item should stand until the minister gets some knowledge of it, because the facts in connection with the Sorel shipyard are really startling.

Mr. LAPOINTE: No man was dismissed unless there was good ground for his dismissal along the lines mentioned by the Prime Minister at the beginning of the session.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The certificate of a member showing that he wanted him to go.

Mr. LAPOINTE: That a man has been guilty of offensive partisanship to the knowledge of a member of parliament. If this is not done, there is an investigation, and the report of the commissioner is accepted. Surely my right hon. friend should not complain. We are keeping everywhere men that my right hon. friend's friends put into the service during their regime, and we are being blamed by our own friends for doing that. Surely

we should not incur any criticism in this House, when men who were dismissed for nothing after 1912, are still asking for work and we are not giving that work to them.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister need never expect that he will do anything that will satisfy those who seek for patronage, nor will I ever find fault with the minister for dismissing where offensive partisanship has been established. The investigations which the minister has carried on, where even he has dared to investigate—and the same applies to other departments—have been farcical to a degree.

Mr. LAPOINTE: No.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have had letters from his own strong supporters who are disgusted with the operations of those investigators. To state to the House that a member says that a man is guilty of partisanship, without producing the certificate or giving any details whatever, is most unfair to anyone in the service. The cases are not one or two or a dozen; they are simply legion. There should certainly be a fair investigation and a fair show given. If there has been active participation in politics, the minister has a perfect right to dismiss, and I could find no fault with him. Instead of that no regard whatever has been had to the circumstances.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes, there has.

Mr. MEIGHEN: None at all.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Let my right hon. friend come to my own city where there is an agency of the Marine department, and let him say how many men have been dismissed in that agency, when all those who were dismissed after 1912 are asking for work, when my colleagues here are asking me to replace those men who were dismissed, when they are not put to work and when we are keeping on the others who have not been dismissed. If there is one thing we should not deserve any blame for, it is in connection with the question of dismissals, and I am sure the remarks of my right hon. friend will be read with great interest by the people of the city of Quebec.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I sincerely hope they will. The minister often refers to 1912. We have had the same experience that he has had, but we certainly went far more thoroughly into the cases.

Mr. CANNON: Does my right hon. friend say that seriously?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MEIGHEN: My hon. friend makes very exaggerated statements, and other ministers make them too. I shall not be afraid, in the slightest degree, of any fair comparison by any unprejudiced person. The minister must remember that there is this difference: For some years the Civil Service Commission has been established, and appointments have been made by that commission, wholly without regard to politics. That constitutes a somewhat different situation. If, after that is done, the axe of patronage is still to be wielded, the case is hopeless. A government that takes the responsibility, boldly faces the situation, strips patronage from its hands almost entirely,—entirely as regards the service under the commission,—undoubtedly takes a penalty for doing so, and a very severe one, as the hon. member knows the late government did. Once that is done, surely the least a new government can do is to permit appointees to remain in the service, to permit patronage to remain outside, and not to seek to reintroduce it and the old methods and to seek to justify it by something that took place years and years ago. I do not know about Quebec. I gave the minister this credit. As regards his own department, I have not had any substantial complaints from the city of Quebec. They may have thought their case was hopeless.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I have requests from my own friends.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They may know the power of the minister and have conceded that despair only was their lot. I do not know, but in other departments from the city and district of Quebec, I have had cases simply by the score. The reason why I rose was that I have had cases from his own department at this point. Undoubtedly, slaughter went on that I do not think was any credit to the government. I am glad the minister himself was not there. It appears that the immediately guilty party, the Minister of Customs and Excise (Mr. Bureau), has now returned to the House.

Mr. BUREAU: Present.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He had access to the minister's seat for just long enough to create this situation in the town of Sorel.

Mr. BUREAU: Yes, and it is a good one. I have nothing to take back on it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, he never takes anything back. He is a master of the patronage axe, and I do not think we could do better now than listen to just what he has accomplished.

Mr. BUREAU: I have accomplished a great deal in the interest of the country. The foreman at Sorel Mr. Lacouture, an appointee of the late government, we retain. He was appointed to replace a Liberal who was fired without inquiry or anything else by the friends of my right hon. friend. He is there still. The dismissals that took place, took place because there were reasons for them. The reasons were that the member came and upon his own responsibility made the statement that acts of partisanship had been committed, stating the particular acts.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Verbally?

Mr. BUREAU: In writing, and verbally sometimes. This may have been verbal.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the minister produce these written statements of the member?

Mr. BUREAU: The verbal ones I could not produce, but there are some I could produce.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think they are mostly verbal.

Mr. BUREAU: I made inquiries. I went to Sorel, and I made inquires of the foreman as to the respective value of the men. Those that went out went out because they were not the proper persons to fill these situations and those who were appointed to the situations were better men than they were. I did this in the interest of the Sorel yard and of the country.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I really thought I would get a better justification than that—

Mr. BUREAU: There can be none.

Mr. MEIGHEN: —from the ingenuity of the Minister of Customs. What he says in effect is: "I was approached by the member for the district—"

Mr. BUREAU: I did not say that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: "—and the member for the district said that they were partisans."

Mr. BUREAU: They were accused of partisanship.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not know the difference. He wanted them to go, and in justice to this great Dominion and to the public service, he fired them.

Mr. BUREAU: In the interest of the Dominion, yes.

Mr. SHAW: I think in view of the interesting dissertation that has taken place, we ought to have from the minister a list of the number dismissed.

Mr. MEIGHEN: And the names.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Does it interest the hon. member too?

Mr. SHAW: Yes, I am interested intensely in this matter of partisanship, and I am anxious to see that the Civil Service Commission operates, not only as regards the Sorel yards, but in every part of the Dominion.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I do not know that those men are under the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. SHAW: I would be willing to put them under the commission and to use my influence to bring that about. One thing the country is disgusted with is the abuse of patronage which has been inflicted on it for many years.

Mr. LAPOINTE: What does my hon. friend think of those people who were dismissed without any reason a few years ago and who want their positions back now? What is his opinion? Must they suffer the injustice permanently, if an injustice was done? Has he kindness in his heart only for those new men who were appointed to take their places?

Mr. SHAW: I have every sympathy with anyone who has suffered injustice.

Mr. LAPOINTE: But sympathy is not enough.

Mr. SHAW: I do not see however how the minister can do justice to those who have suffered injustice by doing injustice to others.

Mr. LAPOINTE: No, but by redressing the injustice that was done.

Mr. SHAW: You cannot redress an injustice to an individual by dismissing someone else, and thus doing an injustice to him.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Is that so? If that someone else worked for the dismissal of his predecessor and himself got the position under unfair circumstances, does my hon. friend say that such a man is entitled to that position, while the other who has been ousted should suffer permanently?

Mr. BUREAU: That is bad justice.

Mr. SHAW: I suggest that the minister bring us the list that we may investigate the matter, and if anyone has improperly secured a position then certainly he should not be continued in it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: On the minister's argument, he had better bring us the list for 1896. According to the minister, the further back you go the stronger the case becomes.

Mr. LAPOINTE: No.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I never went further back than 1912.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Because that suits the minister. It just shows the futility of the whole argument; if you keep going back, you might as well go back from one election to another to the birth of patronage.

Mr. LAPOINTE: But those men are all dead.

Mr. MEIGHEN: You can never get rid of patronage on any principle of that kind, and that is what the hon. member (Mr. Shaw) is endeavouring to point out. What the committee wants to know is what justification there is for these dismissals. I think the minister should produce the names together with the certificate of the member, giving such particulars as can be inquired into, so that we may see what is behind it all. Parliament has a right to this.

Mr. CANNON: Before the minister does that he might produce the record in regard to the 12,000 Liberal employees who were dismissed by the friends of the right hon. gentleman.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I should like that too.

Mr. CANNON: The right hon. gentleman would like the record in regard to the dismissals in 1911?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. CANNON: It is all very fine for the leader of the Opposition to give us—

Mr. BUREAU: A lecture.

Mr. CANNON: Yes, a lecture—

Mr. LAPOINTE: After all his friends are safe.

Mr. CANNON: It is all very well, I say, for the right hon. gentleman to give us a lecture in 1923. But I want him to go back to 1911.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Why not go back to 1896?

Mr. CANNON: If he wants to go back to 1896, I think I am justified in asking him first to go back to 1911 and explain why his friends at that time dismissed 12,000 Liberal employees, without investigation, inquiry or anything else.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Nothing of the kind.

Mr. CANNON: The leader of the Opposition cannot, now that he is in opposition, maintain a theory which his friends put altogether aside when they were in power. We know how the government of this country was run from 1911 to 1921; there was nothing but patronage, and rank patronage too, everywhere. The Civil Service Commission was a joke and a farce, and that joke and that farce are in evidence everywhere; they were continued under the pretext of abolishing patronage, although enabling hon. gentlemen to appoint their own partisans and supporters throughout the country. The whole Civil Service is filled with Conservative employees, and we contend that if one thing is good for the Tories it is just as good for the Liberals—

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): And it is worse for the country.

Mr. CANNON: I do not know about that.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Oh, yes; the country says so.

Mr. CANNON: I would rather have a friend do my work than an opponent; at least I should have more confidence in him. I was going to say, the last man who should get up in this House and raise the debate which is now going on is the leader of the Opposition, who was the arch-partisan while in power. Nothing he did was inspired by anything else than the party spirit. We all know that. And although to-day he gets up in this Chamber and sings an altogether different tune, I do not think that many people will believe him. So far as we are concerned in Quebec, and for that matter throughout the country, we want our ministers to be ministers of the Crown and to run the country themselves; we do not want the Civil Service to do it. As regards my hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. Shaw) I think he has a right to be strongly opposed to patronage if he sees fit. Every man is entitled to his own views, and the hon. member may be perfectly sincere. I have absolutely no right to doubt that hon. gentleman's sincerity, as I have to doubt that of the leader of the Opposition; because the hon. member for Calgary has no past as the leader of the Opposition has. But I might ask the hon. gentleman from Calgary to explain how it is, if patronage is such a bad thing, that when the farmers came into power in Ontario, in Manitoba and in Alberta patronage was revived and they knew exactly how to play the game as well as any other party?

Mr. SHAW: I want to tell the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Cannon) that I have not the slightest sympathy for anyone who

plays the patronage game, I do not care whether it be a Farmers' government, a Conservative government in 1911, or a Liberal government in 1923.

Mr. MICHAUD: In the name of what party is the hon. member speaking?

Mr. SHAW: The sooner an effort is made by every government, no matter what it is, to eliminate patronage entirely from the public service, the better it will be for the country.

Mr. BEAUBIEN: I would inform the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Cannon) that our provincial government in Manitoba does not exercise any patronage. I am not opposed to the Liberals placing their own friends in positions if there are vacancies and if those friends happen to be qualified and the positions are properly filled under the Civil Service Act. But I do want to assure the hon. gentleman, speaking in the name of my own province, that we have no patronage in Manitoba.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I want to put a thought or two to the member for Dorchester that he can think over in the dinner hour.

Mr. CANNON: I can think it over right now.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member spoilt his speech, so far as it might have any effect on a fair-minded audience, by the assertion that the Civil Service Commission is a farce.

Mr. CANNON: Under the old government.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Under the late government, yes; that is what the hon. member said. Now, there has been some investigation lately, and there is not a member of this House who would suggest sincerely—

Mr. CANNON: Will you allow me a question?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly.

Mr. CANNON: If the right hon. gentleman intended that the Civil Service Commission should carry out the law as it stands, how is it that the old commissioners were replaced by friends of his?

Mr. MEIGHEN: To start with, they were not replaced by friends of ours. One member of the three on the commission was appointed by the government that preceded us, the Laurier government. The secretary, who has always been known to be most influential and to take an active part in the commission, was also appointed by the preceding government. All we did was to appoint the other two. I do not know that such a proceeding can be duplicated by the present administration.

Mr. CANNON: Does the right hon. gentleman claim that it is not a matter of patronage to appoint a minister to the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. MEIGHEN: There was no minister appointed.

Mr. CANNON: What about Doctor Roche?

Mr. MEIGHEN: He had been a minister, it is true.

Mr. CANNON: He could not be both at the same time; if it had been possible, he would have taken both jobs.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think the hon. member gets anywhere by an assertion of that sort, if it is put before any fair-minded man in the Dominion. Hon. members know the present chairman of the commission, and I do not think that anyone will seriously suggest that the commission has acted partisanly in all the time of its existence, either under the late government or under this government. The member who asserts it is a mere partisan instrument does not contribute much to the establishment of the judicial character of the commission, nor does he contribute much to his own reputation in this House. What he states is simply not the fact. I want to say this, however, I have heard the number dismissed by the previous government stated at different times variously: at one time it is 6,000, at another time 8,000, and to-day 12,000. I have no doubt that in a few years it will have risen to 112,000. But one will be as near the truth as the other. Certainly, there were some dismissals and there was debate upon them. But I believe that any hon. member who reads the debates will see that they were not carried to any great extreme; and there was considered to be, as I think there was in some cases, ample justification for certain dismissals. It is true, however, that there was not at that time in the outside service of Canada any pretence at a commission. No government had dared to take that course, and no member of this House can know, unless he was a member of that government that did, what a government will encounter that does dare to take such a step.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Would my hon. friend agree that I should reinstate in my department all the employees dismissed without investigation in 1912?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Dear me! I think if he would replace all those dismissed in 1896 he would not be going back too far.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Does my hon. friend say there was an investigation in every case?

Mr. MEIGHEN: There was an investigation. There may not have been an investigation by a commissioner under the Inquiries Act in each case.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Most of the officers in my department were dismissed without investigation.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If we are to go back from one election to the other we get nowhere. There can never be reform if you are going to carry on the principle of vengeance; it cannot be done. The hon. gentleman says I was a partisan of the partisans. I venture to suggest to him that I had to do with the appointment directly of more Liberals than Conservatives. In my own county only one was dismissed. Nor was I a member of the government until the middle of 1913, in fact I was not a member of the Cabinet until 1915. I do not think he was quite justified in pointing to me as the arch-offender in effecting dismissals. Besides, the majority of the appointments I had to do with, which were chiefly to the Bench, were in favour of Liberals.

Mr. JACOBS: During the Union Government?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, and Liberals were appointed who opposed Union government.

Mr. JACOBS: Who are they?

Mr. MEIGHEN: One of them was the son of a recent hon. member opposite who was opposed to Union government throughout. He was appointed by the previous government a judge of the Supreme Court of Saskatchewan.

An hon. MEMBER: The exception proves the rule.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Others I could name one by one. These were much more important offices than the petty ones whose occupants hon. gentlemen opposite have dismissed. Faithful servants, one by one, score by score, have been dismissed. That is not in the interests of those individuals, it is not in the interests of the civil service of Canada. A strong effort has to be made to stand to what we have reached. If we cannot get any farther, let us at least not retrogress. I make that appeal to the government, and I do so particularly on this item because I think it is in relation to it that the chief transgression has taken place.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN: We were discussing item 230:

To provide for the maintenance and operating of Sorel shipyard, $125,000.

Mr. LEWIS: The hon. minister said that an amount of $35,000 was transferred to this item and that that accounted for the increase In regard to the item from which it was transferred has that $35,000 been deducted therefrom?

Mr. LAPOINTE: It has not. As a matter of fact, it was intended to have a much larger amount for the other item, but council decided to reduce it to make an increase of $35,000 only.

Mr. LEWIS: And that amount was transferred to this item?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the resolution carry?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not know that item No. 229 carried. I understood it was standing till the minister got certain information.

The CHAIRMAN: Item 227 is to stand, and items 228 and 229 have been carried.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Item 230 stands till the information comes down.

Mr. LAPOINTE: My hon. friend will be surprised at the extent of the misinformation he has received. The number of permanent employees who were dismissed there is very very small indeed. I think I could count them on the fingers of one hand.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They are mostly on the temporary list, are they not?

Mr LAPOINTE: They are day labourers. They are in no way permanent. More than that, as to those day labourers who perhaps have considered themselves as being dismissed or as to whom my right hon. friend has been informed by somebody to that effect other shifts have been put on for fifteen days or three weeks just to give employment to the unemployed in the city of Sorel. That

was done under the supervision of Mr. Lacouture, the Superintendent of the Sorel shipyards, and a supporter of the former government with the co-operation of the charitable associations of Sorel. I do not want to pose as a philanthropist in the matter at all, but really I do not deserve the criticism that is being made.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the minister would let this item stand and bring down the information, if it is of the character he describes, I assure him there will be no delay so far as I am concerned when this item is reached again.

Mr. BUREAU: What is the information my hon. friend wants? The names of the people put out?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. BUREAU: There were three or four only.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The information I ask for will be found in Hansard. I asked for it about a quarter to six this evening—the dismissals, and on whose certificate, and what the nature of the information was.

Mr. BUREAU: I can tell my hon. friend as to one man. One man, Morgan, was dismissed, and dismissed for cause because he was the secretary of the Tory organization during the last fight.

Mr. CARROLL: Bad man.

Mr. BUREAU: Politically, not otherwise, and he was dismissed on the recommendation of Mr. Cardin, the member for that constituency who stated that he was the secretary of the Tory organization and took an active part against him in the last election. I thought that was sufficient ground, and I dismissed him.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is one.

Mr. BUREAU: There are two more. I forget their names—

Mr. MEIGHEN: About two hundred more, according to my information.

Mr. BUREAU: —but they were dismissed on the same grounds.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If that is the fact there should be no delay when the item is reached again.

Mr. LAPOINTE: We have been discussing this for over two hours now.

Mr. MEIGHEN: And the information is not here.

[Mr. Lapointe.]

Mr. BUREAU: I have given one third of the information. There are two more I think.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh!

Mr. BUREAU: That is all.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the resolution carry?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have asked the minister to hold this item until we get the information. He admits he has not it here. He cannot get through all his estimates, he is holding one item; why not hold this one? About eight have gone through.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Because we have been discussing this for two hours, and to let the item stand would mean the whole discussion over again.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We will discuss it longer still, then.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I really do not deserve the criticism my hon. friend is making. In fact, I am blamed all the time for keeping his friends in office. That is the blame I am receiving, not what he is ascribing to me now.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not dispute that, but does he not see the help I am giving him now against that attack?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I think my hon. friend is not giving any help to his friends whom I am keeping in office.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am not looking to my friends. I am looking to the country.

Item 230 stands.

Amount required for the construction of one self-propelling Hopper barge (revote), $54,800.

Mr. MEIGHEN: When was this started?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Last year. It is under construction now.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is the estimated cost?

Mr. LAPOINTE: The contract is for $274,000. It was granted to Canadian Vickers, who were the lowest tenderers.

Mr. MEIGHEN: How much has been spent?

Mr. LAPOINTE: There was $219,200 expended before the close of the year.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Two hundred and nineteen thousand dollars had been expended, and the contract is for $224,000—

Mr. LAPOINTE: No, $274,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh. Were there any other tenderers besides Canadian Vickers?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Oh, yes, I have the list here:

The Davie Shipbuilding & Repairing Co. Ltd. Lauzon, Levis, P.Q.	$300,000
Fraser Brace, Limited, Montreal	295,000
Engines by Inglis, Toronto, and boilers by the Robb Engineering Works	310,000
Engine and boilers by J. Englis & Co. Toronto	315,000
The Collingwood Shipbuilding Co., Collingwood	319,000
The Port Arthur Shipbuilding Co. Ltd. Port Arthur, Ont.	322,675
The Halifax Shipyards, Limited, Halifax, N.S.	324,500
The Wallace Shipyards, Limited, Vancouver.	340,000
The Midland Shipbuilding Co., Midland, Ont.	385,250

The tender of Vickers was $274,000, much by far the lowest.

Mr. BOYS: Did I understand the minister to say the contract price was $274,000?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes.

Mr. BOYS: Why was $285,000 required?

Mr. LAPOINTE: That was the estimated cost by the engineers of the department.

Item agreed to.

Agencies—rents and contingencies, $212,000.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The increase of $2,000 there provides for the statutory increases in salary.

Mr. HANSON: How many agencies are there and where are they located?

Mr. LAPOINTE: There are eight agents located as follows: Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, Quebec, Montreal, Parry Sound, Victoria and Prince Rupert.

Mr. HANSON: Why is it necessary to maintain a separate agency in the province of Prince Edward Island? That must be a very small territory. It seems to me it could be yoked up with either Nova Scotia or New Brunswick.

Mr. LAPOINTE: That agency covers the northern coast of Nova Scotia and the northern coast of New Brunswick as well as Prince Edward Island and the Magdalen islands.

Mr. HANSON: The New Brunswick agency only covers the Bay of Fundy?

Mr. LAPOINTE: The Bay of Fundy and as far as Lockeport in Nova Scotia.

Mr. BOYS: What are the agencies for, what work do they perform?

Mr. LAPOINTE: For placing and maintaining necessary aids to navigation and other work. All the lightkeepers and the vessels employed in placing the buoys are under the control of these agencies.

Item agreed to.

Salaries and allowances to lightkeepers, $650,000.

Mr. LEGER: I should like to ask the minister if the lightkeepers were given any increase in salaries last year?

Mr. LAPOINTE: No. I must admit that there have been requests for increases in the salaries of the lightkeepers, and their case is deserving of consideration. The only reason for not yielding to these requests is economy and the disinclination of parliament to increase any expenditure at the present time. I may say that my hon. friend from Brandon (Mr. Forke) told me that he desired to plead for the lightkeepers when this item came up. The question of increasing salaries is under consideration.

Mr. LEWIS: Are these men under the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. LAPOINTE: The most of them are.

Mr. LEWIS: Would they get the customary statutory increase if they were under the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. LAPOINTE: There is a minimum and a maximum salary provided in every class and they are getting it year by year.

Mr. GAUVREAU: Is there any prospect of a reclassification in the near future in response to the demand that was made?

Mr. LAPOINTE: The question is being considered.

Mr. LEGER: These officers are certainly not adequately paid for the work they do. Their duty is to protect navigation and in this work they are engaged from the month of April, you might say, up to the month of October. The salary for part time officers engaged in this work amounts to only about $30 or $35 a month. With very few exceptions the amount they receive is only $30, which is wholly inadequate to maintain themselves and their families. They are located in very lonely and isolated spots and I think they should have a little more salary than they are now paid in order to enjoy a fair living. Inadequate payment is not much of an encouragement to efficient work. It may be said that if these men do not want the positions they can resign, but that would not be

a fair answer to their request. Other men would take the jobs at insufficient salaries. I would ask the minister to consider the advisability of making a reclassification of these officers in order that they may be a little better paid in the future.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Did the minister state the average salary paid to lighthouse keepers?

Mr. LAPOINTE: There are twenty classes of lightkeepers. In class 1, the minimum is $2,880 and the maximum $3.240. There are 10 lightkeepers in class 1.

Mr. HANSON: What class of lightkeepers would those be?

Mr. LAPOINTE: They are in charge of the most important lights. Those are Cape Race, Belle Isle, Bird Rocks, Pelee passage, Estevan point, Pachena, Leonard island, Langara, and Sand Heads. There are 21 lightkeepers in class 2. The salary is from $2,100 to 2,280. There are 56 lightkeepers in class 3, with salaries from $1,560 to $1,740. There are 39 in class 4, with salary from $1,500 to $1,680. There are 13 in class 5 with salary from $1,440 to $1,620. There are 17 in class 6 with salary from $960 to $1,200. There are 32 in class 7 with salary from $840 to $930.

Mr. BUREAU: Dispense.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am giving the details.

Mr. BUREAU: There are not going to be any lighthouses on the prairies.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The classes continue until we reach class 19 which relate to the contract lights. In class 19 the minimum is $60 and the maximum $80.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is that per month?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Per annum.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What do they do for that wage?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Those are small wharf lights.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Are the keepers supposed to stay there?

Mr. LAPOINTE: No; they go and light up in the evening and go in the morning to extinguish the lights.

Mr. HANSON: What is the lowest class of full time men and what are they paid?

Mr. LAPOINTE: That would be class No. 7, $840 to $930 per year.

[Mr. Leger.]

Mr. HANSON: I had an interview with one of these gentlemen from my own native country when up here last winter, and he told me he got the magnificent salary of $200 a year. He had been on the job for twenty years. He was appointed by the old government prior to 1911. He further told me it was impossible for him to do any outside work, except once in a while, when he did a little fishing. He also told me he could not possibly live on the salary.

Mr. LAPOINTE: He could not.

Mr. HANSON: And I quite agreed with him. I think this case ought to receive special consideration. This man does the classifying of the lights. Is that under the department? I do not suppose the Civil Service Commission do it.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It was done by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. DUFF: Arthur Young and Company.

Mr. BUREAU: No, Griffenhagen.

Mr. HANSON: Possibly the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) thinks he could do it a great deal better himself, but I did not ask him.

Mr. DUFF: I could do it better than the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson).

Mr. HANSON: I take issue on that.

Mr. DUFF: The hon. member would take issue on anything.

Mr. LEWIS: Is there an allowance in addition to the salary? This item says, "salary and allowance".

Mr. LAPOINTE: They got a living bonus for the last two years, in common with all other civil servants.

Mr. LEWIS: That covers the allowance.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is not an allowance.

Mr. HANSON: That is not an allowance.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I understand the minister is a little diffident about increasing the salaries because of possible objection by the House. We might appropriate Duncan Marshall's salary and distribute it amongst these men.

Mr. MILLAR: Is the salary of $840 for seven months' or twelve months' service?

Mr. LAPOINTE: In many cases it is for twelve months' service.

Mr. FORKE: I met some of those men from the lighthouses and discussed the whole situation with them, the wages they were getting, the hours they were putting in, the loneliness of their lives, the disadvantage in not being able to educate their children and a great many things. I think really they ought to get a little more pay than they are getting at the present time. I am just as much for economy as any one, but I would like to begin at the top and come down.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am glad the hon. member takes that view. I know the work that the lighthouse keepers are doing on the St. Lawrence, and I know that in many cases their salaries are not commensurate with the services they give to the country. The employees who deserve the first consideration are the lighthouse keepers.

Mr. HANSON: Could the minister tell us in what class the Gannett Rock light keeper in the Bay of Fundy is placed?

Mr. TOBIN: Could the minister increase the salaries of the lighthouse keepers without going to the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. BUREAU: No, they have been classified.

An hon. MEMBER: There is no light on Gannett Rock.

Mr. HANSON: Yes, I have been there myself.

Mr. LUCAS: Are any of these lighthouse keepers provided with a house?

Mr. LAPOINTE: All the permanent ones, the full-time men have houses.

Item agreed to.

Maintenance and repairs to lighthouses, $850,000.

Mr. LEWIS: Has the maintenance any reference to food, or do these men supply their own food?

Mr. LAPOINTE: This increase has reference to fuel, delivery and supply, freight and cartage, for the use of the staff.

Mr. HANSON: Are these purchases by tender or by agents of the department?

Mr. LAPOINTE: In every case by tender and contract, except for small merchandise requirements?

Mr. LEWIS: How many lighthouses has the department to keep up?

Mr. HANSON: The minister said supplies were purchased by tender. Is there a public advertisement for these supplies, or is there a selected list in each case.

Mr. LAPOINTE: We ask prices from the dealers in every locality.

Mr. HANSON: The minister asks the friends of the government to put in tenders?

Mr. LAPOINTE: No.

Mr. HANSON: I understand there are no public tenders called for in the province of New Brunswick.

Mr. LAPOINTE: No more in New Brunswick than elsewhere. We are asking the dealers for prices of articles in the different localities. Tories and Grits are invited to give their prices, and in many cases the friends of my hon. friends get the contract.

Mr. HANSON: Is the minister quite sure of that?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes, there have been many changes in this country.

Mr. HANSON: That is why the minister is where he is.

Mr. LEGER: I wish to draw the attention of the minister to an item which seems to have been neglected by the agent in the district. I refer to a very important light on the mainland, at Richibucto Cape. I understand the keeper has asked the agent to look after it and get it put in proper shape, but it has not been done. Some complaint was made last year. This place is open from the shore right up to the light and the cattle go in. The agent paid no attention to the complaint and it has not been remedied. Therefore, I call the attention of the minister to it so that he may see that the matter will be attended to in the future.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The hon. member is not the only member who is in such a position. There are many others. We are asking for repairs of that kind. This vote formerly was $1,000,000, but it has been decreased to $850,000, and the unwillingness to increase the appropriation is responsible for certain necessary repairs, such as those my hon. friend mentioned, not being done, but I will try to meet his views.

Mr. BOYS: It was only $800,000 in 1920-21.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I mean a few years ago, especially before the war

Mr. HANSON: While this may not be exactly relevant to this item, I should like to get some information in regard to the tugboat Murray Stewart. Last year there was an appropriation of $100,000 in the estimates to replace the Lambton that was lost in lake Superior in a gale with large loss of life. On that occasion the minister, in making an explanation, stated that no decision had been reached whether a boat would be purchased or one would be built. Later on it was discovered that the minister had purchased from one, Mr. Stewart, a gentleman living in Toronto very close to Mr. M. J. Haney, president of the Port Arthur Shipbuilding Company, a ship called the Murray Stewart. This vessel, I am instructed, was built at Port Arthur some few years ago. I am informed that her hull was new but her machinery was old, having been transferred from some other vessel; that the purchase price paid by the department was some $80,000. I am further advised that that vessel had been sent down from the Great Lakes to the harbour of St. John, not under charter, but in the hands of agents for sale, and that at any time that boat could have been purchased for $25,000. Later on, after the Lambton was lost, friends of the government, including Mr. M. J. Haney and his friend, Mr. Stewart, of Toronto, had this boat transferred from the Port Arthur Shipbuilding Company to Mr. Stewart's name, and they unloaded her on the the Minister of Marine and Fisheries at the sum of $80,000. This boat was intended to replace an icebreaker. I understand that she is absolutely useless for that purpose, and that the $80,000 expended for that purpose might just as well have been thrown away; that this spring boats had to be hired to do in Midland harbour the work that she was designed to do. I should like to have some information about this boat other than what has been given in answer to an inquiry made through the order paper.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I must say that this boat was to replace the Lambton, as my hon. friend has said, and an appropriation of $100,000 was voted last year for that purpose. The department was in immediate need of a boat for the work which had to be performed by her. Only three boats which were suitable for that purpose were offered to the department. They were visited and inspected by the engineers of the department.

Mr. HANSON: What are their names?

[Mr. Lapointe.]

Mr. LAPOINTE: I cannot give the names just now.

Mr. HANSON: The deputy will know.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The Murray Stewart was recommended to me by the officers of the department as being the one best suited for the purpose. It is a steel tug, length 119 feet, beam 26 feet, gross tonnage 234.46, registered tonnage 92.25, speed 11 knots. It was built in 1918 by the Port Arthur Shipbuilding Company, complete except for the engine, which was rebuilt at the time of the construction of the hull. She was purchased for $80,000 from James Frederick Martin Stewart, of Toronto, to replace the Lambton which was lost on lake Superior in the spring of 1922. The boat will also be used to render assistance to ships handling grain in Georgian bay ports at the close of navigation each year. Although she is not intended for an icebreaker, she is much more suited for that work than the one she has replaced.

Mr. HANSON: That may be true, but if she was purchased for an icebreaker she could not perform that duty.

Mr. LAPOINTE: She never was purchased for an icebreaker.

Mr. HANSON: That was the explanation given by the minister last year.

Mr. LAPOINTE: To assist ships in handling grain.

Mr. HANSON: I think I can refer the minister to the pages of Hansard. Is it not a fact that the engines in this boat were second-hand engines taken out of another boat, and that when she was purchased she had no engines?

Mr. LAPOINTE: The engines were in excellent condition, although second-hand.

Mr. HANSON: That, of course, is not answering my question.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I said "although second-hand."

Mr. HANSON: I beg pardon. Did the minister see Mr. Haney in regard to the purchase from Mr. Stewart? If he had any correspondence with him, I would be glad if he would produce it.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I do not know the gentlemen. I would not recognize them anywhere if I saw them

Mr. HANSON: The minister surely does not say that he has never met Mr. Haney who laboured for the government down in the Maritime provinces?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am sorry. My hon. friend is better acquainted than I am with him. I do not know him.

Mr. TOBIN: He has a good name, anyway.

Mr. ARTHURS: Is this vessel equipped with wireless?

Mr. LAPOINTE: No, it is not.

Mr. ARTHURS: Are the other vessels presently on the Great Lakes equipped with wireless??

Mr. LAPOINTE: None of them on the Great Lakes.

Mr. ARTHURS: Why not? The Minister will remember that last fall there was a great difficulty in regard to navigation on lake Superior. Would it not be well to have these vessels equipped with wireless?

Mr. LAPOINTE: The suggestion is one which deserves consideration.

Mr. ARTHURS: More than that, I think it deserves very favourable consideration. I think all these vessels should be equipped with wireless, especially in view of the situation as it was last fall and as it may be any other season on the Great Lakes.

Mr. LAPOINTE: That is right, but there was no wireless there two or three years ago any more than there is now. I have been trying to keep expenditures down.

Mr. ARTHURS: May I be excused for saying that that is not absolutely in accordance with the facts. The Simcoe was equipped with wireless until she was taken down during the war for service on the ocean.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The Lambton was not equipped with wireless.

Mr. HANSON: Coming back to the Murray Stewart, I understand that the minister had this boat thoroughly inspected before he bought it?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes.

Mr. HANSON: Did the minister not have to have substantial repairs made on that vessel this last spring—to the boilers?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Some repairs were made on that boat.

Mr. HANSON: After she had been inspected and purchased and $80,000 paid over?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes, the $80,000 represented the price of the boat as she was when we bought her.

Mr. HANSON: I agree. What repairs were put on her and were tenders asked for those repairs?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I may inform my hon. friend that this boat cost over $200,000 to build.

Mr. HANSON: This boat was built by the Port Arthur Shipbuilding Company in their own plant. They transferred into her an old engine that had seen years of service, an engine that was in no sense modern. That is one of the reasons why she was not sold when she was down on the Atlantic coast. If she cost $200,000, it must be borne in mind that she was built during the war at the peak of prices, and that is no criterion at all of her value to-day. If the minister doubts that statement he can just consider the merchant marine.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am not responsible for the merchant marine.

Mr. HANSON: But you are responsible for this vessel.

Mr. BUREAU: He wants you to broaden out.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Though I have the greatest opinion of my hon. friend I must confess that when it is necessary to purchase another boat for my department I shall rather take the advice of the chief engineers and other experts of the department than that of the hon. member.

Mr. HANSON: Of course, that is a very cheap remark to make.

Mr. BUREAU: But very appropriate.

Mr. HANSON: But it does not make me subside for a moment.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Oh, no, I do not want to do that.

Mr. HANSON: I should like to know when this boat was taken over, where the crew came from, what was the cost of getting her to the scene of operations, and how long it took to get her there.

Mr. LAPOINTE: My hon. friend should not be over-inquisitive about this item, and I will tell him why: It was passed days ago. I do not object, of course, to his asking any questions in reference to the item, even although it has been already voted, so long

as they are reasonable; but he must not overstep the limit. I am quite willing to give all the information I have by me, but this matter does not come under this item.

Mr. HANSON: If the minister has not the information I cannot expect him to give it. But do I understand that when we give him a blank cheque, as we did last year, we are never to ask any questions with relation to the expenditure of the money so voted?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Not at all.

Mr. HANSON: Well, that is what it amounts to.

Mr. BUREAU: The hon. gentleman misinterprets the minister.

Mr. LAPOINTE: My hon. friend gave me a blank cheque of $100,000 for the purchase of a boat; I made a good bargain and got one for $80,000, saving $20,000.

Mr. HANSON: You got a second-hand $25,000 boat for $80,000.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It was built in 1918.

Mr. HANSON: The hull was built in 1917.

Mr. BOYS: If the repairs cost over $20,000 it might not be a good bargain. The deputy minister is probably trying to find out what the repairs cost.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I cannot tell my hon. friend how much was paid for repairs. I was not supposed to answer these questions to-night, because the item to which they relate has already been passed.

Mr. BOYS: Of course, if the minister takes that stand then it ends the matter.

Mr. LAPOINTE: No, the matter is not necessarily ended; I am simply giving the reason for my not having any information to offer hon. gentlemen in reply to these questions.

Mr. BOYS: I am not finding fault at all with the minister; I am only asking for information if it can possibly be got.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I shall be pleased to get the information.

Mr. BOYS: Then I understand that at the moment the minister cannot tell us what was paid for repairs?

Mr. LAPOINTE: No.

Mr. BOYS: I thought the deputy was looking it up.

[Mr. Lapointe.]

Mr. LAPOINTE: So he is, but he has not been able to find it.

Mr. HANSON: Is it not a fact that the boat was intended, among other things, to be used as an ice-breaker, and that she failed to function as such and the department had to hire other boats to do this class of work?

Mr. LAPOINTE: No.

Mr. HANSON: That is my information.

Mr. BUREAU: Misinformed again.

Mr. SIMPSON: Was this boat used for placing the lightkeepers at the respective stations this spring? If not, was she engaged elsewhere, or was she considered unsuitable for the work?

Mr. LAPOINTE: The ice conditions this year were particularly bad. There was so much ice that it was thought advisable to charter a boat to do the work.

Mr. SIMPSON: I take it, then, that this boat was not used because she was not equipped to stand the ice.

Mr. LAPOINTE: There was so much ice that it was thought dangerous to use her.

Mr. BOYS: Where can we find the item that provided for the cost of repairs to this boat?

Mr. LAPOINTE: It will be found under Dominion Steamers, item 215.

Mr. ARTHURS: I would impress upon the minister the necessity for equipping all boats of the merchant marine with wireless.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I shall certainly take the suggestion into consideration.

Mr. MANION: What are the regulations governing the closing down of lighthouses in the fall months? Is there a regular date for closing them down, or do they stay open until the navigation companies decide to discontinue operations?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Navigation is supposed to close on December 20, when the lighthouses are closed.

Mr. MANION: Last year, I know, navigation was open on the Great Lakes after the 20th of December, and the lighthouse keepers were not taken off until some time subsequently.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Navigation closes at the date I have stated, and the lighthouse keepers are picked up as soon as weather conditions permit.

Mr. MANION: I know that navigation was open last year a good deal later than it has been in previous years.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The official date is December 20.

Mr. BOYS: I presume it would be easy for the minister to have his deputy turn to the items that make up the total of $1,500,000 referred to in item 215. If he did that we could find out what was required for the repairs of the boat in question.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The repairs to the hull and engine for the year were $11,000.

Mr. HANSON: Was there a tender?

Mr. BOYS: Does that include all repairs? The minister says "hull and engine"; perhaps there were other repairs in addition to these.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The whole amount for the Murray Stewart is $11,000. including all repairs, salaries, fuel, steward supplies and repairs to hull and engine.

Mr. HANSON: Were not tenders called for in connection with repairs to the boiler, and were they not rejected because they were too high?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I have no recollection.

Mr. HANSON: I wish the minister would look into the question. My information is that the boilers needed a great deal of repairing and tenders were asked for, but the amounts of the tenders were so high that, in view of the fact that the boat had just been bought, she was patched up instead of being repaired properly.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The hon. gentleman's information is wrong.

Mr. HANSON: I do not think it is.

Item agreed to.

Construction of lights and aids to navigation, including regulation of traffic in the Detroit river and such other places as may be found necessary, $500,000.

Mr. BOYS: There is a very substantial increase of $100,000 here, which I presume the minister will explain.

Mr. LAPOINTE: A great deal of new construction and renewal work has been postponed from year to year for several years past until it cannot reasonably be postponed any longer. It is proposed to enlarge operations and to begin some of the work this year. For this purpose an increase of $100,000 as compared with 1922-23 is provided for. As a matter of fact, we have from time to time deferred the construction of new lights and other aids to navigation on account of not having the necessary funds. I think most members who represent maritime constituencies have had their constituents urge them to ask for new aids to navigation, and they know that this added expenditure is absolutely necessary.

Mr. BOYS: Are there two or three very large new items, or is the increase generally distributed?

Mr. LAPOINTE: It is generally distributed. Everything is submitted to the lighthouse board, and no new improvement is made without being recommended by the board; the minister comes next.

Mr. HANSON: Is the minister continuing the practice of only authorizing new lights and aids to navigation that have been first recommended by the lighthouse board; or has he adopted the reverse practice of suggesting these improvements to the board?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Where the request is made direct to me, it is sent to the Lighthouse Board, they pass upon it, and the minister accepts their decision; otherwise life would be miserable for me.

Mr. BOYS: I think in an item of this size we ought to have a fuller explanation. A hundred thousand dollars is a great deal of money. Where are the increases immediately to be found?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I can give my hon. friend a list of the new work recommended, but it is very long.

Mr. BOYS: I was not asking the minister to take up the time of the committee with a lot of small things. If he would single out a few of the larger items, I think those are all we would be interested in.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Here are the principal items: Fog alarm and light stations, Green island, Nova Scotia, $30,000.

Mr. HANSON: Is that a new light?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes. A fog alarm at West Point, Anticosti, $15,000; a lighthouse and dwelling at Entry island (Magdalens), $18,000. On the Great Lakes there is a fog alarm and lighthouse at Trowbridge island, lake Superior, $30,000; another fog alarm at Angus island, lake Superior, $30,000. In British Columbia, among other items, I find a fog alarm and dwelling at Merry island, $18,000; at Quatsina, fog alarms, $9,000.

Mr. BOYS: What have you got in Kempenfelt bay, lake Simcoe?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I hope my hon. friend will send me his requests direct.

Mr. BOYS: I would be glad to do so if the minister would promise to accede to them.

Mr. LAPOINTE: They will be submitted to the proper board. Then there are renewals recommended at Bunker island, Nova Scotia, $15,000; lighthouses at cape Sable, $16,000; a dwelling at Scatarie, $12,000. In New Brunswick, a dwelling at Machias Seal island, $12,000.

Mr. HANSON: The minister ought to go out and visit those places.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I hope to do so next summre and to see my hon. friend there. Then at Anticosti a dwelling, $12,000; a light ship at Princess shoal, $25,000; and so on. I hope I have satisfied my hon. friend.

Mr. HANSON: These are all large expenditures. Have they been recommended by the Lighthouse Board?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Every one of them.

Mr. FANSHER: I see this item also covers regulation of traffic in the Detroit river. What is the nature of the regulation?

Mr. LAPOINTE: This is the most congested channel in the navigable waters of the country, and the department is looking after its regulation.

Mr. HANSON: What supervision is exercised over the bootleggers in that district?

Mr. LAPOINTE: The Customs is looking after that.

Mr. BUREAU: That is all right, don't worry.

Mr. FANSHER: Are there too many boats crossing, do I understand?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Oh yes, there are many.

Mr. HANSON: Are these new lighthouses being built by tender?

Mr. LAPOINTE: In every case where it is possible. The only exceptions are at isolated points where it would not be possible to obtain tenders.

Item agreed to.

Marine signal service, $104,000.

Mr. HANSON: Would the minister explain this item?

[Mr Lapointe.]

Mr. LAPOINTE: It is to provide for the maintenance and operation of marine signal service stations. These have been established for the purpose of reporting the movements of ships, weather and ice conditions, and dangers to navigation generally. The system extends from St. John and Halifax to Cape Race and Belle Isle, and from the gulf of St. Lawrence through the Great Lakes to Sault Ste. Marie. The increase of $15,000 as compared with last year is to provide for normal expansion, including statutory salary increases, increased telegraph and telephone tolls, stationery and some necessary repairs.

Mr. BOYS: It is increasing quite rapidly. I see in 1920-21 it was only $65,000.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes, it has been increasing. The marine signal service has expanded tremendously, and requests are continually coming in for a still greater expansion of this service. Undoubtedly it is necessary for the safety of navigation.

Item agreed to.

Administration of pilotage, $250,000.

Mr. MANION: Would the minister mind explaining the decrease in this vote?

Mr. LAPOINTE: With pleasure. Last year provision was made for the construction of a pilot boat at Father Point at a cost of $100,000, which expenditure of course will not be required this year. We have, however, to add $6,000 for statutory increases.

Mr. HANSON: Is it the custom of the department to provide boats for the pilots at the different ports? I understand that the port of St. John pilots have always had to provide their own boats. I am rather surprised to learn that in the province of Quebec the government provides these boats.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The pilots on the St. Lawrence river have been supplied with boats by the department from time immemorial—I suppose prior to there being any pilots at St. John.

Mr. HANSON: It would be interesting to know if the minister will extend this accommodation to the pilots on the Atlantic, because I think the St. John pilots would be very glad to have their boats provided for them by the government.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The suggestion will have my most serious consideration!

Mr. BUREAU: Do the pilots at St. John take off the mail bags from the steamships?

Mr. HANSON: No.

Mr. BUREAU: These boats on the St. Lawrence take the mail from the incoming steamships and deliver it on the dock, to be shipped by the Intercolonial out West to Vancouver.

Mr. HANSON: They pilot the mail boats just the same. We do not have to lighter them down there like they do at Quebec.

Mr. BUREAU: We do not lighter them. This is so as not to stop the ship. It is to give better service to the people of British Columbia. They come to Father Point, drop the pilot or take one on, the mail bags are taken off and landed on Rimouski wharf, and from there they are taken by the Intercolonial and go on to Vancouver.

Item agreed to.

To provide for breaking ice in Thunder bay, lake Superior and other points deemed advisable for the good of navigation, $40,000.

Mr. MANION: I see the item is the same as last year, $40,000, yet I know there was difficulty there this year in regard to breaking the ice. The company that had the work had a contract price, $40,000, was it not?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes.

Mr. MANION: The company that did the breaking of the ice last year fell down on the job this spring, and another company was called in. Was that charged up to the contractors who succeeded in getting the contract for the work?

Mr. BUREAU: That was done while I was acting for the minister. The company that had the contract fell down, and we were wired that ships were stuck in the ice, and that it was pressing that we should do something. Another company offered its services, and we thought it was advisable to accept, which we did. The contract price was paid less the amount charged by the other company, which is being held over to pay the company that took over the work.

Mr. MANION: Then it is the intention of the government to charge the cost up to the contracting company.

Mr. BUREAU: I cannot say, I am no longer acting for that department.

Mr. LAPOINTE: There is a claim pending with regard to that, but no decision has been arrived at yet.

Mr. HANSON: Why did not the minister send the Murray Stewart up there? That is what she was purchased for, we were told last year.

Mr. LAPOINTE: She was not intended for that, but as we are told that she is such a good boat we may use her.

Item agreed to.

Amount required to pay pensions to pilots—Louis Rob. Demers, Joseph Lapointe, Bartholemi Lachance, Alphonse Asselin, Elzéar Desrosiers, Hubert Raymond, Arbel Bernier, Adelme Pouliot, Edmond LaRochelle, L. E. Morin, A. T. Simard, Joseph Plante, Victor Vézina, Raymond Baquet, Alfred LaRochelle, Théophile Corriveau, Alphonse Pouliot, Emilio Couillard, Trefflé Delisle, David Dumas, Alfred Gaudreau, F. X. Demeules, Adjutor Baillargeon, Joseph Pouliot, Arthur Baillargeon, John A. Irvine, Camille Bernier, Joseph Eugène Lachance, Elzéar Normand, Philéas Lachance, $9,475.

Mr. BAXTER: I have no objection to the item, of course, but will the minister explain why the pensions for these pilots are chargeable to the vote, while if my impression is correct, the pilots in the maritime province ports which have a pilotage service get their pensions out of the funds provided from the pilotage dues from the vessel. If I am in error, I would like the minister to correct me.

Mr. LAPOINTE: My hon. friend is right, but this has been voted since 1906 under an agreement between the pilots of the Quebec district and the government. By order in council of December 5, 1906, provision was made for the payment of an annual pension of $300 to every pilot in the district of Quebec who had retired after reaching the age limit of 65 or in special cases 60 years. In addition and by agreement a life pension is paid to a number of pilots who retired voluntarily in the interests of the service prior to 1913. The number receiving such pension is thirty. This appropriation provides for that number in full. It has been voted by parliament since 1906.

Mr. BAXTER: May I ask the minister further whether there has been within a year or two some change in the St. John pilotage in the nature of having it taken over by the government? I cannot express it more exactly than that. I am under the impression there has been some change in the system.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The pilots of St. John have been brought under the Minister of Marine like those of Quebec, Montreal and other important ports. The Minister of Marine has become the pilotage authority. That was recommended by a royal commission some years ago, and I understand the pilots themselves wanted the change.

Mr. BAXTER: I cannot at all object to it, but I want to know if the same result as takes place in the Quebec or Montreal district will eventually take place at St. John, Halifax and other Maritime province ports;

that is, when a pilot is pensioned, will he fall on this general fund, or even though the minister takes charge will it remain a purely local matter?

Mr. LAPOINTE: The agreement I spoke of covered the case of the pilots of the Quebec district who were then pilots. None of those who have pased their examinations and have become pilots after that date come under the provisions of that agreement, and when the pilots who are at present being pensioned under that agreement disappear there will be no such pension paid, because the agreement will not apply to the new pilots.

Item agreed to.

Patrol of the Northern waters of Canada, $15,000.

Mr. BANCROFT: Will the minister explain this item?

Mr. LAPOINTE: It is to provide for the publication of reports of the Canadian Arctic expedition. Approximately one-half of the reports prepared or to be prepared will be published by the close of the fiscal year, 1922-1923, and it is hoped to complete that part of the work of the expedition before the close of the fiscal year 1923-1924. Also it is hoped to complete the binding of 3 or 4 volumes of these reports, for issue to libraries, universities, and so forth, before the close of the ficsal year 1923-1924. The salaries are as follows: Hon. J. C. Patterson, Investigator of titles to British possessions in Arctic seas, $2,400; F. Johansen, Assistant Zoologist, $2,280.

I might give a list of the volumes prepared by the different scientists with regard to the work of the Arctic expedition, in geology, botany, and so forth.

Mr. HANSON: I am not interested in the names of all the volumes, but I would like the minister to tell us who owns Wrangel island.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I should like to know myself.

Item agreed to.

Department of Marine—Meteorological service including Magnetic Observatory, grants of $500 each to Kingston and Montreal Observatories, and allowance of $400 to L. F. Gorman, Observer at Ottawa, $287,629.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The increase in this item is asked for in order to provide for an enlarged distribution of weather bulletins and for printing the Ontario and Quebec section of the Climatology of Canada, the completion of the Magnetic Observatory at Meanook, Alberta, the replacement of the existing Observatory building at Quebec, the old building having been pronounced beyond repair, and $1,000 for miscellaneous expenses. A saving of $4,871 will be effected in salaries, of $4,000 for repairs to stations, and $500 in travelling expenses.

Mr. HANSON: Would the minister explain why a special allowance is made to Mr. L. F. Gorman, observer at Ottawa? Is that a method adopted to give him a larger salary, or what?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I understand that this vote has been made for twenty years and that the gentleman deserves his salary to the full extent. I agree that it seems peculiar that he should not have been classified with a fixed sum covering the whole amount of his salary, but this has been an annual appropriation for, as I said, the last twenty years.

Mr. HANSON: I have found in the last session or two since I came up here, that when no better reason can be given for doing a certain thing the reason is assigned "Well this has been done forever and ever". I think that is the very weakest kind of reason that can be advanced for doing this, that and the other thing.

Mr. LAPOINTE: This is good doctrine coming from a Conservative.

Mr. HANSON: I have heard that reason assigned in the committee very often. It is no reason at all to advance. I submit to the minister that to say that because the thing has been done for an innumerable number of years it must be kept up is no proper explanation. If this gentleman is worth the money why not pay him accordingly? If it is a sop for him or a method to get round the Civil Service Act why not say so? I suggest that if the gentleman is worth the money as the minister suggests he should be paid the salary to which he is entitled and not have money voted each year in this way.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I admit that the observations of my hon. friend appeal to me. I think if he remains a few years in opposition he will become a good reformer. However, I will look into the matter and if it is possible to have the gentleman get his salary otherwise than by this item of $400 additional I will see to it that it is done.

Item agreed to.

Steamboat inspection, $119,210.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The appropriation provides for statutory salary increases and for the appointment of two clerk-stenographers, one

in the inspector's office at Port Arthur and one in the inspector's office at Kingston, the whole involving an expenditure of $4,400 in excess of last year.

Item agreed to.

Salaries and disbursements of fishery officers and guardians, fisheries patrol and fishery protection services, $880,000.

Mr. HANSON: May I ask the minister if any decision has been reached with respect to the use of Canadian Atlantic ports by American fishermen? That is a live question I think, at the moment, and the House is entitled to a statement with respect to it.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The question is still under consideration and a decision will be arrived at shortly. I will then be pleased to make an announcement.

Mr. HANSON: That is the statement that has been given out to the press every day for about ten days.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am afraid that in most instances the press merely guessed at it.

Mr. HANSON: Well, they are good guessers. The government is doing nothing as usual.

Mr. BUREAU: At the last election they were bad guessers.

Mr. HANSON: Not down in my locality. Perhaps the minister, for the information of the House will state how this question has arisen and what has been the action of the American government as regards the use of their ports?

Mr. LAPOINTE: During the war there was an international commission which investigated all matters concerning the fisheries of both countries, that was one of their recommendations, and it was agreed upon by both governments. The United States ports were opened to Canadian fishing vessels just as the Canadian ports were opened to the American fishing vessels. When the war was over the Americans closed their ports again claiming that the privilege previously enjoyed had been granted under war legislation and that the powers of their War Times Measures Act had expired. On the other hand we kept our ports open to American vessels. Since 1888, under what was called the modus vivendi, American vessels were allowed the use of our ports on payment of a small license fee. Many interests in our country were in favour of granting that privilege to the Americans. Many of our people in the Maritime provinces were selling their fish to Americans.

Mr. HANSON: Did the modus vivendi include a supply of bait as well?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes, it did. On the other hand it resulted in placing the Canadian fishermen in a state of inferiority compared to American fishermen, because the latter used our ports for all the purposes mentioned and shipped their fish to the United States in bond and free of duty. Now a very high duty has been imposed on Canadian fish entering the United States under the new Fordney tariff. Consequently there has been a movement on the part of Canadian fishermen to deprive their competitors in the United States of the right which they do not want to grant to our fishermen. Under the conditions as they exist to-day my own opinion is that if we cannot get from the United States privileges similar to those we grant, it is only fair and just that we should treat American fishermen as Canadian fishermen are treated by the United States.

Mr. HANSON: Let me say to the minister that I entirely agree with the concluding part of his observations. You will never gain anything from the American government by lying down and submitting to them; you always want to have something that you can retaliate with in dealing with them. When they closed their ports to our fishermen a mistake was made in not immediately closing our ports to them, regardless of the objection that might be raised by a few supply men in some of the Atlantic ports. If that had been done long ago the United States would have realized that we had a stiff backbone and that we were able to stand up for our own rights. There has been so much delay that the closing of our ports to American fishermen may not have the result my hon. friend anticipates. However, I would say close them at once as far as I am concerned.

Mr. McBRIDE: I would concur in the statement of the hon. member (Mr. Hanson). As a representative from the Pacific coast, I think it is about time that Canada should treat American fishermen in a manner corresponding to the treatment our fishermen receive over there. I think this government should take a very strong stand on the matter. They should close the Canadian ports to American fishermen, and keep them closed until the ports of the United States are opened to the fishermen of this country.

Item agreed to.

Building fishways and clearing rivers, $40,000.

Mr. CALDWELL: When this item was up last year I drew the attention of the minister to the fact that there are two or more dams built across Salmon river in Victoria county with no fishways in them. On that occasion the minister told me the matter had been investigated and it had been found there was not water enough in this river to enable salmon to get up. I made it my business to investigate the question during the recent summer and at a dry period of the season. I was somewhat surprised to find, after the statement of the minister, that this is quite a large river—in fact lumber is driven down it, I believe, for a matter of sixty miles. There is no time in low water when there is not plenty of water for salmon or for boats, and pretty good navigation. The river got its name from the fact that it was teeming with salmon at one time; therefore it was called Salmon river, and is a tributary of the St. John river, not far below Grand Falls. Salmon cannot go up the Grand Falls in the St. John river. That is one of the reasons why the fish should be able to go up the Salmon river to the breeding ground in the northern country. It was one of the most prolific sources of salmon in years gone by, as I learned from residents whom I interviewed there.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Are there any salmon there now?

Mr. CALDWELL: I doubt if there are; the dams have stopped them coming up. I would, therefore, urge the minister to have the fishery overseer go there and make an inspection.

Mr. LAPOINTE: How long have the dams been there?

Mr. CALDWELL: I do not know the number of years. I know there has been quite an urge from the settlers that fishways should be put in the dams when they were built. This was not done, and due to that fact the salmon have become almost exterminated on the upper reaches of the river. If fishways were put in, they could go up there and breed.

There is another matter which I called attention to last year, and I would like some information in regard to it. It is the question of the pollution of the rivers by sawdust from the sawmills. The northern end of the St. John river is the boundary line between the United States and Canada, running through Madawaska county on the one side, and the state of Maine on the other. With regard to our own mills on the Canadian side, and in fact on both sides of the river from Grand Falls down, which is Canadian, the regulations are very strict, and well enforced, I believe, by the fisheries overseers to prevent sawdust being dumped into the river, because it is very injurious to the fish. However, there are mills on the American side of the St. John river where the river is a boundary line, and I believe the sawdust from those mills is being dumped in the river. The American authorities are not very particular about it, because the river almost immediately runs into Canada, and the injury is done in Canada. It is a very great injury. Our Canadian sawmill men are compelled to burn their sawdust, or to carry it back on the high ground where it can do no harm. I suggested to the minister that this matter might be referred to the International Joint Commission. I believe there is such a body, is there not? Has this been done? I asked last year that it should be done, but I believe no action has been taken.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It has been submitted to the commission, as my hon. friend suggests, and they said it was not a matter they could deal with. We are trying to negotiate with the Commissioner for the state of Maine with regard to this very matter, and I hope we will be able to get a solution such as would suit my hon. friend.

With reference to the hon. member's question in regard to the Salmon river, in view of what he has just said, I will make it a point to send an engineer there this summer to inquire into the conditions, and if it is necessary, we will compel the owners to put in fishways.

Mr. HANSON: Who bears the expense of building these fishways in the dams? Is it the department or the owners of the dam?

Mr. LAPOINTE: The owners of the dam.

Mr. MILNE: When this matter was up before, I drew the attention of the minister to the fact that there was a little stream up in Manitoba, White Mud river, on which the railway company had a dam near the village of Gladstone. I was assured that the department would look into the matter and see that a fishway was built so that the fish could go up. I understand that during the summer an inspector went up and looked at the dam and the fishway, and from what I can gather nothing has been done. The citizens there tell me no change has been made. I asked some of the officials of the railway company why they did not fix the slide so that the fish could get up, and they assured me

that it was built according to the specifications of the Fisheries department, and they did not know what else they could do. I want to draw the attention of the minister to the fact that a fish inspector going up and looking at the slide does not assist the fish one bit in getting over. We have been trying for a long time to get that fishway built so that the fish could go up. For the last ten or twelve years we have been working at it as hard as we could, and we are no further ahead than when we started. It seems to me it is the next thing to a crime to have in the dams fishways which are not suitable and which the fish cannot climb. It deprives the settlers of the opportunity of getting a few fish in the spring. If they could get over the dam there is nothing to hinder them going up into the country 40 or 50 miles. Not only that, but the fish die below the dam. They pile up there until they are sticking out of the water, starve to death, and pollute the stream. In addition to that, the fish do not get up to the shallow waters and the sandy beaches to spawn, as I understand they should. I think this is a matter of great importance. It is too bad to have our people deprived of the food, and it is too bad to have the fish depleted, because they cannot go up the river to spawn.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I thought we had written to my hon. friend long ago explaining where the matter stood. We were waiting for the water to subside before taking final action in the matter. It is still engaging the attention of the department, and I hope we shall be able to do something.

Mr. McBRIDE: We have a fish inspector out in British Columbia whom everybody respects. He simply goes along and when he sees a dam in a creek he gives the owner a certain time to put a passage over it. When the inspector comes back, if the passage is not constructed over the dam as ordered, he blows the whole dam out with dynamite. I do not see why the same regulations should not be enforced in regard to the dam under discussion.

An hon. MEMBER: He is an Irishman.

Mr. McBRIDE: Yes, he is an Irishman, and a good one at that.

Mr. FORKE: We are very peaceable and law-abiding on the prairies and do not attempt any such doings as that. The conditions which the hon. member for Neepawa (Mr. Milne) describes exist all over the prairie, and on the prairies the railway company at intervals have dammed the streams for the purpose of getting water. I think we brought this matter to the minister's attention last year. I remember some years ago writing to the game guardian in Manitoba complaining that the chutes were so built that the fish could not get up. He inspected them and said that they were built according to law. Well, that did not help the fish. I think the trouble is the chutes are so steep that the pike cannot jump over them as the salmon do. The pike are slower going and are unable to get up, except in high water. I agree with the hon. member for Neepawa that while people who are used to salmon, such as the hon. member for Victoria and Carleton (Mr. Caldwell), look with contempt upon a pike, we on the prairie are only too glad to get them, because they are good food. It seems a pity that this condition should exist. I know the streams are being depleted. The fish cannot leave the lakes and go up to spawn, and where there were plenty of fish some years ago there is none to-day. My house is almost on the banks of Pipestone creek, and we used to be able to go out and catch a fish any time we wanted to, but we cannot get any now, and the only reason for this is that they cannot spawn. I think the chutes are too steep and the regulations should be altered. The fish cannot go up except in high water. I think the minister might look into this, because it is important.

Mr. CALDWELL: I would like to impress another matter upon the minister. It is not right for a man to put his own fishway in his dam. He should have someone see that the fishway is properly put in.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes.

Mr. CALDWELL: I can realize why a man running a sawmill with water power does not want a fishway in his dam. It wastes water. He is inclined to put in a small chute that will not waste much water. They had better not waste any water at all if they do not make it big enough so that the salmon can go up.

Mr. LAPOINTE: We always provide plans and specifications, and an engineer is sent there to see that the work is well done.

Mr. MARTELL: What evidence is there that any of those fishways were in any way defective? I have heard a great deal about this, and I know from my experience in the department that fishways are constantly put in; but it seems to me that, though every effort should be made to permit fish to pass upstream for spawning, too many restrictions are being put on industry. Requests are made for fishways here and fishways there;

or the statement is made that sawdust is getting in a stream here and sawdust is getting in a stream there, and people are compelled to install a fishway, according to plans and specifications supplied by the department, for the purpose of letting one or two fish get up stream, irrespective of the damage this is doing to industry.

Mr. FORKE: We want fair play for the fish.

Mr. BEAUBIEN: Does the hon. gentleman suggest that sawdust in a stream does not affect the fish?

Mr. MARTELL: I am not suggesting anything of the sort; but with all due respect to my hon. friend, I know as much about fish as he does. I happen to come from a fishing constituency, and I was brought up practically in a fishing boat or vessel. I quite understand that sawdust or other mill refuse, is deleterious to fish life. But when, in order to meet the demands of one or two in a particular community, as regards streams away inland you put injunctions on millers who are making a living by sawing a few boards, you are putting a wrongful injunction upon industry. I remember some years ago when I was an official of the Marine and Fisheries department, word came from the constituency of my hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Mr. Bureau), that, I think it was called the Grace Falls Pulp and Paper Company, were polluting the waters and destroying fish. It appeared that once in nine years a man had caught a fish in that particular place, and immediately an action was begun in the courts of law to punish this company. Technically they were guilty. I was sent down by the department, being an official at that time, to investigate the matter, and I must say to the credit of the minister, although he was not of my political persuasion, that he immediately stopped the prosecution and said that the thing was absolutely absurd. That is what is going to happen again. I do not think people should be compelled to put in fishways or be prevented from letting a small quantity of sawdust get into a stream, when the fish life is not in any way commensurate with the amount of employment given to the people of the community.

Mr. CALDWELL: I am glad the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Martell) is no longer in the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and I hope the minister has not many officials with the same views on fish life as the hon. member for Hants has.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I should like to have him back in the department.

[Mr. Martell.]

Mr. CALDWELL: I should like him to change his views before he administers the fishery laws. He speaks of penalizing industry in order that people may fish. Our millers do not object at all to comply with the regulations, and where there is one miller, there are hundreds of people who want to fish. The question is one of the greatest good to the greatest number. Our millers do not feel that it is any great hardship to take care of mill refuse.

Mr. MARTELL: I do not want to be misquoted at all.

Mr. CALDWELL: If they did not do so, the fish would be exterminated, and fish is a very nice food.

Mr. FORKE: The only industry we have on the streams I mentioned is the fishing industry, so this cannot do any harm to other industries.

Mr. MARTELL: I am speaking simply of the upper streams where there is very little fish life, and it is absurd to interfere with industry in that connection. If people are polluting streams where the fishing industry is important they should be prevented from doing so, but the law as it stands to-day is absolutely too drastic.

Mr. BUREAU: I want to protest in the name of the fish in my riding.

Mr. HANSON: Is this the item under which the vote is paid for clearing snags out of the river St. John?

Mr. LAPOINTE: No.

Item agreed to.

To assist in the conservation and development of the deep sea fisheries, and the demand for fish, $25,000.

Mr. HANSON: Is this money spent for advertising?

Mr. LAPOINTE: To some extent.

Mr. FORKE: How are the deep sea fisheries developed? This may be a foolish question, but I should like to know.

Mr. LAPOINTE: This is to provide for the operation and maintenance of a publicity —it is propaganda as my hon. friend said— and marketing division, for the purpose of distributing information in regard to the fish of Canada, its food values, methods of cooking and so forth, all with a view to the creation of a wider demand and greater consumption. Through this division a press bulletin service was carried on. Interesting information regarding fish and the fisheries was prepared and sent to all the newspapers, and it was being widely used. Special illustrated articles

regarding the fisheries as well as recipes for cooking fish were supplied to household periodicals. As a result, what would have been equal to 600 columns in 200 newspapers of fisheries matter, appeared in the newspapers last year. There are also arrangements made with the Trade and Commerce department for moving pictures showing how valuable our fisheries are.

Mr. HANSON: They are very good. Under this item I should like to ask the minister if it is the intention to have another roving commission on the Atlantic similiar to the one we had on the Pacific last year, captained by the admiral from Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) and with the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Martell) as forecastle boy. From the press I understand that such a move is under way. How much was the expense of these gentlemen who had this junketing trip to the Pacific coast last year? Has it been paid yet, and is it considered that it was a violation of the Independence of Parliament Act for these gentlemen to receive compensation for their time? I should like to have some information about that.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Whether or not it is the intention to have another commission lies in the hands of parliament. Last year a commission was appointed on the unanimous recommendation of parliament, first on the unanimous recommendation of the committee on Marine and Fisheries, and, second, on the unanimous approval of that report by parliament, so there was nothing else to do but to appoint a commission. My hon. friend was responsible for it as much as I was, because he is a member of the House of Commons which approved it unanimously. I think that is a fair position to take. Am I wrong?

Mr. HANSON: I do not think I was in the House at the time. If I did vote for it, I desire to repudiate it right now; but the man who is responsible is the minister, because without his consent this could not have occurred.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The minister is the servant of parliament.

Mr. BUREAU: And a good one at that.

Mr. LAPOINTE: If it is in the power of the minister to give or grant, the minister will always grant it. He thinks the combined wisdom of parliament, including my hon. friend, is much greater than his own. That is my reason for saying that.

Mr. HANSON: Is there any intention of having a similar commission roving around the Atlantic during the coming season?

Mr. LAPOINTE: That question is before parliament now. I understand a report of the Marine and Fisheries committee was presented to this House a few days ago; but a motion to approve the report which was made was postponed, and it is still pending. Therefore, my hon. friend will have ample opportunity to give his opinion in the matter.

Mr ROBICHAUD: I am glad to find another friend of the fishing industry in the person of the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson).

Mr. MARTELL: He never caught anything more than a minnow in his life.

Mr. BUREAU: That is a direct insult. I would not take it.

Mr. ROBICHAUD: It strikes me that there must be some other factor besides this item. The item reads:

To assist in the conservation and development of the deep sea fisheries.

I should like to ask the minister whether the main purpose of this item is to come to the assistance of the industry.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I explained to the hon. member the purpose of the item. There might be many other things that could be done.

Mr. ROBICHAUD: Is there anything else that is intended?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes.

Mr. ROBICHAUD: There is something else to which I would direct the attention of the committee, and that is the express rates we have to pay from the fishing districts in the county of Gloucester and in northern New Brunswick to the markets that are available to us. So far as my memory serves me, we have had to pay between 4½ and 4¾ cents a pound for express transportation from the Baie des Chaleurs coast to the Boston market, the rate to the New York market being in proportion while the freight rates from the Baie des Chaleurs coast to the Montreal market is 2 cents a pound, the fish being carried in iced containers. Our fish leaves the Baie des Chaleurs coast and is shipped via Montreal. It arrives in Montreal in the morning at seven o'clock or half past seven and remains there until half past eight at night; that is to say, it is exposed to the heat of the sun for about thirteen hours during the months of July and August, when the market is open to the fishermen. This is a difficulty that could be overcome. The Baie des Chaleurs coast

is only twenty hours from Boston. If our produce were shipped via Fredericton, which is only 150 miles distant, it would help matters considerably, provided that proper train connections were established. As it is now we are one day and a half from Fredericton but with proper train connections we could land our fish at that point in about nine hours. It would then leave Fredericton in the afternoon, landing in Boston next morning. At that rate the Baie des Chaleurs coast would be twenty-two hours' run from Boston, so that fish from the coast could be placed in the Boston or New York market as the case might be in twenty-two or twenty-four hours instead of after a delay of fifty-six hours as is now the case. This is one matter that the department might look into.

Some time ago an hon. member from Ontario in the Fisheries committee made the statement that at certain times of the year good fish was almost a luxury in some parts of Ontario and could not be bought at any price, whereas our fishermen in the county of Gloucester had dumped on the American markets millions upon millions of pounds of nice fish which they could not sell to cover the freight and tariff charges entirely. This is one respect in which the department could be of some real advantage to the fishermen of that part of the country. I think that we should have proper rail connections, and there should at the same time be established some kind of intelligence bureau that would keep the Maritime provinces in touch with other sections of the country. Fish, it has been proved, is one of the most valuable foods that can be used; and it has been stated that the provinces of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island have produced some of the most intelligent men—and I am not speaking of myself for a moment—that this country has seen.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Do not be so modest.

Mr. ROBICHAUD: We have contributed able men to the political life not only of Canada but of the Mother Country. For example, the late Prime Minister of Great Britain, the Right Hon. Mr. Bonar Law, is a native of my own province; and I believe that this superiority of intelligence is due to the fact that our people use a lot of fish. I do not wish to depreciate the food products of other parts of the Dominion, but I certainly think that this valuable food produced in the Maritime provinces should be used more extensively in Canada; and although I have nothing whatever but admiration for the good qualities of the women of the West, I do not think that they are quite as skilled in the art of cooking fish as are the ladies of the Maritime provinces. It does not matter what hotel you visit in the Maritime provinces, you will find the fish excellent and well cooked. If the art of cooking fish were more extensively practised throughout this country, more fish would be used. To be serious I would impress upon the minister and the committee this fact: The fishermen of the Maritime provinces are becoming disheartened and are leaving the country for the United States. Family after family have gone and we are losing many of the pioneers of this country. So far as the Maritime provinces are concerned, we are losing the flower of our population. The fishing industry is one of the oldest of our activities in this country. I was astonished on entering the legislature of the state of Massachusetts some time ago to see in front of the speaker's chair, as the emblem of the state, a golden codfish. But so far as my knowledge of the Canadian parliament goes, and judging from the reports I have read of the proceedings in this House during the past twenty years, if a man stood up and ventured to talk about fish he was regarded as a faddist. It was considered an extraordinary thing for any member to broach the subject. I think, Mr. Chairman, that this is a mistake; we should insist on the value of this industry and, whether or not there are some who may think that the question is not of any great interest, we should talk so much about fish that the government will perforce do something to encourage the industry and thus retain our population within the precinct of this country of ours.

Mr. McMASTER (Translation): Before this resolution is adopted, Mr. Chairman, I want to draw the attention of the Minister of Marine to a few remarks that I wish to make and I hope that he will not press the item through. We have no money to spend in advertising fish. If the Maritime provinces' fish cannot speak for themselves, at least they do so through the voice either of the member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson), or the member who has just taken his seat (Mr. Robichaud). There is no necessity for spending the public funds for that purpose. I appeal to my old friend. What is the sense of disbursing money for a display of moving pictures of fish? I am calling the minister's attention to that fact. It is most unreasonable, at present, owing to the financial state in which the country finds itself. We have no money to spend on moving pictures of

fish, even though they be salmon which leap in the British Columbia rivers.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Translation): Mr. Chairman, the first objection which I can find to my hon. friend's speech is the adjective "ancien"—old—which he made use of in his expression "my old friend."

Mr. McMASTER (Translation): Friendship persists.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Translation): I hope that my hon. friend shall always be my friend, in the future as well as he was in the past.

Now, it is perhaps to be regretted that, in this committee of which my hon. friend is chairman and over the deliberations of which he presided with such distinction, the fishing industry was not included with that of agriculture.

Mr. CALDWELL: Would the minister kindly speak in Gaelic so we can understand him?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am afraid my hon. friend from Brome would not understand me in Gaelic. I am speaking for his benefit.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Translation): The fishermen of Canada have been complaining for ever so long and more so at present, that a sufficient interest is not taken in their industry, that everybody is interested in other industries, agriculture among others, but that the fisheries of the maritime provinces and British Columbia are neglected. I think that, especially at a time when the fishermen have never been under such hardships, my hon. friend should not be so parsimonious about the small amount put to their credit for the development of their industry.

Mr. McMASTER (Translation): It is rather difficult to swallow moving pictures.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Translation): I do not expect my hon. friend to do so.

Item agreed to.

To provide for the inspection of pickled fish, $25,000.

Mr. BOYS: Why the increase?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Last summer we had to appoint three new inspectors on account of the increased work.

Mr. BOYS: Where are they located?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yarmouth county, Eastern Halifax county and Guysborough.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I do not quite understand the necessity for the inspection of pickled fish. It seems to me that if properly pickled they would pass any investigation.

Mr. LAPOINTE: This appropriation is for the purpose of enforcing the Fish Inspection Act and the regulations made thereunder. The Governor in Council makes regulations prescribing the materials to be used for containers for fish, the size of such containers, how they shall be made and marked, and the quality and weight of the fish packed in them; and for the appointment of inspectors for the enforcement of these regulations and the exaction of penalties for their infraction. The improvement in the fish packed since the passing of this legislation has resulted in a much wider demand for inspection not only from the fishermen but from dealers as well, and this has necessitated an increase in the number of our inspectors.

Item agreed to.

Fish culture, $370,000.

Mr. HANSON: Mr. Chairman, under this vote I desire to get some information from the minister with respect to a matter in the province of Nova Scotia. On the 11th May I put a question on the order paper respecting the Margaree River Salmon Fisheries Association. Yesterday an answer was brought down, which of course was no answer at all. These are the questions I put on the order paper:

1. When was the Margaree River Salmon Fisheries Association formed, and what are its relations, contractual or otherwise with the Department of Marine and Fisheries?
2. What were the names of the members of the association in 1921?
3. Was any change made in the membership of the association in 1922? If so, at whose instance?
4. Were any persons, members of the association in 1921, deprived of their interests or shares in the association, or in the proceeds received from the Department of Marine and Fisheries in the year 1922 by reason of any action of the department or any officer thereof, in the year 1922?
5. Has any claim been made to the Department of Marine and Fisheries by any person, for a share of the payment agreed to be made to the association by that department, which has been disallowed? If so, who are the persons and what are the reasons for such disallowance?
6. Has the Department of Marine and Fisheries at the instance of any member of parliament, changed the membership of such association?
7. If so, who was such member of parliament?

The very illuminating answer I got yesterday was as follows:

The answer to these questions will be contained in the return moved for by Mr. Hocken for Mr. Hanson on the 14th instant.

It must be apparent that at this late stage of the session the return would not be brought down before these estimates were under consideration by the House, and I regret very much that the minister has not seen fit to give me the desired information. I have to say that this is one of the most glaring cases that has ever come under my notice of interference on the part of a sitting member of any riding with property rights and vested interests. Briefly, these are the facts: About 1909 a non-incorporated association was formed at Margaree in the county of Inverness for the purpose of supplying parent salmon to the government hatchery which was established in that vicinity about that time. The association originally consisted of a relatively small number of members, but in 1910 the membership was brought up to nineteen and continued at this figure until the summer of 1922. Several of the original members died in the meantime and their places were filled by their widows or elder sons, by agreement in every case.

The association, subject to the direction of the superintendent of the pond, so called,—an official of the Department of Marine and Fisheries—laid the fish trap each year, at the expense of its members; that is to say, the trap was the property of the members of the association, and while they were an unincorporated body, yet there was a contractual relation existing between the members and the department to supply these parent fish. In every case the material has been paid for by members of the association. At the annual meeting of 1922 the year's business was provided for as usual, and a contract was made with one of the members for setting a trap and no question of additional membership was raised. On the 4th of August, 1922, the president of the association, Mr. Severin Arsenault, got orders from the department by wire to have the trap set. At the same time he states he got orders from the hon. member for Inverness in this house (Mr. Chisholm) to exclude from the list of persons to be served with notice to set the trap, the names of five Conservatives and to include five Liberals in their places. Arsenault carried out his instructions, but the Conservatives nevertheless turned up and did their part in the work.

About the same time, namely on August 9th, J. A. Rodd, Superintendent of Fish Culture of the Fisheries branch of the department, wrote to P. D. LeBlanc, superintendent of the pond at Margaree, stating that the department "understands that the present membership of the association is as follows" and proceeded to eliminate the five Conservatives and include the five new Liberals. On learning the names included in this list John C. LeBlanc—one of the Conservatives—wrote to Mr. Rodd protesting and explaining what the situation really was. Mr. Rodd replied on August 31st disclaiming any intention of determining the question of membership but proceeded as follows: "The information before the department showed that the membership for the present year consisted of the persons whose names were communicated to the Superintendent of the Pond"—referring of course to the letter of August 4th to P. D. LeBlanc. J. C. LeBlanc replied to this at length on September 13th pressing for the sources from which the department obtained its "information." The department replied on September 20th in the usual vein, not disclosing its source of information.

On December 18th the secretary-treasurer of the association, Thos. J. LeBlanc, also one of the Conservatives, wrote to the department asking for the cheque in payment of the association's account for the year. In previous years the cheque had, properly, been sent to the secretary-treasurer. He waited a month for a reply which, under date of January 17, 1923, informed him that "a cheque has been issued and forwarded to Severin Arsenault the president for distribution amongst those who are entitled to any portion of it."

Arsenault cashed the cheque and in the distribution left out the five Conservatives and included the five Liberals who had no property interest in the trap whatever.

Mr. LAPOINTE: We have nothing to do with that.

Mr. HANSON: I think you have something to do with it, if you will allow me to proceed.

Arsenault states he was ordered by the member for Inverness to divide the money among the persons named in a list furnished by the superintendent of the pond, P. D. LeBlanc, and that he acted accordingly. He further stated that there were certain departmental forms or blanks which were sent to the superintendent of the pond filled in with the names of these nineteen Liberals and that he was required to pay to the persons named in these forms.

I want to say to the minister that the whole matter is now before the courts of Nova Scotia, and undoubtedly if these people cannot get any justice from his department they will get it from a court of law. But I want to point out the attempt made by the hon. member for Inverness in the exercise of political patronage to deprive five gentle-

men in his own constituency of their proprietary interests in their fish trap. I want to point out to the members of this House that the minister and his department—I do not say perhaps that the minister knew anything about it personally, but certainly his department knew there was a change in the membership and that it was an involuntary change, that it was a change dictated by the hon. member for Inverness, a deliberate attempt to deprive people of their property rights, and that will be demonstrated, I have no doubt, in due course by the courts of Nova Scotia, where I believe they are still administering justice notwithstanding some recent appointments.

Mr. DUFF: Order.

Mr. BUREAU: Do not reflect upon the courts.

Mr. HANSON: I think it was a matter of justice and right for the minister to save these fishermen the necessity of going to law and incurring the expenses of counsel, solicitors' costs and the costs of trial. I think the minister himself should look into this matter and see justice done irrespective of all question of political patronage. If he does not like the way things have been done in the past he is not bound to enter into a contract with this association in future, but after having once entered into a contract with an unincorporated body like this he is bound, I say, to see that the money is properly distributed. Remember this is an unincorporated body, each member of which has a property right. I am sure that will appeal to the minister as a legal man. He is bound to see that the rights of these people are respected whether they enter into another contract with his department or not. That is all I ask for, a plain matter of common justice. And I wish to say this: I think it is a small matter for any member of parliament to attempt to deprive one of his own constituents of some of his property rights by the mere exercise of the power of patronage.

Mr. DUFF: Will the hon. member tell the committee what document he is reading from or where he got his information?

Mr. HANSON: I am not addressing any remarks to the hon. member for Lunenburg, and I say further, when we are asking the ministers a question I do not think we want an answer from the hon. member for Lunenburg.

Mr. DUFF: I did not make an answer, and it is very discourteous to say the least for the hon. member for York-Sunbury when I ask him a civil question as to what document he is reading from to make such an answer as he did. I think the committee has a perfect right to the information I asked for. He read from a document, and if he is a gentleman he will give me a gentlemanly answer.

Mr. HANSON: If the minister wants to know I shall be very glad to supply the information, or to show him the document.

Mr. CHISHOLM: I am much obliged to my hon. friend (Mr. Hanson) for bringing this matter up. It has been a subject that he has evidently taken a great deal of interest in.

First let me tell him for his information that when he talks about the politics of these men he does not know the first thing about it. There were Liberals and Tories in what he calls the association. There were Liberals and Tories who ceased to be members of that so-called organization, and let me remind him that some of these men that he seems to stand up for to-night were supporters of mine and not supporters of the Tory party.

Let me tell you, Mr. Chairman, the history of this matter. If my hon. friend had just taken the trouble of discussing it with me, as I would have done with him, were the circumstances reversed, he would have been in a much better position to discuss this question intelligently. He evidently does not know the first thing about it.

Some years ago the department in their wisdom thought fit to pass a regulation preventing the setting of salmon nets in the tidal waters of the rivers of Canada, including the Margaree river. At that time there were several people, perhaps twenty-five, setting nets in the Margaree river. They were getting a little revenue from it. When the regulation was passed, the department of course prevented them from setting their nets. About this time a fish pond was opened up there for salmon to supply the hatchery and I suggested to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that it would be a good thing for him to give the business of catching these salmon for the pond to some of the men who were deprived of the right of putting their nets in the river. At that time I suggested the names of seventeen men. Afterwards the names of two additional men were added, but that did not at all comprise the number of men that used to operate nets in the river previous to this regulation, preventing the setting of nets in the Margaree. These nineteen men were operating—that is were getting these salmon for the fish pond up until last year. I have no compunction in the world in telling my hon. friend, if it will bring any comfort to his soul, that I suggested myself that a

change should be made. I will tell him the reason why. I did not think it was right to continue this thing as an apparent favour to a few people while their neighbours were deprived of it—neighbours who were entitled to consideration. I suggested to the department that they drop five of these men and take up five more, and let me tell my hon. friend that most of the people living in that section, yes, 80 per cent of them are supporters of mine. I did this simply from the standpoint of justice and fairness and did not do it without the knowledge of these men—one and all of them. I said I would recommend that five of these men would be dropped and some more of the remaining 17 would be dropped later, until we were able to give each one of the men who were deprived of net fishing in Margaree by government regulations their turn of this somewhat valuable privilege. I propose to follow up that policy. Notwithstanding the moral lecture my hon. friend has been giving me I propose following it up and seeing to it that all the men who enjoy the right of putting nets in the Margaree river will have a turn at this privilege in so far as the trap is concerned. I am not a lawyer and I cannot understand the mentality of my hon. friend when he attaches any guilt to the department whatsoever. The department said to a certain number of men down there "We want you to get salmon for the pond and we will pay you so much." These men got together and they bought a trap. The fact that the trap was bought and paid for is one matter. It was not paid for by the department. The department had nothing at all to do with it. All the department had to do was to tell their agent down there to see that a proper trap was provided, that is, a trap suitable for the purpose, and to see that the salmon were properly looked after until they found their way into the pond. That is all the department had to do with it. Let me tell my good friend something else: When these five men were going to be added in place of the five that were dropped they went to the five that were dropped and told them "We will pay you the value of your part of the trap, we are prepared to do it any time." The seventeen men were in this position. When the time came I made a recommendation to the department.—I say this right now in the presence of my hon. friend and if he can take any comfort out of it or if he can see anything unmoral in that he can view it according to his own judgment—I suggested to the department to put those five men in place of the five to be dropped. These seventeen who were left in had a trap on their hands and there was only one of two things for them to do: They would either have to operate this trap or buy a new trap because evidently they could not satisfy the other five men for the reason that they expected to enjoy this privilege in perpetuity, they expected it was to be everlasting. They have discovered, however, that it was not going to be done and I will assure my hon. friend it will not be done. I will tell him something more: As a lawyer he, in my judgment, should refrain from discussing a matter that is before the courts, as he says. This, I tell him, is a primary principle of law as I understand it. In the judgment of the court in Nova Scotia my hon. friend may find himself sadly mistaken, and it may be a salutary lesson to him. Now, as to the cheques. The cheques were sent down by the department with instructions to pay the money to those to whom the money was due and a list of these men was sent to the party to whom the list was sent. To whom else should the money be paid? The day the trap was put into the water the agent of the government there told these five men dropped "You have no right here. My instructions are that these nineteen men are to operate these traps." Here comes in my guilt again because I suggested this change. I thought it proper to make a change in order to pass the privilege over to some other men who were entitled to it. The five men dropped had not the privilege of setting a trap in the river—that privilege could only be given to them by the department, which privilege was actually refused to them by the authorized agent of the department.

Mr. HANSON: Does the hon. gentleman think that it is a matter of good conscience to deprive five owners of their property without compensation, or even to attempt to force them to sell out their interests?

Mr. CHISHOLM: I can tell my hon. friend that I am just as conscientious as he is, and that I have just as much regard for a man's privileges or rights as he has. I told him that when these five new men went in they saw the old men whose places they were taking, as my hon. friend says, and told them "We will pay you for your property." The only property they had was one nineteenth of the value of the traps each.

Mr. HANSON: You admit there was a property right then?

Mr. CHISHOLM: There was a property right in the trap but that did not carry anything with it. The department had nothing to do with that.

An hon. MEMBER: I thought there were five to begin with?

Mr. CHISHOLM: There were nineteen in. My hon. friend has not been listening to my observations evidently. These men, that is the seventeen who were formerly in the number who got the salmon and the five new men, got the salmon and delivered them to the proper parties. The money was sent down to the president of what my hon. friend calls the association. I never knew it as an association. I will tell my hon. friend that when the trap was originally bought his humble servant did a good deal by way of encouraging these men to go into this thing, and did something by way of financing to get the trap for them; but so far as the organization as such is concerned I never heard a word about it as an organization. The money was paid to these men whom the department authorized to get the salmon and they are no doubt contented. The other five men now go to court. Would it not be fair and reasonable for my hon. friend, knowing this, to let this matter drop until we get the decision of the court on the legal point, if there is one, determined. So far as justice is concerned I consider that ample justice and more was done to these men. What is more, I will see that more of them will go out in turn if the department will take my recommendation, as they have done in the past, that new men shall go in and that this privilege, which is a very nice privilege shall be spread over the whole community, including the men who, previous to the new regulation, were allowed to put their nets in the river. I trust my explanation will be satisfactory to my hon. friend. I can see a change in his mind right now; I think his countenance indicates that I have made an impression on him, that he sees things differently.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to direct the attention of hon. members to the fact that this debate seems to be out of order under rule 234 of Beauchesne's Rules of Parliamentary Procedure which denies the right of members of the House to refer to any matter on which a judicial decision is pending. In view of the fact that there was criticism of the conduct of a member of the House that hon. gentleman is perhaps justified, as a matter of privilege, in replying. I doubt the right of hon. members to debate the question in view of the fact that it is sub judice.

Mr. HANSON: I am not rising to dispute your ruling at all, Mr. Chairman; it is probably correct. I do not know anything about the rules of the House. I must confess I have seen the outside of Mr. Beauchesne's book but never the inside.

The CHAIRMAN: If a matter is pending in a court of justice it is not debatable.

Mr. HANSON: I desire to ask the minister if he proposes to respect a contract which the department entered into in the early season of 1922 before this change of the association took place? I can ask him that question surely?

Mr. LAPOINTE: The department has nothing to do with the members of the association in question, and after the remarks I have heard to-night I do not want to have anything to do with them. We are buying the parent fish from which the eggs are taken for our purposes and we are paying a certain amount for them. The money is paid to the president of the association and we let the members decide among themselves how it is to be divided. I do not want to interfere.

Mr. HANSON: May I ask the minister why a change was made in issuing the cheque to the president of the association, whereas in previous years it was sent to the secretary-treasurer?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am informed not during the last few years. The cheque was always sent to the president of the association, and that has been done this year. Again I repeat I do not want to deal with the members of that organization.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): May I ask the minister just where the pond is situated for which money is being voted in connection with fish culture?

Mr. CHISHOLM: It is situated on the Margaree river.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I mean the pond as to which we are voting this appropriation.

Mr. LAPOINTE: There are thirty-two hatcheries as follows:

Nova Scotia	4
Prince Edward Island	1
New Brunswick	4
Ontario	8
Manitoba	3
Saskatchewan	1
Alberta	1
British Columbia	10

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Where is the one in Alberta?

Mr. LAPOINTE: At Banff.

Item agreed to.

Marine biological board of Canada, $42,000.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): What is the duty of this board?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I have the following memorandum:

The board was established by Act of Parliament (2 George V, chap. 6) in 1912 and has charge of all biological stations in Canada and the conduct and control of marine biological investigations. While the board is, in the main, a volunteer organization, the members and investigators not being paid, it arranges the investigations so as to throw light on matters connected with the life history of fish, their origin, development, structure, functions, distribution, etc., and reasons for deterioration, etc. Permanent biological stations are maintained at St. Andrews, N.S., and at Departure bay, Nanaimo, B.C., and a small sea-going vessel is also maintained on the Atlantic coast. In addition to the permanent stations, seasonal or temporary stations are established from time to time and at various points as occasion requires.

An increase of $8,000 is provided in comparison with 1922-23 for the purpose of repairing and enlarging the biological station on the west coast.

We intended to have an increase but the Minister of Finance will not let it go through, so that I can strike it out of my book.

Mr. McQUARRIE: How many scientific men are employed in British Columbia?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Professor C. McLean Fraser, University of British Columbia, continued fishery investigations, salmon, halibut, herring and so forth, also conjointly with international (U.S.) committees, researches on pile-borers and ship worms, faunistic studies, and so forth; Mr. Cyril Berkley, assistant at station, biochemical studies on fish and their sea-water environment, bacterial studies; Professor C. H. O'Donoghue, D.Sc., University of Manitoba, marine invertebrates and fourteen other fishery and faunistic problems, fish food, and so forth; Miss Mounce, University of Manitoba, faunistic studies and preparation of biological material for researches; Mr. H. A. Dunlop, University of British Columbia, investigations at Harrison lake hatchery, and spawning grounds, into the biology of the sockeye and other Fraser river salmon, and Mr. G. Foerster, University of British Columbia, Fraser river sockeye investigations on Harrison lake and lower Fraser. These are the scientists working in British Columbia.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Do I understand these are professors employed in the different universities mentioned who devote a portion of their time to this work in British Columbia?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes.

Mr. McQUARRIE: That is to say, they spend their holidays there?

Mr. LAPOINTE: If the hon. member calls that a holiday. They are not paid. They are doing voluntary work. Of course, they must not do that during the season of the university work. They are doing it in the summer time.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Are there no permanent employees?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes, Professor Fraser is employed permanently.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Not connected with any university.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes, with the University of British Columbia.

Mr. McQUARRIE: He teaches in the university as well?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes.

Mr. McQUARRRIE: And devotes some of his time to the work of the department?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes, and I might say to my hon. friend that the board is arranging for another permanent man in British Columbia.

Mr. McQUARRIE: It seems to me that this is a very important branch of the public service of Canada, and that we should have on the Pacific and also on the Atlantic coast a permanent board of scientific men who will devote all their time to the work, who will study the habits of the fish, who will be able to advise the minister as to the proper methods to be employed in the hatcheries and otherwise. It seems to me that the minister should make arrangements to go into this subject more extensively. The matter was taken up by the British Columbia Fisheries Commission, I think some reference was made in the report of that commission. I know the commissioners agreed that the work was a very important one.

Mr. MARTELL: The hon. member referred to the British Columbia Fisheries Commission. Does he understand that the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) referred to me as the fo'csle boy, and the member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) as the captain of the commission? I would like to ask what my hon. friend's position was. Was he a midshipmite or what?

Mr. McQUARRIE: I do not understand.

Mr. MARTELL: The hon. member never heard the discussion.

Mr. McQUARRIE: No, I did not follow it. It is pretty hard sometimes to keep up with my hon. friend. But I have been interested in the fisheries of British Columbia for many years.

Mr. MARTELL: I am not casting any reflection on the hon. member but one hon. member opposite did cast some reflection on some hon. member. My hon. friend was not in the house.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I did not hear it. I think the hon. member will agree with the remarks I have just made as to the importance of a scientific investigation into our fisheries on the Pacific coast and also on the Atlantic coast. I think he will agree that attention has not been paid to this feature in the past. I know I have found a great deal of difference of opinion as to whether or not the hatcheries are doing any good in British Columbia, as to whether artificial propagation of salmon should be continued or not. It seems to me that is a matter which should be determined by a scientific investigation, and that it is important enough to warrant the department in having a permanent force in British Columbia to at all times study this particular question of hatcheries and other questions pertaining not only to the salmon fisheries but to the other fisheries on the Pacific coast. We have a Chief Inspector of Fisheries who is a very good man. But the Chief Inspector is kept very busy attending the departmental matters such as the issuing of licenses and so forth. The Chief Inspector of Fisheries has no time to devote to the study of fishery questions. He has no time to devote to the study of hatcheries. He has no time to devote to the study of the habits of fish. This requires some man to be on hand all the time who can devote his fullest attention to studying fishery matters. I suggested at one time to the late minister the necessity for having someone out in British Columbia who could co-operate with the Chief Inspector of Fisheries and who could be ready and available at all times for the purpose of making these scientific investigations. I am glad to hear that the minister is making an arrangement to get another scientific man on his staff in British Columbia. I would suggest to him that it will not be sufficient for him to employ university professors during their vacation, but rather, that the department should have on hand some one or, perhaps, two scientific men of experience who will be available at all times on this important work.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I quite agree with the important suggestion of my hon. friend. I may tell him that the Biological Board had a meeting last week, and a programme has been submitted in conjunction with the officers of the department. I think, at a later date, there will be either legislation or an item in the supplementaries which will meet the wishes of my hon. friend.

Item agreed to.

Marine and Fisheries—salaries and contingencies, $624,340.

Mr. BAXTER: Are the increases only the statutory ones?

Mr. LAPOINTE: As a matter of fact there is a decrease. The increase that appears in the item is caused by the combination of the Department of Marine and that portion of the Naval Service that was transferred to the Department of Marine on the first July last. As a matter of fact, there is a decrease of one in the personnel of the Department of Marine as constituted last year. It is proposed, however, to include for 1923-24 fifteen persons on the headquarters of the Radiotelegraph branch that were paid previously out of the appropriation for radiotelegraph service. The increased expenditure for civil government is caused by the amalgamation of the Marine department as constituted last year with part of the Naval Service department, that part of it which includes the radiotelegraph service, protection of fisheries and many other things.

Mr. BAXTER: If the minister has, as I understand, the radiotelegraph service under his control, will he to-night broadcast his thanks to the House for having got his estimates through very speedily?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I will see that that is done with thanks.

Mr. DUFF: Is the first item, $6,000, the salary of the Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes.

Mr. DUFF: All I have to say is this, that in my opinion and in the opinion of many men in this country, the Department of Marine and Fisheries is as important as any other department of the government, and more so, as somebody behind me suggests. It seems to me that if the Deputy Minister of Finance, the Deputy Minister of Railways, and the Deputy Minister of Justice can have salaries amounting to $10,000, this important department should also have a deputy who should receive as much money as any one of those deputies. I am sorry the deputy minister is present, because I could say this better if he were not here. But I will say that the government should take steps in the Supple-

mentary Estimates to put the Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries upon the same salary basis as the Deputy Minister of Railways and the others I have mentioned. I think, of course, there is room for reorganization in the department, although I am not going to discuss that question now. I have not known the Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries very well personally for a number of years, but I have known him by reputation, and he is entitled to $10,000 a year just as much as is the Deputy Minister of Railways and the other deputies.

Item agreed to.

Radiotelegraph service and to provide for the building and maintenance of wireless stations and the general administration of radiotelegraphy throughout the Dominion, $454,900.

Mr. LAPOINTE: This item was discussed this afternoon, and it was suspended until after eight o'clock at the request of the hon. member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton), who wanted to know the expenditure on salaries and wages in that branch. The expenditures are as follows:

Maintenance and Operation	
Technical staff	$40,876 29
Operators	59,126 60
Labour	4,395 91
Construction	
Technical staff	4,160 65
Labour	9,626 37
Total	$118,185 82

Mr. CALDWELL: Is this for land service or for government-owned vessels?

Mr. LAPOINTE: For the whole system. For land, for vessels, for the distance-finding stations and for radiotelegraphy throughout the land.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): What is the power of the radio-distributing stations at the present time, the distance of transmission? I know some are able to distribute 300 miles on the lakes, but what is the power of the various transmitters? I just want to find out how far Canada can broadcast?

Mr. LAPOINTE: There are various stations. Some of them are broadcasting for 200 miles, others up to 1,000 miles, and others more than that.

Mr. BUREAU: Vancouver was heard in Australia.

Mr. WHITE: Can the minister give us any idea as to the new constructions that are to be carried on this year?

[Mr. Duff].

Mr. LAPOINTE: I can give them all this afternoon, and the hon. gentleman will find them detailed in Hansard.

Item agreed to.

To provide for the maintenance and operating of Sorel shipyard, $125,000.

Mr. BUREAU: I promised to give my hon. friend (Mr. Shaw) certain names this afternoon. If I remember rightly I gave one of them, W. Morgan, when I came back at eight o'clock. Morgan was dismissed on the declaration of Mr. Cardin, a member of parliament, that he had been using the officers of the department to copy electoral lists. I thought there was ground for his dismissal and I dismissed him, and he is still out. He was replaced temporarily by another man who was recommended and whom I thought was a proper person to take his place. There was also the case of H. Yerjean, stock bookkeeper, to whom the same remark applies. L. E. Trempe, who was employed in the stores, was also dismissed on the same ground. These are the men whom I dismissed. With regard to the charge against me of having dismissed Laforest, foreman caulker, this man was dismissed by the superintendent in order to make room for a more competent man. I had nothing to do with his dismissal.

Mr. BAXTER: In the cases of the dismissals referred to, were the accused given an opportunity of presenting their side of the case?

Mr. BUREAU: I did not make any investigation. The charge was made by the member representing the division. There was a specific charge of a specific offence over the member's signature, and I took that as sufficient evidence of the guilt of the persons.

Mr. BAXTER: I do not want to provoke any long debate on a subject of this kind now, because I shall before the session closes, under another department, have occasion I think to remark upon this system. I am not going to discuss what has been done in the past; I am going to deal only with what is done in the future. I think, however, that it is about time that we came to an end of a system, if there has been such a system, which permits any man to be dismissed on the mere statement of a member of parliament, who is necessarily a partisan. I do not think it is good business; I do not think that a man who is in the employment of all Canada, should be subject to dismissal simply on the statement of another man who is only the representative of a portion of the people in the constituency that

has returned him to parliament, a man who in many cases will have his passions inflamed against an official who he may think has done him an injury in the election field. There ought always to be some fair trial. There are cases where a trial would not be necessary, where a man confesses to having been guilty of certain conduct. But I do not think that a man should be tried behind his back; it is neither British nor French to do that.

Item agreed to.

Salaries—amount required to pay H. Tremblay for services as private secretary to the acting minister while acting as such from September 19, 1922 to January 19, 1923, $200.

Mr. BAXTER: What happened to this man after the 19th of January?

Mr. BUREAU: I might explain this. When the minister (Mr. Lapointe) was away and I was acting I had this gentleman as private secretary, and when the minister returned his services were no longer required.

Item agreed to.

River St. Lawrence ship canal—maintenance and operating dredging fleet (Governor General's warrant of October 16, 1922), $80,000.

Mr. BAXTER: I presume the minister will give the committee a statement of what urgency there was to render the Governor General's warrant necessary?

Mr. BUREAU: I might also explain this matter. For the last six or seven years there has been in existence a fleet, valued at some three or four million dollars, pre-war prices, of dredges, scows and tugs on the Richelieu river and the Chenal du Moine. This fleet was in a state of deterioration for want of proper care and attention. I took hold of the department in the month of August, acting for my hon. friend (Mr. Lapointe) who was at Geneva, and I made a personal inspection of the Sorel shipyard and looked over all the ships, dredges and scows that were there. I discovered that one of the dredges had sunk simply from lack of proper care. The rust had corroded the steel and the vessel was down, and when I asked what it would require to salvage this vessel I found that it would cost about $17,000. I took the superintendent of the St. Lawrence channel, together with the foreman of the yards at Sorel, and made a thorough inspection of the boats. I asked them to tell me which of them could be preserved, which ought to be scrapped, and which could be salvaged. Accompanying me was my secretary, and as I say, there were the superintendent of the St. Lawrence channel and the superintendent of the yards. We went over every ship and found that certain hulls would have to be scrapped, while there was a certain percentage of the machinery that could be salvaged. It was found that a shed would be necessary, and that a quantity of paint would be required to prevent the steel work from deteriorating. For this work it was estimated that the sum of $80,000 would be called for. I came back with a detailed statement covering each ship, scow and dredge, and recommended to council that this fleet, which was worth, as I have stated, some three or four million dollars, should be salvaged as far as possible. Under the circumstances it was considered that the special warrant should be issued. That warrant was issued in order that the work might be proceeded with at once. I did this as a matter of sound business, to prevent the further deterioration of this valuable fleet, and it resulted in saving money to the country. That is the whole matter in a nutshell.

Mr. BAXTER: If the minister will kindly apologize to all the members whose conversation he has been interrupting I think the incident may be closed.

Mr. BUREAU: I stopped because I was afraid to interrupt the conversation.

Item agreed to.

Ocean and river service—To provide for the temporary relief of distressed seamen—Further amount required, $4,150.

Mr. LAPOINTE: An amount for this purpose is voted each year. The amount voted last year was not sufficient on account of the unusually large number of seamen whom we had to help back to this country.

Item agreed to.

Public works chargeable to capital—Fisheries—To provide for inspection of canned and pickled fish—Further amount required, $3,000.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I explained this in the previous vote.

Item agreed to.

Miscellaneous—Amount required to pay balance due to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for the removal of the span of the bridge over False creek, B.C., at different times since 1918, to permit of the movement of vessels, $8,934.08.

Mr. BAXTER: Is this in consequence of a mistaken idea that at one time prevailed regarding our jurisdiction over False creek? Otherwise, when the Canadian Pacific Railway crossed there why were not the usual terms imposed?

Mr. LAPOINTE: The explanation in regard to this was given last year, but I will repeat it. It is as follows:

The Canadian Pacific Railway constructed a bridge across False creek, Vancouver, in 1886. This bridge was replaced by a larger structure in 1898. In 1918 it transpired that the vessels being constructed at the Coughlan Shipyard for the Imperial Munitions Board could not pass to sea without the removal of a span of this bridge. This difficulty was the subject of negotiations between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Department of Public Works at that time. The Canadian Pacific Railway contended that the bridge was properly constructed with the approval of the Public Works department and consequently they were under no obligations to so alter the bridge as to make it possible for vessels of a larger class to pass through. In these circumstances it became necessary for some one to take action, and the undersigned after having discussed the matter fully with the then Minister of Marine and Fisheries, entered into negotiations with Mr. Beatty of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the result being the submission of a proposal that if the courts should decide that the bridge was properly constructed and had the approval of the Public Works department, the government would be responsible for the expense of removing the span to enable the vessels being constructed at the Coughlan yards to pass out. On the other hand if the courts should determine that the bridge was improperly constructed and did not have the approval of the Public Works department, the Canadian Pacific Railway would be responsible for any expenditure incurred for the removal of the span. Letters were exchanged between this department and the Canadian Pacific Railway confirming this understanding. In the meantime the matter was referred to the Department of Justice for an opinion and under date of the 20th instant—

That was June of last year.

—that department writes as per copy attached hereto.

The Department of Justice stated that we had absolutely no case against the Canadian Pacific Railway.

In these circumstances there does not appear to be any alternative but to ask for a special vote of parliament to indemnify the Canadian Pacific Railway for the expenses they have incurred in this connection. Last session a sum of $32,000 was placed in Supplementary Estimates 1922-23 to cover expenditure up to end of June 1920, but a statement of expenditure up to 31st October, 1921, shows that the total expenditure incurred in this connection is $40,-934.08, necessitating a further amount of $8,934.08.

Mr. BAXTER: Will this have to be done in the future for vessels to pass through there?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Negotiations are being conducted between the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Marine and Fisheries and Public Works departments to come to a final arrangement in the matter.

Mr. BAXTER: It would seem to me advisable to put a bridge of a different type there and so cut out these payments.

Mr. LAPOINTE: That is the purpose in view.

[Mr. Baxter.]

Mr. McBRIDE: I know this bridge very well, in fact I supplied the material to build the substructure of it in the first place, but I think the bridge should never have been built where it is. There is another bridge practically in the same location that would serve the purpose equally as well, and this bridge is a detriment to navigation. At the same time, as permission was granted for its erection, I think it is up to this government to see that the swing span is widened so that boats can get in and out. It was not an expensive bridge to build in the first place and I think the appropriation in this estimate would practically cover the expense of widening the swing span, at least it should go a long way towards it. I should like to see the government take hold of this without further delay and reach a settlement of the difficulty so that this vote will not come up every year. There is no call for it whatever.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I think you are quite right.

Item agreed to.

RAILWAYS AND CANALS

Railways and Canals—chargeable to income—to increase the amount of loan authorized by vote No. 136, Main Estimates, 1922-23,—additional amount required, $13,099,493.34.

Hon. G. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals): Mr. Chairman, this and the following item are very large, but they are urgent. These are last year's estimates. We took the amount to pay a debt and thereby made a large saving on the rate of exchange. This is merely to replace the money that we then paid out. The succeeding vote represents money that we need to pay our debts on account of the merchant marine for last year. It does not enter into our next year's estimates.

Mr. BAXTER: This will not alter last year's result in any way as presented to us by the minister in his railway statement some weeks ago?

Mr. GRAHAM: No, I think the method of book-keeping will show that this does not interfere with that result. The Canadian National Railways paid off some securities which were due and thereby saved a large amount of money on account of the rate of exchange. Now we have to replace the sum.

Item agreed to.

Department of Railways and Canals—to increase the amount of loan authorized by vote No. 139, Main Estimates, 1922-23—additional amount required (including Governor General's Warrant, November 20, 1922—$1,000,000, $1,700,000.

Mr. BAXTER: What is this for?

Mr. DUFF: I am not going to discuss this matter now as I intend when the Main Estimates come up to discuss the Canadian Government Merchant Marine, but I just wish to enter my protest now against any money being spent for this purpose. I intend to discuss this item with others when the Main Estimates come up. I think the government has no right to spend any money on the Canadian Government Merchant Marine.

Mr. BAXTER: I take it that this money has already been spent. What is it for? Deficits?

Mr. GRAHAM: For the deficits in connection with the management of the Government Merchant Marine last year.

Mr. BAXTER: This is not urgent, is it?

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes, because we owe the bills of the Merchant Marine and we want to pay them.

Mr. BAXTER: It does not matter whether the item goes through to-night or to-morrow, does it?

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not suppose it would make any difference.

Mr. BAXTER: Then in the absence of the hon. gentleman who leads on this side I would suggest that the item stand.

Mr. GRAHAM: I would not press for the passing of the item to-night only it is the 1st of June to-morrow and to-day is the 31st of May. These are bills that have been contracted, and we must pay them. The passage of this item will not interfere with any discussion on the Merchant Marine or anything of that kind, because I have not had my main estimates before the House at all this year.

Mr. BAXTER: I think perhaps as there will be other items on which we can have a general discussion when the Main Estimates come up, this might pass.

Item agreed to.

Department of Railways and Canals—contingencies—additional amount required, $5,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: This is for contingencies last year. We were $5,000 short.

Item agreed to.

TRADE AND COMMERCE

Department of Trade and Commerce—mail subsidies and steamship subventions—Canada and Newfoundland, steam service or services between, $35,000.

Mr. BAXTER: All the rest of these are through, are they not?

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Most of them are.

Item agreed to.

Canada and the West Indies and South America, or both, steam service or services between, $340,666.66.

Mr. SHAW: Could the minister give us the names of the boats engaged in this subsidized service, with the tonnage and passenger capacity of each?

Mr. ROBB: The boats are the Chignecto, 400 feet; the Chaleur, 400 feet; the Caraquet, 400 feet, and the Chaudiere, 370 feet. Three of these vessels were built in Belfast, and one in Middlesborough, one in 1893, one in 1894, and one in 1899. I might say to my hon. friend that these boats are a bit old and a little slow, and we are advertising for a new service extending over two different periods. We are asking for tenders for a five-year period and also for a ten-year period, and when the tenders are in the government will decide which will be most advantageous to Canada. As perhaps my hon. friend knows, this is part of the contract we have with the West India islands under the trade agreement made in 1920.

Mr. SHAW: The minister has not given the information I asked for. I did not ask for the length of the boats. I wanted their tonnage and passenger capacity. I should also like to know their speed. I want to find out whether they comply with the terms of the West India agreement.

Mr. ROBB: I may say frankly that we fear they do not, and that is why we are asking for new tenders. Under the contract we had a certain limit of time within which to provide for the ships, and we are now advertising for four new ships to give a fortnightly service. Perhaps this admission that we do not think these boats comply with the terms of the contract for the West India service will satisfy my hon. friend.

Mr. SHAW: I am quite satisfied they do not comply with the terms either as regards tonnage, speed or passenger capacity. I would ask the minister whether there are not any ships of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine that would comply equally well with the requirements of the West India trade.

Mr. ROBB: No. They are very far from complying with the requirements. There are two services, one on the west side, and another on the east side. The Royal Mail Line are the contractors on the eastern side, and the Canadian Government Merchant Marine have the service on the west side, but they are

very far from complying with the requirements of the trade, and our friends in the West India islands are objecting somewhat on that account. The previous government advertised for tenders, and my recollection is that they came in either just before this government assumed office or immediately afterwards. The terms were such that the government did not feel able to accept them. The tenderers asked for a guarantee of 7 per cent upon their investment. We did not think that would be profitable to this country. We preferred knowing exactly what we would have to pay rather than give a guarantee on the investment.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: May I ask whether the Canadian Government Merchant Marine vessels are operating in competition with the other vessels of which the minister spoke?

Mr. ROBB: The Royal Mail Line have complained that the Government Merchant Marine boats call at some ports and pick up some of the best cargoes, but we do not admit that. They are not operating in competition with the Royal Mail Line because as I mentioned a moment ago there are two services, one on the east and one on the west side. The trade agreement of 1920 calls for two distinct services, and the Royal Mail Line are running from St. John and Halifax to Barbados, Trinidad, Bermuda, the Leeward islands and the Windward islands. The merchant marine boats run to the Bahamas. Jamaica and British Honduras, so there is really no competition between the two, although the Royal Mail Line have complained that in some cases the government boats on the return trip pick up some very profitable cargoes. We do not admit that that is a disadvantage to the people of Canada. It is competition that means cheaper products for our people.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Under the agreement it was provided that the service was to be weekly. The minister has just stated that tenders are being called for for a fortnightly service. How does he expect, therefore, that these new steamers sailing fortnightly will comply with the terms of the West Indies agreement?

Mr. ROBB: The experience we have is that a fortnightly service will be all that the trade will warrant. I do not believe that Canada can pay for a weekly service in view of the business that offers down in those islands.

Mr. IRVINE: Does the minister mean to cut the estimate one-half in view of the fact that we only get one-half the service?

[Mr. Robb.]

Mr. ROBB: We cannot disclose what the policy of the department will be until we receive tenders.

Mr. IRVINE: If they have decided to give half the service we ought to decide to give half the amount of money.

Mr. ROBB: The West India islands also contribute to the subsidy that is paid.

Mr. SHAW: How much do they contribute?

Mr. ROBB: Let me read article 13 of the treaty:

> The representatives of the colonies mentioned in article X undertake to recommend to their governments that these governments shall contribute towards such subsidized steamship service, when established in the following amounts annually.
>
Barbados, not less than	£5,000
Bermuda, not less than..	2,000
British Guiana, not less than..	7,500
Leeward Islands, not less than..	2,500
Trinidad, not less than..	7,500
Windward Islands, not less than..	2,500
	£27,000

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The minister has simply given in answer to the hon. member (Mr. Shaw) the amounts that the representatives of the respective colonies undertook to recommend to their governments to pay?

Mr. ROBB: Yes.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Would the minister give us the amounts that have been paid out by the islands?

Mr. ROBB: I do not know that I have that?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Have they paid anything.

Mr. ROBB: Some of them have and some of them have not.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Could the minister get the exact amounts that have been paid? I think that is rather important.

Mr. ROBB: I do not know that I have that information here, but I can get it for my hon. friend. I thought earlier in the evening that this matter would not come up so my deputy is not here. I do not think I can give that information to my hon. friend at the present time.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): If it will make it easier for the minister we can let the item stand until the deputy is here.

Mr. ROBB: I will be glad to let it stand.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): If the minister can give the information I am willing to go on.

Mr. ROBB: I have here this memorandum on the western group which may help my hon. friend on the question. Article 15 reads as follows:

Article XV. The government of Canada, subject to the adoption by the governments concerned of the recommendations embodied in Article XVI, undertakes to provide as soon as possible, and in any case not later than the 1st January, 1921, a fortnightly freight, mail and passenger steamship service between Canada, the Bahamas, Jamaica, and British Honduras, on the following lines:

The Canadian Government Merchant Marine, therefore, at the request of the Dominion government, took two of their smaller ships and converted them into passenger and freight vessels, by the addition of cabin accommodation, and put them on this route. It was impossible, however, to provide a fortnightly service, as called for by the agreement, with only two ships. These ships have therefore been sailing every three weeks, from Montreal in the summer, and Halifax in winter. The loss on their operation —I ask my hon. friends to note this—has been heavy, amounting, in the year 1921, to over $400,000, or more than the total subsidy paid by the government to the four steamers of the Royal Mail Steam Packet Company, which performed a more frequent and extensive service with more suitably fitted boats than the two steamers of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Since that time has the Canadian Government Merchant Marine put on some larger boats?

Mr. ROBB: We have tried to improve the service.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I should like to ask about this treaty, because I really must confess ignorance. The minister stated a little while ago that under the terms of the treaty there had to be a weekly service. Now he states it is only fortnightly. Are the terms of the treaty in this respect elastic or what is the actual condition?

Mr. ROBB: My hon. friend can obtain a copy of the treaty. It is printed and quite lengthy.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): What treaty is that?

Mr. ROBB: The treaty of 1920.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): With Jamaica?

Mr. ROBB: Yes. It is somewhat elastic. It was an agreement made for ten years. The government of Canada have every desire to meet our West India friends. We want that trade for Canada if we can secure it, but we do not want to pay out more for the service than the business will warrant.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Are there any ships of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine that can perform this service at the present time?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): This particular service is now being performed by the vessels of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine and by no others.

Mr. CAMPBELL: But not the whole service, just one service?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): The service to Jamaica, Bahamas and British Honduras is being performed by the ships of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine. The other service, to Bermuda, Trinidad, and British Guiana is being performed under contract by the Royal Mail Steam Packet Company?

Mr. CAMPBELL: I understand that. I have here the report of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine and it gives particulars of the service to the West Indies. I notice that Sir Henry Thornton in his report claims there has not been freight enough. He says:

The combined passenger and freight steamship operation inaugurated to give service every three weeks to the Bahamas, Jamaica and British Honduras, from the outset, has been unprofitable from a revenue standpoint, and in an endeavour to reduce losses Bermuda was added to the itinerary in June, the Canadian Fisher and the Canadian Forester making Hamilton, Bermuda, an additional port of call.

It looks to me as though all this service could be performed by the Canadian Government Merchant Marine. I would like to read for the information of the House the resolution passed by the district council of the province of Quebec, comprising councils No. 5, 8, 9 and 17 of the National Association of Marine in Canada. In part the resolution reads as follows:

Whereas, subsidies have been granted to steamship companies owned and operated outside Canada, particularly to the West Indies, while Canadian Government Merchant Marine ships, owned by the people of Canada, are lying idle and our seamen walking the streets of our towns and cities, swelling the unemployed. Under the West Indies-Canada agreement the Canadian government was to furnish the ships for this West Indies and British Honduras freight and passenger service:

It seems to me to be extraordinary to pay out a very large amount of money in subsidizing other ships while the vessels of our own merchant marine are lying idle. I have a

letter here from a seafaring man, a former officer in the Canadian Government Merchant Marine, and he states that there are ships of 3,400 tons of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine that can very well be utilized on this route. He says that a large number of these ships were tied up in the spring of 1922 that could just as well have been used on this service. I wonder if the minister could give us any information as to that?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): This matter was discussed a year ago when the same estimate was being considered, and the same criticism was offered by some hon. gentlemen that is being offered to-night.

Mr. SHAW: Not nearly so much last year as may be offered to-night. I think the facts were not known then.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): There was very considerable criticism last year, I have not heard much to-night. The suggestion is made that this service could be carried on by the vessels of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine. I should like to tell hon. members sitting opposite to me that if they knew the conditions attaching to this particular trade, and could hear the views of the gentlemen who understand it they would not suggest that this service could be performed by the ships of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine—I refer to the whole West India service. The larger service is that from the Atlantic ports of Halifax and St. John to Bermuda, Trinidad, Demerara, and British Guiana. That service is being carried on by a company known as the Royal Mail Steam Packet company. I think that is the name of the company.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Is not the hon. member perfectly sure that is the name of the company?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I think it is the Royal Mail Steam Packet Company. Possibly I may have omitted a word from the title but I do not think my hon. friend would mind that particularly because that would not affect the question. I hope he does not think so, I hope his mind is centered on something more substantial. This contract was entered into some ten or fifteen years ago. At that time a trade treaty was entered into between Canada, certain of the British West India Islands, and the government of Great Britain, and a part of that treaty was that a freight and passenger service be installed or established and subsidized by the interested parties. I think the British government pays something on account of that service as well.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Does the hon. member say that the British government pays part of the subsidy?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I think they do, on account of the mail service.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The hon. member is not sure.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I am not too sure. I speak subject to correction. In order to obtain the service—and it was deemed to be important—it was necessary to subsidize it. No private capital would go and perform such a service voluntarily and carry the mail without a subsidy. Persons who are acquainted with the West Indian trade know that the freight bound for Canadian ports is available only at certain seasons; that is, in the crop moving season, when the sugar, coffee and cocoa crops are being moved. But for two or three months in the year the steamers go north with very little freight. Then a very important consideration for those requiring the service was that it should be a regular service, and that was its great value—that every two weeks a ship would leave an Atlantic port for a West Indian port. That is of inestimable value to exporters. If they did not know or were not sure that these steamships left with perfect regularity we could never have developed the trade we have with the British West Indies. The Canadian Government Merchant Marine ships could not perform that service. They were never built for it, in the first place. Some of these ships run very irregularly to some of the islands, taking their chances of getting a cargo north and south. I have seen some of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine ships advertised to leave Halifax on a certain day, and they would not leave for nearly a month after, waiting for freight. It is an essential factor in the development of trade to have a regular transportation system, so that the importer and exporter can rely upon the regularity and promptness of that service. The Canadian Government Merchant Marine ships were not built for such a service. They were not built to carry on a passenger service at all, and we would have to violate the treaty which was entered into with the West Indian islands if we abandoned the service altogether, and declined to carry on the present contract, or a new contract with some other shipping concern. It certainly could not be carried on by the Canadian Government Merchant Marine ships because they cannot

carry passengers, and I do not think it is possible to reconstruct the ships to make them suitable for that purpose. So that I say, in so far as the Bermuda, Trinidad, Demerara and British Guiana service is concerned, it cannot be carried on in conformity with the provision of that convention by the Canadian Government Merchant Marine ships.

Mr. SHAW: Is it not likewise a fact that the Royal Mail Packet ships cannot, under any circumstances, comply with the terms and requirements of the West India trade agreement?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): In what respect?

Mr. SHAW: Because the minister has already admitted that the ships do not come up to the standard in tonnage, or in speed or in passenger-carrying capacity, and I think they cannot comply with the requirements as to time of service.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax: Even if that were true, it would not prove incorrect the remarks I have made regarding the inability of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine to carry on the service.

Mr. SHAW: I quite agree with that, but you will realize that there may be a partial compliance with the agreement by the merchant marine, but there can only be a partial compliance.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): The Canadian Government Merchant Marine ships could not carry on the service at all, wholly or partially or fractionally. It may be true that the Royal Mail boats are not performing the service well within the obligations of that treaty. I am not sure about that. My own impression is that they are, but everybody realizes that the ships they have now in the service are old and inadequate, and the Royal Mail Steam Packet Company themselves have publicly made clear their realization of that fact, and their desire to construct four new steamers, more modern boats, and put them into that service. It is for that reason they would like to have a long term contract with the government and boats specially designed for that service. The boats now in the service were quite old when the treaty was entered into. Nobody, I am sure, realizes more than that company itself that the boats are hardly up to the requirements of the trade, although they may be well within the requirements of the treaty. Now trade has developed and travel has developed, and it is desirable that a better service be given between Canadian ports and the West Indies, and we can never get the service without paying some subsidy. We cannot, I think, continue our trade arrangements with the British West Indies unless we assist that service. We certainly cannot give a regular mail service, which is a very important factor in trade, unless we have boats sailing promptly and at regular intervals from Canadian and West Indian ports.

Mr. IRVINE: Has the hon. member any idea of the amount of trade that is done on this line as far as Canada is concerned?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I have not seen the figures lately. Usually I have these figures in my mind and am well acquainted with them, but I do not know them at the present moment. The trade has been very irregular and rather depressed in recent years. I fancy it has been unprofitable to the steamship company. I think during the war they probably lost a very considerable sum; at least they would have, had they not been permitted to raise their rates, but I want to assure my hon. friend, if he thinks our trade connection with the British West Indies is worth anything to this country—and it is—that it can only be kept up by the continuance of this service. Now the Canadian Government Merchant Marine have some boats running to these islands that are served by the Royal Mail Steam Packet Company. I think myself it is very foolish to have these ships competing with the steamship line which is subsidized, and I do not think they contribute anything to the development of our trade.

Just a word as to the service between Canada, Jamaica and British Honduras. I have not any personal knowledge of this service, except that I have a little knowledge that comes to me from those who are interested in trading between Nova Scotia and these islands. This treaty was entered into in 1920, I think at a time when Canadians and people generally gained a clear vizualization of the future trade not only between Canada and these islands, but the world over, and I fear that rather an extravagant bargain was made in the establishment of this service. It does not appear that there is a possibility of developing a trade that would warrant the cost to this country last year. I am informed by business men who know, whose firms have been trading with those islands for the last fifty, seventy-five or a hundred years, that it is not possible to develop trade with those islands to warrant the service that is being carried on at the present time. I have no particular

suggestion to make to the minister about the matter, except that it requires careful consideration. It would be far better to give to some private companies two or three of these Canadian government ships and let them operate the service in the best possible way. It need not be a regular passenger service. I think the passenger service should be cut out altogether. The boats are not suitable for the service and this is costing money. We are carrying passengers, mostly tourists, over this route at a great loss to the country. There would be better satisfaction, and I believe the people of the islands interested would be satisfied if a fair freight service might be given to them, and I think that is possible at a very much less cost than that at which the service is being carried on to-day.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The hon. gentleman is speaking of the western group just now, is he not?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Jamaica, the Bahamas and British Honduras.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): That would be the western group.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Yes.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The Canadian Government Merchant Marine.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): It is operating there.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The hon. member thinks the service should be cut off?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I do not say that it should be cut off; but I understand that it was carried on last year at a net loss of $400,000, and I am informed by persons who know the possibilities of trade in those islands, that it is not capable of any great expansion.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Does the same statement not apply to the eastern group that it is unprofitable business at the present time? Why do they want a subsidy if the business pays?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): No subsidy is being paid.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I am talking about the eastern group now.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): No subsidy is being paid by the other group. Our trade has developed with the British West Indies, but our trading with those islands is linked up with the subsidized steamship service. You cannot separate them. We have a trade prefernce with these islands, and one of the conditions of the preference was that this steamship which is a joint passenger, freight and mail service, should be carried on. You cannot drop one without dropping the other. They are linked together.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The preference is an expensive one.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I doubt if any shipping company would undertake to carry on the service without a subsidy.

Mr. LUCAS: For what length of time will that treaty run?

Mr. ROBB: For ten years.

Mr. LUCAS: From what date?

Mr. ROBB: From 1920. I have the information for which my hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. Shaw) asked as to the trade with those islands. I am speaking now of the British West Indies, and I will not give the figures exactly. In 1922, the total trade was $15,300,000 and in 1923, $18,500,000. I am sure my hon. friends will realize that it is worth something to Canada to have this good customer. We expect, as the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) has said, that with improved facilities this trade may grow. Perhaps I might put on Hansard, although this will take a little time, the advertisement for tenders, and let me say at this point that if the Canadian Government Merchant Marine or Sir Henry Thornton desires to tender for this service and can give the service and comply with the conditions, surely we will give the preference to our own vessels.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): He cannot tender.

Mr. ROBB: I am not questioning whether he can tender or not.

Mr. DUFF: He cannot tender.

Mr. ROBB: This is the advertisement for tenders:

1. Tenders for a mail, passenger and freight steamship service between Canada, the British West Indies and British Guiana, are invited, and will be received at the office of the Deputy Minister of Trade and Commerce, Ottawa, Canada, until noon of June 15, 1923.

2. Tenders must be submitted on the enclosed form, and should be sent in sealed envelopes, addressed to the Deputy Minister of Trade and Commerce, Ottawa, Canada, and marked legibly on the outside "Tenders for steamship service between Canada, the British West Indies and British Guiana", and if submitted through the mails should be registered.

3. Tenders are invited for the performance of one or more of the following services:

(a) Sailing fortnightly from St. John or Halifax, and calling one week on the outward passage at Bermuda, Barbados, Trinidad, and British Guiana, and on the homeward passage at Trinidad, Grenada, St. Vincent, Barbados, St. Lucia, Dominica, Montserrat, Antigua, Nevis, St. Kitts, and Bermuda; and on alternate weeks calling on the outward passage at Bermuda, St. Kitts, Nevil, Antigua, Montserrat, Dominica, St. Lucia, Barbados, St. Vincent, Grenada, Trinidad, and British Guiana, and on the homeward passage at Trinidad, Barbados and Bermuda.

(b) The same service as specified in Clause (a) except that sailings shall be made from St. John and Halifax alternately.

(c) Any other frequency of service, or itinerary, or other variation from the terms of this call for tenders, which tenderers may desire to offer.

4. Tenders are invited for service covering a period of five or ten years, commencing within two weeks after the date of the last sailing from Halifax under the present contract which expires on March 31, 1924.

5. The steamers to be employed should be from 5,000 to 6,000 tons gross, capable of maintaining an ocean speed of 12 knots, and providing accommodation for 100 first class, 30 second class, and 100 steerage or deck passengers, and should be provided with 'tween decks.

6. The tender must state the amount of subsidy required, and the period for which the contract is requested.

7. The contract will provide that there shall be reasonable proportionate allocation of passengers and cargo accommodation between the colonies mentioned in Clause 3 (a).

8. There shall be no unfair differentiation in rates of freight against the smaller colonies as compared with the rates of larger colonies situated at a similar distance from St. John or Halifax, and freight and passenger rates will at all times be subject to the approval of the Minister of Trade and Commerce.

9. The steamers should be so constructed that, so far as the traffic warrants, cold storage shall be provided, but alternative tenders may be submitted offering the steamers with or without cold storage.

10. The steamers employed shall at all times, if required, carry such mails as may be offered for that purpose by the postal authorities of Canada, or the West Indian Colonies, and the contractor is to land and embark all mails at terminal points and ports of call at his own expense.

11. The contract will be subject to such general conditions as are incidental to all similar steamship subsidy contracts granted by the Canadian government.

12. Any further information required in regard to this call for tenders may be obtained on application to the undersigned.

13. The minister does not bind himself to accept the lowest or any tender.

The committee will observe that there is an option of five or ten years. These tenders are due, I think, on the fifteenth June of this year, and after the tenders are in and the government have had time to consider them, they are at liberty to accept or reject any of the tenders.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The minister, I think, has given the committee the impression that the subsidy is justifiable because of the fact that a trade treaty has been entered into, and under it a certain steamship service is required. Is that the case?

Mr. ROBB: That was part of the treaty; but we had a subsidy there before the treaty because it is worth something to the Dominion of Canada to have a customer with whom we do a business amounting to $18,000,000 a year. There is no railway communication down to those islands, and you cannot get the business except by a steamship service. We have a considerable preference in that market for our products, and we ship to those islands large quantities of flour. The Dominion of Canada practically controls the trade in flour of the West Indian islands, because we have a considerable preference on flour. We also ship to those islands large quantities of dairy products and fish. It is largely agricultural products that are shipped down there, and in return they send us back products which we require in this country, such as fruit which we cannot grow here, and sugar. I submit that it is a fair trade between Canada and the West Indian islands.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I had not quite finished my question. I presumed, however, it was because of the treaty and the requirement of the regular sailings that the subsidy was being continued. The tender that has just been read calls for a fortnightly service, but the treaty calls for a weekly service. Even if you get the new and improved boats with the new subsidy under the new tender, you still do not comply with the trade agreement.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Which treaty was that—the first or the second?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The last treaty, the one that is now effective.

Mr. ROBB: My hon. friend must understand that there are two parties to a bargain. The people who are doing the business down there intimate that it will not pay. I will put on record the memorandum I have as regards the whole business down there:

Under the agreement, the Canadian government, pledged itself to "use its best endeavours"—

That was the pledge.

—to arrange for a mail, passenger and freight service, to come into effect as soon as possible, and in any case within three years, between Canada and the eastern group (see article X).

In order to carry out this part of the agreement, therefore, the government called for tenders for this service on September 20, 1921, receivable up to noon of January 31, 1922. When the last mentioned time arrived, only one tender had been received, and this was from the Royal Mail Steam Packet Company, the

present contractors. The Canada West Indies Trade agreement contemplates the establishment of a weekly service. The Royal Mail Steam Packet Co., however, pointed out that there is not sufficient trade on this route to keep up a weekly service, and that any attempt to run such a service would be followed by a heavy loss. They, therefore, propose to put on a fortnightly service. As it would be necessary to build four new ships for this route they wanted a contract for the life of such ships, viz. twenty years, They stated that they could not afford to run the proposed new service for a fixed subsidy while the steamers of the C.G.M.M. were at the same time running in competition with subsidized vessels. The R.M.S.P. had previous to this been making complaints to the effect that the C.G.M.M. ships came into Trinidad, Barbados and Demerara, and took away a large proportion of their most profitable cargo,—

That is, on the homeward voyage. There is not enough business for both services on the homeward voyage, although there is quite enough for both going down. It is in the interests of the Canadian people for us to send all the business we can down there.

Mr. IRVINE: But if they are to take freight down they must bring freight back.

Mr. ROBB (reading):

—that is, sugar and molasses. The Royal Mail Steam Packet Company protested against this, stating that while it is admitted that there is sufficient southbound traffic for both lines, yet the northbound cargo is limited in quantity and there is not sufficient for both lines.

I would emphasize the fact that there is a good deal of business going down, but the complaint is that our vessels take away from their freight coming back. I am not debating the question whether they are right or wrong, but that is their complaint.

The R.M.S.P. offered, therefore, to provide a fortnightly service with new steamers of the size and type contemplated by the West Indies Agreement, on condition that the government guaranteed a minimum return of 7½ per cent per annum on the capital value of the said new ships. It may be added here that the present revenue on this service works out at between three and five per cent on the capital value of the four old steamers which the R.M.S.P. are running, after taking the subsidy into account.

We did not accept that contract. We are now submitting tenders which will be opened in June and the government are using their best endeavours to meet the desire of the West India islands because we want to keep those customers of ours, provided, of course, that the service is not too expensive.

Mr. BOYS: Do I understand that the stipulations of the advertisement just read do not comply with the terms of the treaty? If so, what would be the use of securing a contract of that kind? What is the penalty in the event of the treaty being violated?

Mr. ROBB: Our friends in the West Indies are not unreasonable, and I do not think that they are prepared to pay their proportion of the cost if the traffic does not warrant a weekly service. Now, I do not know on whose behalf hon. gentlemen are complaining. We have had a communication with the people there, and I have here a message the Prime Minister transmitted.

Mr. BOYS: I am not complaining at all. I confess at once that I know very little about this matter, but it struck me that it might be idle to call for tenders if the service would not comply with the treaty; I thought we might not get the benefit of it. I should think it would be essential to make sure that the other parties to the treaty would be satisfied with the stipulations in the tender. One would suppose that this would be a condition precedent to the acceptance of any tender. Is it the intention of the department, even if the tenders are thought satisfactory, to accept them without making certain of the satisfaction of the other parties to the treaty? If they were not satisfied, it might involve a variation in the terms of the treaty.

Mr. ROBB: We will certainly not enter into a contract unless it is acceptable to the West Indies.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I suggest that it is hardly fair for the minister to characterize as complaints a very fair criticism of a very questionable looking item.

Mr. DUFF: It is not questionable.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: There are one or two points that are not clear, if this is to be anything like an intelligent presentation of the case. According to the very statement just now read by the minister, the Canadian Government Marine is in competition with a subsidized line.

Mr. ROBB: That is the complaint.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: That is the complaint, and I presume it has some foundation. If that is so, then it is the very point that leads some of us to object to the item. I confess that it does seem very strange, to me at least, that there should be a large subsidy like this granted by the government to a steamship line when at the same time we have our own Canadian Government Merchant Marine vessels in competition with that line. I do not wonder that our vessels are losing, where they are in competition with a line subsidized against us by ourselves. That is the main point, and I do not think it has yet been answered. The statement has been made by the minister, I think, and by

the member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) that the Canadian Marine boats are not suitable for this route. Are there any boats belonging to the government that can be made suitable for it?

Mr. DUFF: No.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I do not know anything about shipping on the east coast, although I do know something about the conditions on the west coast. But I was talking with a captain of one of the Canadian Government boats a few months ago and he informed me that some of these vessels could very readily be converted to meet the needs of that route. He must know what he is talking about because he is on that run himself. He said that very few additions would be necessary to provide a passenger service, and that if there were cold storage facilities these boats could bring back a very profitable return cargo in the form of fruit, and so forth, coming to Canada. Has there been any thorough-going investigation of the possibilities of this route, or has there been any authoritative report on the subject?

Mr. ROBB: I know nothing about steamships myself and I do not pretend to know anything about them. But if the gentlemen who are responsible to the Dominion of Canada for the management of the Government Merchant Marine, and who undoubtedly should know a great deal about vessels, consider that any of the government boats can be so equipped as to meet the requirements of the route without involving too great an expense, I have no doubt they will so inform the government. As I have pointed out, we are asking for tenders.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Have we had any report on the subject?

Mr. ROBB: Tenders will be opened on June 15th. I might repeat that there is no complaint as regards the service going down; there is ample business on the downward trip. The complaint has reference to the upward voyage; they claim that we take away business from the subsidized line. We must remember that while the Canadian Government Marine has made a loss, the people of Canada have had some advantage from the reduced freight.

Mr. CAMPBELL: My information is that last season the Royal Mail Steamship Company raised its rates 25 per cent.

Mr. ROBB: We have no complaint on record.

Mr. CAMPBELL: The department would have to consent to the increase?

Mr. ROBB: We have no complaint of the rates.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): The remarks of the hon. member for Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth) are quite natural. It is only fair to concede the fact that persons not acquainted with this particular trade should think it strange that we should be paying $350,000 a year for a steamship service while at the same time we have our own government ships operating in these waters. I am not objecting either to the criticism that the policy of subsidizing steamships is in itself wrong. I must confess that I am not very much enamoured of it. However, in this particular case the steamship service is part of a trade convention. We receive preferential treatment in the West India islands on certain conditions, one of them being the maintenance of this service. I do not know whether some of the vessels of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine might not be made suitable for this service, but their conversion would cost millions of dollars. Personally I have no faith in the government operation of ships. I say it is much cheaper and more satisfactory in every respect to pay a subsidy to a privately-owned line than to have the vessels owned and operated by the government, because such operation will always be more expensive. The public will not allow these ships to be operated as carefully and economically as is the case with privately-owned ships. I think therefore that on the whole it is in the interests of the development of Canadian trade to subsidize this private service rather than attempt the conversion of our government vessels at a cost of millions of dollars and then operate them at a cost far in excess, I am sure, of the cost of operation of privately-owned ships.

Mr. McBRIDE: With respect to the Canadian Government Merchant Marine, I made the statement on the floor of this House last session that any ship under five thousand tons would never pay operating expenses. There are some twenty-two of these ships under that tonnage. I repeat that statement to-night, and I do so after going over their plans and specifications very carefully. The sooner the government realizes that these ships cannot possibly be made to pay and gets rid of them the better it will be for the taxpayers. A good deal has been said, possibly not in this House, about the late government building those ships. I am not finding fault with that policy, although I did not approve of it at

the time, but they were constructed when most people expected shipping would be good for many years to come. Construction took place at a time when wages and building material were at the very top notch. Last year I went into this question very carefully with the late Mr. Kennedy, then Minister of Railways. In fact he asked me to form a company on the Pacific coast to see if we could not operate these ships, but this I refused to do, because I knew they could not be operated at a profit the way their boilers are constructed. I am not going into this in detail, indeed, it would not be in the interests of the people that I should, because I think it will be better for the country that these ships be disposed of and what I might bring out would not add to the chances of the government getting rid of them. If the government can get 20 per cent of the cost of these ships I think they will be getting a good price; and I question whether they will be able to get even that. If you attempt to convert them into passenger ships they will be a still greater burden, because they have not the required power or speed, and we shall only be getting further into debt for something that will never be a paying proposition.

Mr. IRVINE: As it is twelve o'clock and this is a very important item I would ask that it be allowed to stand over.

Mr. GRAHAM: We have been spending hours on this item, and surely we ought to get it through now.

Mr. IRVINE: Then we will spend more hours on it, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the resolution carry?

Mr. IRVINE: Will the minister tell us the profits of the Royal Mail Steam Packet Line for last year?

Mr. ROBB: I think I gave that a few moments ago. I have not the information under my hand just now, but it was about 5 per cent on the investment. It will be found on Hansard.

Mr. IRVINE: It may be on Hansard, but I should like to get it now.

The CHAIRMAN: The minister is not required to give information twice on the same vote.

Mr. IRVINE: I am not sure that he even gave it once.

Mr. ROBB: Yes, I gave the information.

[Mr. McBride.]

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The minister simply said he thought it was 5 per cent. I think we are entitled to know the exact amount in dollars of the profit or loss, if any, made by the Royal Mail Steam Packet Company last year.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Sir Henry Thornton speaks rather optimistically of the prospects for trade in the West Indies, and I am not entirely convinced that the Canadian Government Merchant Marine cannot handle the business.

Mr. ROBB: He will probably tender for the contract.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I have received several pamphlets and letters from practical seamen, one a former officer in the Canadian Government Merchant Marine, and I am assured by them that these vessels could be used to advantage in this trade. I notice in the Official Journal of the Marine Engineers of Canada, published in St. John, New Brunswick, that a Halifax correspondent writes, in part, as follows:

> We also have to regret that quite a number of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine are still laid up in the Northwest Arm. These if put in commission would give employment to between 250 and 300 men. I was surprised to read a few days ago that the government had made a new contract for two years with the R.M.S.P. Company to supply the West Indies an d Demerara service. Why could not four of the Canadian Government Merchant fleet be fitted for this work, and thus give employment to our own men and put the charter money into the government coffers? We sincerely trust that the new government will remedy these abuses and bring about a better state of affairs.

Now, notwithstanding all that has been said in criticism of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine I note that it made a small profit in both 1919 and 1920.

Mr. ROBB: On the Pacific.

Mr. CAMPBELL: We must remember, of course, that very few steamship companies have made money of late years. Sir Henry Thornton in his report says:

> The steamers, Canadian Fisher and Canadian Forester, in operation on this route, are not suitable for this trade, and it is considered essential, in order to make a success of this branch of the service, that a special type of oil-burning steamers, with increased passenger accommodation, and fitted with proper refrigeration and ventilation facilities to take care of perishable shipments, be provided.

I understand that their specifications come pretty well up to the standard of the other vessels they are competing with, and it does seem to me unreasonable that this amount should be paid out to subsidize vessels operat-

ing in competition with the Canadian Government Merchant Marine. If the capital investment in the Merchant Marine is too large, it should be written down the same as the American government did with their fleet. They wrote it down I think to about fifty per cent of the capitalization.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): The Canadian Government Merchant Marine ships would have to be reconstructed anyway. The operators would have to come to parliament and ask it to vote the money. Parliament would have to grant it to them, and it has not done so yet.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I quite understand that, but I think this matter should be taken into consideration before any subsidy is granted. Let the government make definite inquiries from the Railway Board as to what can be done and ascertain what the recommendations are. It seems an extraordinary thing to tie the country up for five or ten years to a subsidized service without knowing what our own ships can do. In this same report on the Merchant Marine, Sir Henry Thornton also draws attention to the fact that these ships, while perhaps not paying as a separate branch, are drawing a large amount of freight and bringing tonnage for the Canadian National railways. That also should be taken into consideration.

Mr. DUFF: At this late hour I do not want to enter into any lengthy discussion. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Campbell) in what he read from Sir Henry Thornton's report has upset his own argument. First he read something from a marine paper which deprecated the fact that some of the Government Merchant Marine steamers in the Northwest arm were out of commission, when they might be giving employment to a certain number of men. Then it went on to say that if they were put in commission they could be used on the West India service. Then my hon. friend read from Sir Henry Thornton's report that the present steamers on the route were not fitted for the business, and that the type of steamer required was an oil burner. That just fixed the hon. gentleman's argument. Sir Henry Thornton admits that there are no steamers in the Government Merchant Marine fitted for this West India service, which includes carrying passengers, mail and freight, and that is an absolute fact. We may talk till we are black and blue, and I do not want to take up time to-night because I shall discuss this matter on another occasion, when I shall be able to prove that there is not one steamer of the whole sixty-three in the governmenet fleet that is fitted for carrying passengers, mail and freight. At the present time they are using two or three of these steamers on the Honduras route, and they are carrying practically no freight. At some ports at which they call, at Belize and Jamaica they are landing only five pounds of freight, and these steamers are being run at an expense of three or four thousand dollars a day. My hon. friend is correct about freights being increased, but it was not twenty-five per cent. About two years ago they were increased fifty per cent, and for this reason: The government steamers which are competing with the Royal Mail Packet boats on the same route were getting part of the business which the Royal Mail boats should have had if they were to pay, and when the Royal Mail Company found that the Canadian government boats were taking part of the business, which was not sufficient for them both—both lines were carrying only half cargoes—the manager of the Royal Mail Packet came to Ottawa and placed his statement before the Minister of Trade and Commerce. He showed him that they were losing a large sum of money and the Minister of Trade and Commerce called in Mr. Teakle, the manager of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine, and asked him what he thought about it. Mr. Teakle said: "Yes, we are not making any money, and instead of getting $2.40 for a cask of fish and $1.10 for a barrel of flour we should get more." The Minister of Trade and Commerce consequently increased the freight rates both on the Canadian Government Merchant Marine and the Royal Mail Packet line. That is exactly what happened.

The trade agreement with the West India islands calls for a twelve-knot service. The Canadian Government Merchant Marine boats cannot comply with that because their speed is only between eight and nine knots, and inside of two years, although as the hon. member for Cariboo (Mr. McBride) says, we do not want to say too much about it, owing to poor construction these government boats will need new boilers and engines, as their engines and boilers are practically no good.

Mr. IRVINE: Would the hon. member tell us if the boats that are now being subsidized are all speedy enough to meet the requirements of that trade?

Mr. DUFF: Yes, I think they are twelve-knot boats. I am a shipper in Nova Scotia and am using these boats, not every fortnight, but every once in awhile, and we are quite

satisfied with these boats so far as trade with the West Indies is concerned, although, of course, a faster boat would be better.

Mr. IRVINE: You are not sure they are up to the standard.

Mr. DUFF: The Royal Mail Packet boats, yes.

Mr. NEILL: I have here a list of the Royal Mail Packet boats on this service and only one of them is a twelve-knot boat. The others were all built thirty years ago, so they are not very modern.

Mr. DUFF: The contract calls for a twelve-knot service, and I say that the Merchant Marine boats cannot give that service.

Mr. IRVINE: Neither could the other boats.

Mr. DUFF: The minister has not to accept the tender of the Royal Mail Company. He can accept anybody's tender that is satisfactory, yours or mine.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): If the Royal Mail Company get the new contract they will have to put on new ships. Their ships were able to comply with the terms of the original contract ten or fifteen years ago, but nobody disputes the fact that these ships now are hardly suitable for the purpose. If they are the successful tenderers these boats will be withdrawn and new boats put on in time.

Mr. IRVINE: Why were they not withdrawn last year?

Mr. ROBB: We could not get anyone else to take the service. Let me repeat what I said before. The previous government in September, before going out of office, advertised for tenders. Those tenders came in in January, 1922. The tenderers wanted a guarantee of 7 per cent on their investment, and the government did not consider that that was a profitable bargain for the Dominion, so the best thing we could do was arrange with our West India customers to accept a continuation of the previous service by the Royal Mail Line, and we arranged with them to continue the service. My hon. friend asked a moment ago as to the earnings of this company. I have a notation here that the present revenue—I do not know whether this is profit; we have no way of determining the profit; that is for the people who are running the service—works out between three and five per cent on the capital value of the four old steamers which the company are running, after taking the subsidy into account.

[Mr. Duff.]

Mr. IRVINE: This seems to be getting more complicated as we go along. The minister has shown us that the ships that had the contract last year from the government did not meet the requirements of the treaty, and yet they got the contract.

Mr. ROBB: It was the former service that was continued. The West India islands are a consenting party to that arrangement. They pay something too.

Mr. IRVINE: Yes, I understand, but you let the contract to this company because you could not get anybody else that could meet the requirements of the treaty.

Mr. ROBB: We had the Royal Mail Company carry on.

Mr. IRVINE: Under these circumstances does not the minister think it would have been reasonable to have let the contract to the government's own ships?

Mr. ROBB: They could not give the service.

Mr. IRVINE: They could not give the service, yet the Royal Mail Company is complaining that the government ships are taking the trade.

Mr. ROBB: My hon. friend has missed the point. There are some islands that the Canadian ships cannot go into at all, and the complaint of the Royal Mail Line is that the Canadian boats go into the profitable islands and skip the others.

Mr. IRVINE: Why should they not?

Mr. GRAHAM: That is not keeping the contract.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): There is not much profit in it for the tax payer of Canada.

Mr. IRVINE: The hon. member for Lunenburg has just said that he could prove to us that there was no ship belonging to the Canadian government that could be refitted to take part in this trade. I say that if he can prove that, now is the time to do it. It is no use proving it at some other time after this estimate has passed. If he has the proof, we ought to have it now.

Mr. ROBB: Let us understand each other. Here is a contract with the West India islands. Does my hon. friend say that we should repudiate that contract and cancel the service?

Mr. DUFF: I can answer the question of my hon. friend (Mr. Irvine) very briefly. The contract calls for a twelve knot ser-

vice. The Canadian government cannot supply boats which will sail more than nine or ten knots. Consequently I have answered my hon. friend.

Mr. IRVINE: I do not think he has. The minister has just said that they had to take boats last year that had not the necessary speed because they could not get any other. How does he know that they will not have to do that again this year?

Mr. DUFF: That is another question.

Mr. CAMPBELL: This treaty has never been lived up to in the past, and the information I have is that the Canadian Government boats,, although not exactly of the type required for this service, are just as good as the boats operating on it to-day. Now, I have that from practical men. I had that from a number of men in the Maritime provinces not very long ago, practical men, who assured me that these vessels were quite fit to be put on to do that work.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Will my hon. friend permit me to ask him why he makes that statement? What is the purpose of this criticism? Why are the facts not properly considered as they are? Who are the people in the Maritime provinces who say these ships could perform that service? Are they men who want a job on a boat, do they want to get on the Civil Service list, or are they men capable of having an opinion on the matter at all? My hon. friend should know, he could easily find out, that there is not a single ship in the Canadian Government Merchant Marine that can carry on the passenger service between Halifax and St. John. That is a part of the present treaty and it was a provision of the old treaty. What is the use therefore in asking to have ships of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine carry on the service?

Mr. IRVINE: May I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I was asking my hon. friend a question. Will he tell me what it is he wants to know, and what the reason is for this opposition, this persistent inquiry which has, I think, been answered a dozen times?

Mr. CAMPBELL: I was simply giving information that is in my possession. I have a letter here on the subject and a good deal of other information. I am not prepared to give the writer's name but he is a practical seaman. Furthermore I have read a resolution passed by this body of the marine engineers of Canada to which surely some weight must be given.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Very little weight as read. It looks to me as a resolution that was passed as a bit of propaganda upon the request of somebody. You can get a resolution passed to-day anywhere and upon any subject if you take the trouble to have it done.

Mr. IRVINE: I would like to point this out. The hon. member for Halifax asks "Who are these men who suggest that our ships can do this work, and are they men who want to get a job sailing?" I ask: Who are the men who want a subsidy? Are they men who want profits? I submit that these men have as good a right to be heard as the gentlemen for whom the hon. member for Halifax seems to be speaking.

Mr. ROBB: We are advertising for tenders and any person can tender for this contract.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I am not speaking for anybody. The government are asking for tenders from steamship men to perform this service. I do not know who will get the contract. We were very fortunate during the war to have this long standing contract with the Royal Mail Steam Packet Company, otherwise our West India service would have been interrupted four or five years.

Mr. SHAW: I want to ask my hon. friend a question because I do not wish to misunderstand him. Do I gather that the contract which is proposed to be entered into does not take effect until March of next year, and that we are now concerned with the voting of the subsidy for the current year?

Mr. ROBB For carrying on the service.

Mr. SHAW: The sum of $375,000 for this year?

Mr. ROBB: No $340,000.

Mr. SHAW: The contract for next year is no use in determining what is going to be done this year. That is the question I want to ask my hon. friend? Is not that a fact?

Mr. DUFF: If that is true what is the use of discussing this matter? Even if some of the vessels of the Government Merchant Marine could be fitted up for the service they could not be fitted up this year and it is quite evident we can only get the service performed by the Royal Mail Packet Steamship Company. Therefore we are only wasting time in discussing the matter.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I understand the original contract expired four years ago or possibly more, and that it has been renewed for two years at a time since. Nothing better could be done. I do not think that two years ago ships could have been obtained anywhere to carry on that service in a better way than the vessels of the Royal Mail Packet Steamship Company were doing. Temporary arrangements were made for that and I think it is just as well it was done because we have a clearer realization to-day of probable trade currents between Canada and the West Indies, and in fact between all other countries of the world. In 1920 our idea of the future trade of this country was not very sanely based, otherwise I think the Jamaica contract would have been framed in different terms.

Mr. BAXTER: I would like to ask, as the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) has done, where we are going to get by this discussion? What action is proposed? Is it suggested that we shall vote this amount of money or that we shall reduce it? If we reduce it we cannot get even the service that we have got at the present time, and that service is of very considerable value to the Maritime provinces. More than that it extends at least as far as Montreal. The very importation of sugar into the country is surely of importance, and the fact that that sugar is brought in water-borne through our own ports has, I think, quite an effect in keeping down to some extent the price of sugar. Of course that is something that is determined by the larger market but I think it is one factor. I do not think that anyone in the Maritime provinces would want to give up this link of connection with the British West Indies. I do not think that anyone in any other part of Canada would want to deprive us of any opportunity that we have of doing that business. And the business is not confined to what originates in the Maritime provinces. The rest of Canada has its opportunities just the same as the Maritime provinces have. It has become perfectly clear that the steamers are not adequate according to the subsidy requirements. But if you say to the owners of the steamship "Very well, your steamers are not fit, we will not pay any subsidies" you lose such service as you have got. If you try to replace it by something you produce yourself you cannot, as the hon. member for Lunenburg says, fit them up within the requisite time, nor are the boats structurally capable, that is the boats of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine, for passenger service. If hon. gentlemen who talk in this way were a little nearer salt water than they are they would realize that the type of boat for a mere freighter is just as different from one that is built for a combined freight and passenger service as perhaps a yacht is from a battleship.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. BAXTER: Well, hon. members may laugh. But where do we get as a result of this discussion? Are we going to drop all assistance, are we going to drop such service as we have now got? If directions could be given to the minister as to what he is to ask for for a future contract, very well let us give him the suggestion and let us not say that there shall be no service. I do not see how we can get the present service for any lesser amount of money. If I thought we could I would impress upon the government to try and save money.

Mr. ROBB: We cannot, we tried.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I wish to protest against the continuation of this subsidy. I listened very intently this evening to the reasons advanced for its continuation and I must confess I have not heard a single good one from hon. gentlemen opposite, not one. They talk of their treaty and they talk of trade. As to the treaty it was fractured to pieces long ago. Not a single boat of the Royal Mail Packet Company's vessels complies with the trade requirements. For instance, the Caraquet is of 4,800 tons and 5,000 tons is required in the agreement. A speed of 12 knots is required in the treaty, and the speed of the Caraquet is 11 knots. Take the Chignecto and by the way it is a fairly old boat; it was built thirty years ago in my own country.

Mr. DUFF: Is the hon. member not aware that these ships are not operating under the terms of the treaty? They are operating under an old arrangement made many years ago.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Yes, quite so. Last year the argument was put up by the hon. member or some of those associated with him that the reason for the continuation of the subsidy to these boats was the treaty.

Mr. DUFF: Oh, no.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I beg pardon.

Mr. DUFF: I beg your pardon.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): We find the Chignecto has a tonnage of 4,756. It has a speed of eleven knots, not twelve. Then take the Chaudiere, it has a tonnage of 4,019, built 34 years ago in Sunderland, Great Britain, and so on.

Now let me take the passenger accommodation which everybody is talking about so much. It is true the trade treaty calls for a certain passenger accommodation, 100 first class, 30 second class, and 100 steerage and deck passengers, and yet we find all the subsidized boats have only accommodation for 60 first class, 30 second class and 20 third class. So that in every respect they fall below the requirements of the treaty. It may be true that you can get a new line of boats on the service, but even so will it be warranted? I do not think it will be. The treaty is already broken, and, so far as I can see, the advantage to Canada has been little, if anything, and I will tell the committee why in a moment. I am sorry the minister was not able to provide the committee with information requested by one of the members for Calgary, with regard to how much the West Indian government had paid this government as a part of its share of responsibility. It may amuse some of the members of committee to know that outside of that section, which has not been complied with very well up to date, there is another requirement. The agreement says:

> If a subsidized steamship service is arranged for, the government of Canada will endeavour to secure the co-operation of the owners of such steamship service towards the provision of hotels and bungalows in the colonies, the governments of the colonies being prepared on their part to offer such facilities as may be practicable both as regards sites and financial assistance.

The main objection to the Canadian Government Merchant Marine and the Royal Mail Steam Packet appears to be the fact that you cannot equip the merchant marine with passenger accommodation, but, so far as I can see from the agreement, the only type of passenger who wants to go down there will be those who want a lazy holiday and not the business men. The business man with any business instinct would never take the slow boat, not even the 12 knot boat if you had any. He would go to New York, make a rapid trip and get through with his business. The whole subsidy is to provide the wealthy people with opportunities for a lazy voyage. The agreement looks as though it were framed for that purpose. I have the greatest respect for the nautical knowledge of the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff), but I would submit that there are others in the House who know a little about it, not so much perhaps as he does. There are some members from the prairies born and raised for many years in seaport towns, who may presume to know something about the matter, but the hon. member in his criticism of the merchant marine said the engines were no good, the boats were no good and nothing good about them. I think before the committee on transportation in 1921 he said he would like to see them all sunk.

Mr. DUFF: Hear, hear—better for the country if they were sunk.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): That statement will give the committee an idea of the loyalty of the hon. member to government ownership.

Mr. DUFF: Hear, hear.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I wish to quote for his benefiit from the Montreal Daily Star shipping notes, October 10, 1922. This article deals with one Canadian Government Merchant Marine boat with new and untried engines, built by the Canadian Vickers Limited, a Canadian firm. This paper says:

> The ship, with new and untried engines, built by the Canadian Vickers Limited, eventually completed a maiden voyage of 13,000 miles without a single breakdown. This is still considered a wonderful feat for a new vessel.

The hon. member's criticism of the merchant marine on account of inadequate engines has broken down completely, in fact it was broken down long ago. I am a little confused as to the hon. member's attitude at this day. In 1919, I think it was, he said he was rather critical of this very subsidy. I quote from Hansard, page 1284, where he refers to the Royal Mail Steam Company on the eastern route as follows:

> These boats are loaded to the hatches every trip and cannot take all the freight that is offered. A lot of freight is left at Halifax every time the boats leave. If these boats can ply between Halifax, Jamaica and Cuba without a subsidy the Royal Mail Steam Packet boats ought to be able to do likewise.

Mr. DUFF: Hear, hear.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I agree with him.

Mr. DUFF: That was before the Canadian Government Merchant Marine boats were put on.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): According to the hon. member's statement, a lot of freight is left at Halifax every time. Now I may say the hon. member for Guysborough at that time was also particularly critical and asked the minister to look into the question and see if we were not allowing matters to drift a little too much, and if each year, before the estimates came before the House, he could find out the standing of the different companies and what they earned during the previous year. There was some criticism of

the compagnies earning the subsidies. Then the hon. senior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean), apparently acting as the minister at the time, states at page 1285:

> The matter of granting subsidies to steamship companies, particularly in connection with services to other countries is, I must admit, a very doubtful one.

I very much agree with the hon. member. I am sorry he has also changed his opinion since that time.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I said that to-night.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I am very glad. Why not carry it out?

An hon. MEMBER: So say we all.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Apparently the hon. members are, shall I say, excusing their consciences by saying "I said that too," but they are making no effort to do what they pretend is right.

Mr. ROBB: Is the hon. member finding fault because we declined to accept a tender asking for 7½ per cent on the investment, or is he finding fault because we are asking for new tenders and reserving the right to accept any or the lowest tender?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Any tender such as the minister has sent out can meet with nothing but utter disapproval from me The tender called for a subsidy.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Is the hon. member against the subsidy?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Absolutely opposed to subsidies.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Then that is all there is to say.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): No, not at all. We might look into the history of this thing a little bit. The hon. member for Lunenburg stated on the 23rd March, 1920, at page 634 of Hansard:

> But I am not under ordinary conditions in favour of bonusing the building of ships or any other industry.

But Mr. Keefer replying to him says:

> 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—

I need not read it all, but he says:

> What is the reason? Lack of transportation, namely, ships—Canadian controlled ships.

Mr. DUFF: Who said that?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Mr. Keefer.

Mr. DUFF: I thought the hon. member said I said it.

[Mr. E. J. Garland.]

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I would not knowingly attribute anything to the hon. member he had not said. Looking into the history of the thing, the whole question of the treaty itself came into being at a meeting of the delegates from the West Indies, under the chairmanship of Sir George Foster, with Lieutenant-Colonel Amery present. To any one who has read that evidence carefully, it must be perfectly clear that there was one great guiding hand throughout the whole proceeding, and that was the hand of Colonel Amery. Looking into the reasons why he should be so interested in the matter, we find that, on the 23rd March, 1920, it is stated in Hansard:

> 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.

And so on.

Mr. ROBB: I do not want to interrupt my hon. friend's argument. I just want to ask him this. Apparently Colonel Amery was of opinion—I have not read this, but that is what I gather—that the Empire wanted to keep that business with the West Indian islands. It was unprofitable to attempt to carry it on towards Englnad. If Canada did not come in, the United States would have got the business. Is my hon. friend proposing to-night that we shall cut out the business altogether and let it go to the United States?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): If the minister has no more confidence than that in the people of the British West Indies with their British governors and British connections, I would suggest that he have a little more faith, courage and hope. I want to read the words of a well known and respected former member of this House. As reported in Hansard of 1920 at page 899, Mr. Michael Clark said:

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.

Those words, I may say, express my sentiments exactly.

Mr. BOIVIN: Is that gentleman still a member of the same party?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The hon. gentleman had better write and ask him. I venture to say that after the budget of this year, he would prefer to belong to this party than to the party of my hon. friend.

Mr. BOIVIN: The hon. member is not sure of that.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): We have had a brief discussion to-night on the question of contracts made for two years or more ahead. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean), as reported on page 2261 of Hansard of April 19, 1921 said:

But I do say that no other line of ships competing against the company—

The Royal Mail Steamship Company—

—which has this contract can do any business. It does not matter how many ships are put on or who are operating them, they cannot get the trade and will operate only at a loss; at the same time they will be doing an injury to the other company.

The hon. member for Halifax is reported as defending private ownership, irrespective of the fact that this country owns a government merchant marine and that the people are taxed to pay the cost of it.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I think the people of this country are being very heavily taxed to-day, and I would like to see the burden lessened.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The costs have to be paid anyway whether the service is a government-owned one or a privately-owned one.

So far as I can see, in reading the history of this steamship line to the West Indies, the country has had to pay all the way through. It has never paid to keep up that service. The minister refers to the important service, the great trade, the danger of violating the treaty which has already been violated. He has referred to a trade of $18,000,000 a year. I question very much whether he can state many years when the trade has reached $18,000,000. There might have been one year, but not very many. He also throws a little sop to the committee by stating that the trade was mostly in agricultural products. Last year I tried to give to the House some figures showing the falling off in trade, and I gave them in dollars. The hon. senior member for Halifax at once raised the question that tonnage was the proper basis for comparison, and I have endeavoured to secure tonnage in this case. For example, let us take agriculture or some natural resources such as fish, in which the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) will be interested. In 1920, before the treaty that was to develop trade came into operation, we shipped $1,621,419 worth of fish.

Mr. DUFF: Was that shipped by these steamers?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I am not talking about that. I am talking about the trade treaty, the magnificent increase in trade that has been built up by this treaty.

Mr. DUFF: Which treaty?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The West Indian treaty.

Mr. DUFF: It is not in effect yet.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The hon. member should wake up. I would suggest that the hon. member for Lunenburg read the sessional papers of 1921. The hour, perhaps, is fairly late, and it may be his usual custom to go to bed early. In 1920, there was fish exported to the West Indies from Canada to the extent of $1,621,419. In 1922, there was only $1,347,083 worth, or a falling off of about $300,000 worth. In fruits, in 1920, there was $113,177 exported, whereas in 1922 there was only $8,526 exported. The minister was talking about wheat and flour a little while ago. In 1919, we shipped 32,000 bushels of wheat to the West Indies; in 1920, none; in 1921, 2,512 bushels, and in 1922, none.

Mr. ROBB: How much flour?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I will tell the committee in a moment. The value in dollars of that wheat was in 1919, $80,000, in 1920, nil; in 1921, $4,885 and in 1920 it was, of course, nil. The minister made quite a point of the fact that agriculture was being assisted by this treaty. These are the figures with regard to other grains:

1919, 32 bushels exported.
1920, 35 bushels exported.
1922, 92 bushels exported.

An hon. MEMBER: That is increasing.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Yes. My hon. friends from Ontario will be interested

in bran, shorts and middlings. The trade in this showed quite an increase—16,452 hundredweight shipped in 1920, and 21,434 hundredweight shipped in 1922. That is, shipping out of that province what is needed for the development of the dairy industry there.

Now, we come to the question of wheat flour. In 1918, 410,230 barrels were shipped. That increased the next year by about 100,000 barrels. In 1920 the trade fell off to about 52,200 barrels, and to-day the figure is 524,683 barrels or under what it was in 1919.

Mr. PARENT: What was it in 1918?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): It was 410,230 barrels.

Mr. DUFF: That is pretty good.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): In 1919, 573,580 barrels. The treaty came into effect the next year, 1920. Immediately there is a falling off, and you find that in 1922, we have lost about 50,000 barrels. The trade under the treaty is not increasing very fast.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): What does that mean? My hon. friend must be talking for a purpose or he should sit down.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I am talking for a purpose.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): That is what I want to know. What is his purpose? If the hon. member is talking for the purpose of informing the committee, and if he can interpret the figures, I hope he will tell me whether or not he ascribes that decline in trade to the treaty? If not to the treaty, to what other cause or causes does he think it is due?

Mr. IRVINE: Change of government.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The minister a little while ago made a somewhat exaggerated speech about the vast value of the treaty to agriculture. He stated that the great bulk of the export trade to the West Indies consisted of agricultural products. If the member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) would listen intently, I think he would see that I am endeavouring to prove, and I think effectively, that the minister, I will not say did not know what he was talking about, but slightly exaggerated the facts. In 1918, we shipped 215 tons of hay, and that increased by 1923 to the enormous amount of 339 tons; in other words, in five years, and after nearly three years of the operation of a very effective treaty, that was the increase in business in that direction.

[Mr. E. J. Garland.]

Mr. ROBICHAUD: Tell us about potatoes.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I doubt very much whether there is any notation here about potatoes; perhaps they did not ship any. No doubt the hon. gentleman is interested in potatoes; I too, as well as he, was interested in fish.

Mr. ROBICHAUD: If the service between the Maritime provinces and the West Indies were discontinued, what does the hon. gentleman think would happen to the farmers of New Brunswick who ship a good deal of potatoes to the West Indies?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): He does not care about that.

An hon. MEMBER: He only wants to block the estimates.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The member for Halifax interjects a remark which I think he must know is both unfair and insulting. I am not endeavouring to hold up the item, nor have I any objection to anyone in Canada trading with any part of the world. I should be only too glad to see my hon. friend's potatoes go to the West Indies or anywhere else.

Mr. ROBICHAUD: With or without a subsidy?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Without any subsidy.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Does the hon. gentleman really mean to suggest that he is discussiing this matter with a view to informing his colleagues or parliament upon the real issue before the committee?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I do not know whether the hon. member is unduly dense to-night; it may be due to the lateness of the hour.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): The member for Halifax is not a bit dense just now. He is sufficiently bright to understand why the hon. gentleman is talking in this fashion.

Mr. SHAW: What does the hon. gentleman think is the reason?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I need not waste time stating it now; I will tell the hon. gentleman in the morning.

Mr. SHAW: Does the hon. member for Halifax think that anyone has given any

more information to the committee than has been submitted by the member for Bow River (Mr. Garland)?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The total exports in 1918 were $6,838,563; in 1919, they had increased to $10,200,582. They remained roughly about the same in 1920, but increased slightly in 1921 and fell off by almost three million dollars in 1922. These are the exports about which we have heard so much. If the minister and the member for Halifax care to study these schedules giving the summary of the trade of Canada with the West Indies over a number of years and with individual islands they will discover without much trouble that our trade with Cuba has increased largely during all these years, while on the other hand our trade with the West Indies, since the coming into effect of this magnificent treaty, has actually fallen off. So that with an island to which we have no subsidized steamers running we have a greater trade than we have with the West Indies where our subsidized boats call.

Mr. DUFF: Can the hon. member tell the committee how the products of the Maritime provinces get to Cuba?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I do not care to answer that question.

Mr. DUFF: No, because you cannot answer it.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Frankly, I cannot.

Mr. DUFF: Then the hon. member's whole argument falls, because most of the goods shipped to Cuba go by New York steamers, which is a different proposition altogether from sending them direct from St. John and Halifax.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): We have been in good humour up to the present and I hope the hon .member will not be otherwise.

Mr. DUFF: I am in good humour.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The greater part of the export and import trade with the West Indies is still done via the United States.

Mr. BOIVIN: And does the hon. member encourage that?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): No, sir.

Mr. DUFF: What are you talking about then?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): What I say is that I am not willing to subsidize a line of ships to call at islands that do a smaller trade with us than does an island to which we send no subsidized ships. Some hon. gentleman opposite tried to show that there was no competition between the Government Marine and the subsidized line, but that there is such competition I do not think any hon. member will doubt. Both the Government Marine and the Royal Mail Steam Packet Company complain about it; they have both protested against this competition. The Canadian ships which are now running on the West India service claim that there is sufficient southbound traffic for both, but that there is not enough northbound traffic to justify a double service. I have here a statement of Mr. Teakle, who says that there is not sufficient traffic between the West Indies and Canada to maintain three distinct services. The minister did not inform the committee that there is being inaugurated a new service between Montreal and the West Indies by the Canadian Pacific Railway. Surely the Canadian Pacific Railway are not going to put boats on an utterly losing service. There are protests from various associations against this subsidy. An hon. member read resolutions from the National Marine Engineers' Association,. and I have similar resolutions from the International Association of Machinists, the Trades and Labour Council of Montreal, representing 62 or 63 councils, and from other bodies protesting against the continuance of this subsidy; and I submit that the time has come when the people of this country ought not to be asked to pay profits—for that is what it amounts to—to a firm of ships that are owned in England, whose shareholders are in England, and the captains and sailors of which ships are mostly Englishmen, while our Canadian seamen are out of jobs, as even the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) is aware. We have our own marine, and this subsidy should be discontinued and our ships be allowed to run in fair competition with any other line. The treaty should be abrogated because it is of no advantage to Canada. I have gone thoroughly into this matter and I think I have proved to the satisfaction of the committee that the subsidy should be discontinued. I move therefore that the item be reduced by the sum of $300,000.

Mr. DUFF: Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman quoted some remarks I made in the House in 1919 in opposition to subsidies. In reply I might say that I have never changed my opinion on the subject. If the

committee will allow me to be a little personal, I would say that sailing ships in which I am interested are doing business with the West Indies in competition with the Royal Mail Steam Packet Company and the Canadian Government Merchant Marine. These little ships, of which I am manager, go to Barbados and the other islands with Canadian products and bring back molasses and other commodities. For instance, this week I was home sending the schooner A. W. Chisholm to Trinidad with a cargo of cotton. These ships get no subsidy from this or any other government, they sail on their own bottoms, and if we lose money we grin and bear it. Consequently I agree with the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Garland) that we should not pay subsidies if it is possible to avoid it. But a change has taken place since I made my speech in 1919 which makes it essential for us to pay this subsidy, if we are to continue the service to the West Indies. And the change is that the Canadian Government Merchant Marine ships are now engaging in the same trade and taking business which the Royal Mail Steam Packet Company should get. If a new contract is entered into by the Minister of Trade and Commerce with a reputable firm which will supply good ships, my opinion is that inside two or three years we will not have to pay any further subsidies because there will be sufficient business developed to enable such a line to be operated without assistance. But at present owing to the stupidity of some one, the Canadian Government Merchant Marine ships having been put in competition with the Royal Steam Packet Company's fleet, both lines are losing money, and as a result this parliament is compelled to vote a subsidy to maintain communication between the West Indies and the Maritime province ports. It would be suicidal to talk of discontinuing the subsidy now, for the shippers of the Maritime provinces would not be able to get their products to the West Indian markets, and consequently our farmers and fishermen would suffer. Therefore while I am opposed to subsidies in principle, I say it is necessary to have this subsidy voted, and I hope it will be agreed to.

Mr. BOYS: When do the existing contracts expire?

Mr. ROBB: The original contract expired four years ago, then it was renewed for another two years.

Mr. BOYS: When is the end of the year?

Mr. ROBB: The previous government advertised for tenders in September, 1921. The only tender we received asked for 7½ per cent upon the investment. We did not accept this tender, but we continued the present arrangement for a further period of two years, which will expire in 1924. We are advertising now for new tenders.

Mr. BOYS: So as a matter of fact this vote is necessary to discharge our obligations under contracts which are still in existence?

Mr. ROBB: Yes.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The hon. member for Lunenburg suggests that we could not do away with this subsidized service because our trade would then cease. I submit, Mr. Chairman, we have plenty of boats we could put on that service, and the hon. member could increase the business of his own boats.

Mr. DUFF: What are you talking about? Mine are sailing ships.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Certainly, but they carry cargo?

Mr. DUFF: Yes, but these steamers are for passengers and mails.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I am not interested in the passengers to the West Indies from Canada. They are simply holidaying people, not business people.

Mr. DUFF: How does the hon. gentleman know they are not going down on business?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I was speaking to a lady only the other day who informed me she intended to take a trip to the West Indies. I said, "I hope you are going by the Canadian Government Merchant Marine or by the Royal Mail Steam Packet Company's boats, because I should like to have your experience of the trip." She replied, "Oh no. No one wants to go to the islands on those slow old boats. I shall go from New York." I have no doubt that business people would take the same route.

Mr. DUFF: Hon. members on this side and on the other side who understand anything about this business must be laughing in their sleeve. Let me tell my hon. friend that every first class passenger who leaves from Halifax or St. John on the Royal Packet steamers for the West Indies are business men or trade agents. The hon. member does not know that or he would not get up and talk in this way. Why are these business men travelling by these slow boats? For this

reason, the boats call at Bermuda and other ports and while discharging cargo a business man has time to go ashore and do his business. That is why the passengers are business men, not rich people of leisure. I should like the hon. gentleman to acquaint himself with the facts before talking such utter nonsense.

Mr. BAXTER: I think it is quite obvious to everyone present what the result of this vote is going to be; the subsidy as proposed by the government will undoubtedly be carried. Now, we can, if not profitably or pleasantly, at least endurably, I suppose, stay here until two or three o'clock in the morning, and nobody will be a bit further ahead. The case against the subsidy has been as fully presented as it can be I should think. Those of us who are in favour of the subsidy will have to take the responsibility of voting for it, while those who think that a subsidy is wrong in principle will have the advantage before the country of having stated their view and supported it by their votes. Now, might we not just as well proceed to take the vote as continue a discussion in which no member is going to convince any other member of a single fact?

Mr. IRVINE: Would the hon. member apply that same principle to all other questions? If so we might as well go home.

An hon. MEMBER: It would be a very good idea.

Mr. BAXTER: No, only to the case under consideration.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The minister a moment ago in answer to a question from the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Boys) stated that the contract was already let, and that therefore the money had to be voted. Am I right?

Mr. ROBB: A contract was given for two years, but there is a clause in all these subsidy contracts that their continuance is subject to the vote of parliament. If parliament does not vote this money the contract ceases. But there is an obligation on the part of the Dominion to carry on this contract until March, 1924. And we are not the only parties to it; our fellow-Britishers in the West Indies are also concerned. We are trying to carry out our part of the contract. If my hon. friends desire to continue the argument all night, well and good. I have been in that game before, and I agree with the hon. member for St. John City (Mr. Baxter) that nothing is to be gained by it. I never favoured such tactics when I was opposition whip. If my hon. friends say frankly they do not want to take the vote now, we can adjourn and go home like decent men to-night, but we can stay here until August just as well as they can. But if hon. gentlemen are prepared after reasonable debate of the amendment to vote, I do not object to staying a little while longer.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): May I submit to the committee that we are trying to act conscientiously and carefully? Some of us have gone into this matter with care, and we are trying to do our duty as we see it. There is no intention on anybody's part to hold up or unduly obstruct the business of the House, and I think any such suggestions are rather unkind.

Mr. ROBB: I am glad to have that assurance.

Mr. SHAW: I understood the minister to say that we are obligated so far as this particular item is concerned to the amount of $340,000.

Mr. ROBB: It is $340,600.

Mr. SHAW: Whatever it is. Will the minister state shortly the actual terms of the contract existing between this company and the government under which this liability arises? I want to get particulars as to the nature of the service to be rendered and the tonnage of the boats to be used if any tonnage is provided for, or does the government simply say: You carry on the service fortnightly with these boats that you have got and we will pay you $340,000.

Mr. ROBB: My hon. friend is right. That was the best arrangement we could make at that time. When the late government advertised for tenders for the improved service in order to carry out the contract, the tender that came in was not satisfactory. We considered that a basis of 7½ per cent on the invested capital was too uncertain, so we made an arrangement with the company to continue the service that had existed for many years and we paid them the same subsidy.

Mr. IRVINE: I am not going to make a speech, although I had a great deal of information that I wanted to give to the committee, but since I have been assured by my hon. friend from St. John and by hon. gentlemen opposite that they do not pay any attention to what is said anyway, it is unnecessary to make a speech. I understood the minister to say that he thought it advisable to subsidize an opposition line in order to secure competition which would result in lower freight rates for the Canadian people.

Mr. ROBB: I hope my hon. friend did not understand me to say anything of the kind. I do not remember making any such statement.

Mr. IRVINE: I thought the minister did not remember having said that, but I am quite sure he said it.

Mr. ROBB: Hansard will show.

Mr. IRVINE: Yes, I think it will show he made that statement.

Mr. NEILL: There are two points I would like to mention before the vote is taken. A suggestion was made from the opposite side of the House that if the government took off the government boats and continued this service, in other words, gave a monopoly to the Royal Mail Line, in a very short time the profits presumably of the company would be such that there would be no further subsidy required. I would like to ask the committee if it has ever been on record in the history of Canada that any steamship company ceased to ask for a subsidy or to get it. Did the condition ever arise when a company would come forward and say that it did not require any further assistance? No, they have always asked for it, and they have always got it.

There is another phase of the question. The minister said that when he was calling for these contracts there was only one tenderer. Now if we do away with the opposition of the government boats and practically give a monopoly to this Royal Mail Packet Line, it will not be $340,000 that they will want in two years, but five or six hundred thousand dollars because they will take deliberate, cold-blooded advantage of the fact that they have no competitor in the field. You cannot dig up a competing line in a week or two. The company that has a monopoly stampedes you. I have had some experience out west with that kind of thing. When the contract has nearly expired the people served by this line are naturally very anxious to see it maintained, and the company that has been given a monopoly knows that they have driven off competitors, and they get busy and hold up the government. We may lose money by the continuation of the merchant marine service down there, but we shall save it in the other way by stopping a monopoly, and if there was no opposition that would be the inevitable result.

I have only this to say as regards the vote: There is no question that as the government have entered into the contract parliament will have to vote the money, and judging from the numbers here the government will carry the vote. I hope they will, because I realize they have to carry out this contract. But I think there is a great deal of light to be let into this system of subsidies all over Canada, and I do not think the discussion to-night has been time ill-spent. I intend to support the amendment of the hon. member for Bow River, not that I am in favour of doing away with the vote, but as an expression of sympathy with him and those who support him in the suggestion made from across the floor that they are animated by improper motives, as if they had no right to do so if they chose.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I do not want the committee to be under the impression that we in this corner of the House are moving this amendment from pique or anything of that kind, nor because we fail to recognize the sacredness of a contract. I submit that it is a protest from the people of Canada whom we are here to represent against the government of Canada entering into contracts that compel the subsequent voting of money by the members of the House.

Amendment negatived.

Item agreed to.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Graham the House adjourned at 1.10 a.m. Friday.

Friday, June 1, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

DOMINION LANDS ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. CHARLES STEWART (Minister of the Interior) moved that the House to-morrow go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend The Dominion Lands Act, chapter twenty of the Statutes of 1908, and to provide that the original valuation of the Homestead Inspector may be revised, if necessary; that authority be given for the granting of second homesteads to settlers within a definite district covering the southern portions of the province of Saskatchewan and Alberta; that further provisions regarding the issue of patents in the event of the death or insanity of the entrant, and respecting sections reserved for school lands, and permits to cut timber on Dominion lands, be enacted; and that the Governor in Council may make grants not exceeding in any case the sum of two hundred and forty dollars in cash in satisfaction of claims of half-breeds arising out of the extinguishment of the Indian title.

He said: His Excellency the Governor General, having been informed of the subject mat-

ter of this resolution, recommends it to the favourable consideration of the House.

Motion agreed to.

RETURNS BROUGHT DOWN

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals): Mr. Speaker, with the consent of the House I move to return to the order of motions.

Mr. SPEAKER: By unanimous consent.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. GRAHAM: I wish to lay on the Table of the House a return to an order moved for by the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens)—earning and expenditure of vessels of the Canadian Government Marine; also a return moved for by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Church) concerning the Canadian Government Merchant Marine; also a return moved for by the hon. member for North Toronto with regard to the sale of the Toronto Suburban railway; also a return moved for by the hon. member for North Toronto concerning the purchase of property by the Canadian National railways at the corner of King and Yonge streets, Toronto.

REDISTRIBUTION

Hon. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou, Acting Minister of National Defence) presented the second report of the Redistribution committee as follows:

The special committee to whom was referred bill No. 15, an Act to readjust the representation of the House of Commons, beg leave to present the following as its second report:

Your committee, in accordance with the resolution adopted at their meeting of the 31st May, ask that it be given leave to have its proceedings printed from day to day for the use of members of the committee and of the House when deemed advisable.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou) moved that the report be concurred in.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not see in the motion any request that the reports be printed. The motion is only to concur in the report.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): As I understand it, the report recommends that the committee be allowed to print its own proceedings as and when it, the committee, desires, That being the case I take no objection.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand it is in conformity with the report brought down.

Motion agreed to.

NOTICE OF MOTION BY MR. CARROLL

Mr. W. F. CARROLL (Cape Breton South and Richmond): I wish to give notice that on Tuesday next I shall move the second reading of bill—

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must give notice in writing of his motion, or wait until we reach the Orders of the Day.

HARBOUR OF THREE RIVERS

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) moved that the House to-morrow go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to bring in a measure to make provision for the improvement and management of the Harbour of Three Rivers, in the province of Quebec, and to provide:

1. That the Commissioners appointed under this act shall be incorporated under the name of the "Three Rivers Harbour Commissioners".

2. That boundaries of the harbour be defined; harbour commissioners and a harbour master, a deputy harbour master and other officers be appointed; and rules and regulations, and a tariff of rates and dues be made.

3. That the jurisdiction of the commissioners be defined, as well as their powers as to expropriation of lands and the making of by-laws, the collection of rents, and the borrowing of money.

4. That the commissioners shall expend the moneys collected, after payment of the salary of the harbour master and the necessary expenses of maintenance of the harbour, in improving the harbour and its appurtenances, according to plans to be approved by the minister.

5. That regulations as to seizures, penalties, the application of the same, and the general administration of the harbour be established.

He said: His Excellency the Governor General having been informed of the subject matter of this resolution, recommends it to the consideration of the House.

Motion agreed to.

PENSION BOARD

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. L. H. MARTELL (Hants): I should like to draw the attention of the government to a despatch which appears in the Ottawa Evening Journal of May 31st, 1923, which reads as follows:

Would remove Pension Board

Victoria, B.C., May 30.—A resolution moved by Rt. Rev. Dr. Schofield, Bishop of Columbia, and seconded by Alderman E. W. Woodward, secretary of the Trades and Labor Council, calling upon the Dominion government to remove the members of the Canadian Pension Board, was endorsed last night at a meeting of 300 citizens. H. D. Twigg, commandant of the Canadian Legion here, quoted individual cases of alleged harsh treatment by the board, and reviewed the recent report of the Royal Commission which recently investigated the acts of that body.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with reference to my question, I might say that I have the honour to be personally acquainted with the right reverend Dr. Schofield, who is a graduate of my own alma mater and for years was rector of Christ Church in the town of Sydney, and bishop of the Anglican church, or the Church of England, to which I have the honour to belong—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order, order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I ask the hon. member not to comment, but to simply put his question.

Mr. MARTELL: It is probably necessary for me to preface my remarks. Of course now I cannot do it. I have every respect for Bishop Schofield's opinion, and I want to say for the honour of the Anglican church in the province of Nova Scotia that we represent one-fourth of the population of the province—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order, order.

Mr. MARTELL: Is it the intention of the government to ignore a resolution moved by a Church of England minister in the Dominion of Canada?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The government will be pleased to take this resolution under consideration.

CANADA COLONIZATION ASSOCIATION

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. J. S. WOODSWORTH (Centre Winnipeg): I have a question on the order paper with reference to the reorganization of the Canada Colonization Association. An article in the press states that the Canadian National Railway Company, as well as the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, will be represented in the new association, and that each of these companies will make a grant of some $100,000 annually for a period of five years. I would like to know whether this matter has come to the knowledge of the government, and whether the government approves of representation of the Canadian National on such a board, and of the grant to be made by the Canadian National Railway to an outside organization?

Hon. CHARLES STEWART (Argenteuil), (Minister of the Interior): I have seen the despatch, and have discussed the matter of the proposed co-operation of the two railway companies in immigration work. The matters have been discussed informally between our department and the railway company, to prevent overlapping in continental work, in the Scandinavian countries particularly, and work in Great Britain. We have been discussing it for some considerable time. The final meeting with respect to this matter will take place early this month, but no definite arrangement up to date has been arrived at. With respect to the Canada Colonization Association, I understand representations have been made on behalf of the proposed organization by Mr. Brown, the vice-president, but I cannot say how far these negotiations have gone at the moment. However, the moment negotiations are completed with respect to the other matter, as well as with respect to this question, I will be prepared to give the House full information.

ROYAL COMMISSION ON PENSIONS

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. R. J. MANION (Fort William and Rainy River): Can the Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment tell us whether it is his intention to bring in the proposed amendment to the Pensions Act, in compliance with the report of the Ralston commission?

Hon. H. S. BELAND (Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment): The resolution with respect to this matter is on the order paper. The matter cannot be dealt with at all events before next Tuesday, as the House will adjourn till that date. It will be taken up next week.

Mr. MANION: Will the minister be so good as to inform the House two or three days in advance?—because there are very important changes and many hon. members wish to take part in the discussion.

Mr. BELAND: The resolution will be dealt with, of course, in the first place in Committee of the Whole, and the bill should be introduced three or four days later. Ample notice will be given to hon. members in regard to the matter. The bill will be more extensive than the resolution.

Mr. MANION: It is the desire, I am sure, of the minister to bring in this bill at the earliest possible moment, because it is a long time since the report was sent in, and there is a good deal of agitation among the soldiers asking for it to be dealt with as soon as possible. The report says that injustices have been done, and that they should be corrected as soon as possible.

Mr. BELAND: We have expressed our intention of dealing with the matter.

Mr. MANION: Intention—yes.

Mr. BELAND: And the resolution is on the order paper.

Mr. SPEAKER: Perhaps the hon. member, to save time, would like to move his resolution now.

Mr. BELAND: Yes. In connection with this resolution, I beg to say that His Excellency having been informed of the subject matter contained therein has been pleased to commend it to the attention of the House. I move that the House to-morrow go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend the Pension Act, chapter 43 of the statutes of 1919, and the amending Acts, and to provide,—

1. That enactments be made respecting pensions for military services rendered during the war and after the war, which shall be made retroactive to the first day of September, 1919, and all cases in which pension has been refused, reduced, discontinued or underrated by reason of the fact that the proposed legislation was not included in the Pension Act shall be subject to review by the Board of Pension Commissioners, and on such review pension shall be granted, increased or continued as from the date or dates it would have been granted, increased or continued had such proposed legislation been in force when such refusal, reduction or discontinuance or underrating was made effective.

2. That the Governor in Council on the recommendation of the Minister of Justice may appoint a District Review Board for each of the nine districts of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, and a Federal Appeal Board for Canada, to review appeals from decisions of the Board of Pension Commissioners; and that provision be made for the tenure of office and qualifications of the members of such Boards, and for the payment of their remuneration or salaries out of any unappropriated moneys of the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

3. That the Governor in Council may make such rules and regulations as are deemed necessary to carry out and enforce the provisions of the proposed legislation.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. SHAW: Is it proposed to publish the final report of the Ralston commission for the benefit of the members?

Mr. BELAND: The final report is not in yet. My hon. friend, I assume, refers to the second report.

Mr. SHAW: Yes.

Mr. BELAND: The motion was carried in this House some ten days ago calling for the printing of five hundred copies in English and two hundred copies in French. I am not aware whether it is printed or not, but I suppose if it is printed it will be distributed at an early date.

Motion agreed to.

RELATIONS WITH RUSSIA

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. J. S. WOODSWORTH (Centre Winnipeg): Mr. Speaker according to an English despatch, a very serious view is taken of the developments which have occurred during the last few days in the negotiations between Lord Curzon and the Soviet.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must draw attention to the fact that the hon. member has already spoken on the Orders of the Day.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: It is another question.

Mr. SPEAKER: It can be done with the consent of the House, but it is not usual for an hon. member to speak twice on the Orders of the Day.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Perhaps I might ask a question. The papers would indicate that a situation is developing in the negotiations between Lord Curzon and the Soviet Republic of a rather serious character.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member might well afford to wait for another sitting of the House. I would ask him to put a question regularly on the order paper. He has already put a question on the Orders of the Day being called. The practice is that only one question can be put if it is a matter of public importance. More than one question, according to the authorities, can be put by the leaders of the parties in the House. I must live up to the traditions of parliament.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I do not exactly claim that we are on all-fours with other parties in this House; but there are two of us here who are not able to speak through any other leaders, and I think we have a right to speak in this way. I submit to the ruling of the Chair: we do not press that viewpoint; but it seems to me in keeping with the best practice in the British House, that a member can ask more than one question.

Mr. SPEAKER: This question has been dealt with on many occasions during this parliament and before. If the hon. member will refer to Bourinot, he will see that on questions before the Orders of the Day are called, only questions of public importance can be raised in order to elicit an answer from the government. Bourinot says that those questions must be distinctly on matters of public importance, and one member should speak only once, otherwise the sittings would be taken up with questions the whole afternoon and the whole evening. Of course, the hon. gentleman has just called to my attention the fact that there is a fourth party, and on that consideration I will allow the question. I regret that I had ignored that fact.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Mr. Speaker is very gracious. I think this is a matter of public

importance. For the last few weeks we have heard these rumours and, indeed have seen these despatches, as to negotiations being in progress. As I understand the matter, the government is kept informed from day to day of what is proceeding, and in view of the importance of the question, we might well have a statement from the government as to the exact situation, as to how these negotiations have been carried on, and whether there is any danger that there may come a rupture between these two great countries.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): With respect to the particular matter referred to by my hon. friend, I might say that such information as the government receives on European affairs is generally received in advance by the press. There is nothing that has been received within the last day or two which would throw any additional light on what has appeared in the press. The rumours are similar to rumours that have appeared from time to time regarding European transactions. I think we may assume that matters are unsettled, but beyond that the government has no information.

DAIRY ACT, 1914, AMENDMENT

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. W. F. CARROLL (Cape Breton South and Richmond): I should have given notice of this before, but I wish now to give notice—

Mr. SPEAKER: In writing?

Mr. CARROLL: No, as a matter of record: That on Tuesday next, at three o'clock or as shortly thereafter as I shall be given the privilege, I shall move the second reading of Bill No. 186, to amend the Dairy Industry Act, 1914.

OLEOMARGARINE

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. GEORGE BLACK (Yukon): I should like to call the attention of the government to the fact that members of the House have been circularized with material calculated to prejudice them against the manufacture in and importation into this country of oleomargarine. The communication, except that it has been sent out in an envelope stamped with the stamp of the Department of Agriculture, is anonymous. Is it the government's policy to approve a campaign of that sort, and does the government intend to oppose legislation authorizing the manufacture and importation of oleomargarine?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: As to approving any campaign of the sort, I should say that the government would not.

[Mr. Woodsworth.]

PUBLIC SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved that the House go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to extend for one year the operation of the Public Service Retirement Act, chapter 67 of the statutes of 1920, as amended by chapter 49 of the statutes of 1921, and by chapter 39 of the statutes of 1922.

Motion agreed to and the House went into committee, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

Mr. FIELDING: This is a resolution which will hardly provoke any dissent. There are from time to time questions raised whether we should have a general superannuation act. Reserving that for future consideration, I think we all agree that what is commonly called the Calder Act, taking the name of the hon. gentleman who introduced it some years ago, and which expires the 31st July, should be extended for a further year, giving the government an opportunity to consider the advisability of bringing down a general superannuation bill.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I thoroughly agree with the minister as to the value of this act. It is one of many acts which received a great deal of criticism, but which were really necessary. Can the minister give us information as to the number of men and women employees who were retired under the act during the past fiscal year?

Mr. FIELDING: I have not the information at hand, but I shall be glad to give it on the third reading of the bill.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Perhaps the minister will give a statement with the names and the amounts allowed. The act, of course, will speak for itself as to what principle applies.

Mr. FIELDING: The names will be very numerous. They run into hundreds.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In one year?

Mr. FIELDING: I will not say, in one year.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I asked just for one year.

Mr. FIELDING: I will get what information I can and give it on the third reading.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think there would be more than a few. Has the government considered the wisdom of simply extending the act?

Mr. FIELDING: Generally?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, and then when a superannuation bill comes down, it may contain a clause for the repeal of this act. I

must say that I really never understood the idea of extending this act from year to year. I know this was done before, but just why it was done I do not know.

Mr. FIELDING: There has always been in the minds of some ministers, probably of both governments, of introducing a general superannuation bill. I must not speak for my colleagues, but I have repeatedly said that there should be such a bill. My hope is that by another session we may agree upon such a bill, although I do not say that definitely. We extend it from year to year, always in anticipation of a general bill being prepared.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I would suggest that the minister change the bill in committee, so that if he has not a general bill next year, he will not need to extend the Calder Act. The Calder Act is certainly very useful. When the minister has a general superannuation act, all he need do is to put in a clause repealing this act.

Mr. FIELDING: This has the same effect.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That would be a great deal cheaper.

Resolution reported.

Mr. SPEAKER: When shall the resolution be read the second time?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Before the question is put, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) to submit the information before he moves the third reading? There would be no time to read the statement on the third reading.

Mr. FIELDING: I will see that the hon. member is personally furnished with the information.

Resolution read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Fielding thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 191 to amend the Public Service Retirement Act.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

Mr. SPEAKER: When shall the bill be read the second time?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have no objection to the second reading now, but I suggest that the information be submitted in committee.

Mr. FIELDING: I shall have to let the second reading stand, because according to procedure we should have to go into committee immediately if the bill were read the second time. When the bill comes up for second reading I shall be glad to give the information.

Mr. SPEAKER: At the next sitting of the House.

SAINT JOHN AND QUEBEC RAILWAY

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals) moved that the House go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

That the provisions of chapter 12 of the statutes of 1921, be amended by extending the time for the completion of the Saint John and Quebec Railway between Centreville, in the county of Carleton, and Andover, in the county of Victoria, New Brunswick, from the 31st day of December, 1923, to 31st day of December, 1925.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Why is this resolution necessary?

Mr. GRAHAM: It involves a subsidy, and my legal instructions are that as the proposed amendment to the act contemplates the payment of money on the completion of the work a resolution is necessary.

Motion agreed to and the House went into committee, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The minister might tell us how the work stands, how much has been constructed and how much remains to be done.

Mr. GRAHAM: There is a stretch of twenty-six miles on this road on which there has not been any construction. This portion of the line, in fact the entire line, was undertaken under an agreement between the provincial government of New Brunswick and the federal government in 1916. In 1919, an act was passed extending the time for completion to 1921, and in 1921 an act was again passed extending the time until 1923. The purpose of the present resolution is to extend it for a further period until 1925. As a matter of fact no work has been done on this twenty-six miles. I understand that both the people and the legislature of New Brunswick are very anxious that we should extend the time for the completion of the work for another two years. If the matter were merely an extension of time for the charter the bill would no doubt go through the Railway committee in the ordinary course; but it involves a subsidy and this procedure has been followed in connection with the two previous extensions.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is the status of the company now? Is the road owned by the province?

Mr. GRAHAM: The St. John Railway is owned by the province but operated by the Canadian National Railways under an agreement; the province of New Brunswick has the fixed charges while the Canadian

National Railways carry on the operation. I regret to say that no money is being made.

Mr. BAXTER: The company is really an artificial concern; it is the province of New Brunswick. I believe that the railway is still owned in a perfectly nominal way by the company, but it is really the province that is involved.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): Is it paying?

Mr. BAXTER: Is any railway paying? This matter is one in regard to which I should like to have some further information if possible. For some time the process which the minister has referred to has been carried on, that is to say, the extending of the charter by provincial legislation and the subsidy by Dominion legislation. Has the minister any definite, concrete proposal from the provincial authorities with regard to the completion of this very much needed portion of the road? Or is the whole matter simply in the uncertain state which the minister implies, pending the dawn of some happy day when the work may be taken up in earnest? I am not going to enter into a discussion of what has been considered on the floor of this house many times as to the routing of the Transcontinental railway through New Brunswick. The Transcontinental railway, so far as it passes through New Brunswick, is a completed fact. The province assumed the burden of building the Valley railway because that railway was needed to do the work that many of us thought ought to have been done by the Transcontinental. Unfortunately, the Transcontinental was connected from Grand Falls to Moncton by practically a straight road through territory which will never produce much traffic, and the St. John valley has been left aside by every government since confederation. At the time of confederation the Intercolonial was built on the extreme northern and eastern side of the province because of a military bugbear. The Transcontinental, for some unknown purpose, was run to Moncton, as if it were possible to create a winter port there; and the route of the St. John valley, one of the most fertile parts of the province and one that requires connection to the greatest extent, was left unserved except in so far as it was served by the purely local Canadian Pacific railway line. The gap which this resolution deals with would enable the St. John Valley railway to be connected with the Transcontinental at a much better junction than now exists. In other words, it would connect at one end with the Transcontinental, which would then be able to use the St. John railway throughout its entire length, instead of stopping halfway at Fredericton as is now the case, and using the line between Fredericton and St. John. I think, despite the fact that we do not want to have any additions to the public debt that can possibly be avoided, it would be well worth while for the government—or, I suppose, it is now the Railway board—to take this matter up in earnest with the idea of lifting the burden off the province of New Brunswick, a burden which that province was compelled to assume because provision had not been made otherwise for this absolutely necessary routing. If this road were completed and made part of the government system the whole burden would be taken off the province. Besides it would then be much easier to reach the port of St. John, as well as the port of Halifax, with western freight, because the gradients would be easier and the distance from Montreal to St. John not any longer than, if as long as, from Montreal to Portland, Maine. To us in the Martime provinces this is a very important question. I notice that in some newspapers, published not very far from the city of Ottawa, we are constantly being reminded that the Maritime provinces should not make requests for lower freight rates or further railway facilities. Apparently we ought to be "good little boys" down there and put up with existing conditions. We, however, inspired by other examples in this House, propose to reiterate our case just as frequently as we can get an opportunity to do so; and perhaps repeated importunity may on some government at some time have the effect that repeated importunity is said to have had upon a certain person very much worse in reputation than the present or any past government. Speaking with all seriousness, I do not think that the million or million and a half that might be involved in completing this work would be at all a burden upon the National Railway system, but such expenditure would remove an encumbrance which the railway system is placing to-day both upon the province and upon the Dominion. That is one way of making the system profitable and improving its facilities, and is above all one of the great means of utilizing a port within the Dominion instead of neglecting it to the advantage of a port lying outside.

Mr. GRAHAM: So far as we are aware, there has been no definite proposition recently for the construction of these twenty-six miles, although the Premier of New Brunswick has written an urgent letter that this act be extended for another two years in the hope that

some arrangement may be arrived at before the expiration of that time.

Mr BAXTER: As this is a matter not with a private railway company which is seeking to get its charter extended from time to time, but really with the province, why not put the legislation on the statute books in such a way that it will always be open to be taken advantage of by the province? Why limit the province to two years, why not keep the thing perpetually open?

Mr. GRAHAM: I imagine the province itself will renew the charter to this company every two years.

Mr. BAXTER: They might as well renew it for an indefinite period.

Mr. GRAHAM: If the subsidy keeps up with the renewal of the charter it is doing pretty well. Except under special act, no charter is extended for more than two years under the Railway Act, and the subsidy generally follows the extension of time for the completion of the road.

Mr. BAXTER: But the minister realizes that this is not a private railway company. Although it is under the name of the St. John and Quebec Railway Company, it is really the province of New Brunswick and nobody else, and you might just as well deal with the matter under the name of the province.

Mr. GRAHAM: You could not do that.

Mr. BAXTER: Why have the province of New Brunswick secured legislation here every two years to extend the right to get this subsidy? Or why have them go through the farce every year of themselves passing legislation to complete this railway? Why not enact legislation providing that the provincial government may complete this road whenever it sees fit, and that then the federal government will come to its aid to the amount promised? Why load up our statute books every two years with a mere farcical proceeding like this when one government is dealing with another, not with some private railway company which perhaps is trying to get an undue extension of some right which others would like to avail themselves of?

Mr. GRAHAM: Legally it is a private company we are dealing with, although the province of New Brunswick, I suppose, owns the controlling interest.

Mr. BAXTER: It does.

Mr. GRAHAM: That company, by agreement with the province of New Brunswick, might transfer the right to some other company.

Mr. BAXTER: Not without the consent of the province.

Mr. GRAHAM: But without our consent. Then we would be extending for all eternity a subsidy to a private railway company. I think some safeguard ought to be applied to these charters without exception, because parliament is always reasonable in extending the time for completion of the project when reasonable grounds are shown therefor.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Graham thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 191 to authorize an extension of the time for the completion of the Saint John and Quebec Railway between Centreville, in the county of Carleton, and Andover, in the county of Victoria, N.B.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first and second time and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

On section 1—Time for extension of line extended until 1925.

Mr. BAXTER: Has the Canadian National Railway board in any way considered the taking over of this road when completed instead of continuing the present leasing arrangement under which a heavy burden falls on the province each year for what is really a Dominion work?

Mr. GRAHAM: I am afraid there is a great willingness on behalf of all the provinces to hand the Dominion anything that does not look like a paying proposition. I am not going to read the figures showing what it cost the Canadian National Railway to operate this road last year. An agreement was made some years ago between the province and the Dominion as to the construction of this line under which it was agreed that the province should assume responsibility for construction and receive certain aid from the Dominion, and that the Intercolonial Railway should undertake the operation of the road. This operation has been a loss to the Canadian Government system each year, and the road itself has also been a loss to the provincial government. The Canadian National Railway board has made no representations to the government concerning the purchase, but the Premier of New Brunswick has on one occasion urged us very strongly to purchase the road. Up to the present time the Min-

ister of Railways has not been convinced that this is in the interests of the Dominion.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

Dominion Lands and Parks, $4,387,030.

Mr. MARTELL: One item under this vote is "Canadian National Parks and Historic Sites, $1,250,980," and in connection with that item I would like to bring to the minister's attention the historic site of Fort Edward, formerly the Indian Fort Pisiquid, in the town of Windsor. Last year, through neglect, the old block house on this site was burned down, and the site generally is being permitted to go to waste. I believe the minister has appointed a caretaker for it, but it is practically a case of locking the barn door after the horse is stolen. This is one of the most ancient forts in Nova Scotia, and I do not believe it should be under the Parks branch; I should like to see it under the Quebec Battlefields Commission if at all possible, because they do things in more proper style and more in accordance with what the people demand. At present the Parks Commission exists absolutely for the purpose of keeping up certain things in the prairie provinces, such as Jasper Park or the buffalo park at Wainwright, and the like. Now, we in Nova Scotia have many historic sites, one of the most interesting of which is right in the shire town of the county which I have the honour to represent. It is a place that was used in days gone by to enable the English soldiers to defend themselves and the people against the attacks of the Indians. I believe that the people of the province of Quebec have a proper sense of sentiment, and that sentiment is equally pronounced in the people of the Maritime provinces. The keeping up of these areas in the western provinces is purely a matter of dollars and cents; it is a matter which is entirely devoid of sentiment. As Sir Ernest Shackleton once said, "You may call it sentiment if you will, but the world sadly needs sentiment." There should be some sentiment as regards these historic sites in Nova Scotia, and I would like to ask the minister if it would not be possible to have the ancient site of Fort Edward placed under the control of the Quebec Battlefields Commission.

Hon. CHARLES STEWART (Minister of the Interior): I have not very much information with respect to the Quebec Battlefields Commission, but I do know that the Historic Sites Commission have been sitting for some time, and taking into consideration the merits of the various historic sites throughout Canada with a view to preserving them and keeping them in repair.

Mr. MARTELL: Who are the representatives of Nova Scotia on the commission?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): E. Plimsoll Edwards of Halifax.

Mr. MARTELL: I know Dr. Edwards very well indeed; he is one of the most important officials of the Nova Scotia Historical Society. But the way they proceed is to put a brass tablet on some old building and then let it go to pieces. That is what the Nova Scotia Historical Society is doing at the present time—of course, they also have a few papers read. I suggest that a fence be put around the portion of the site containing the remnants of the blockhouse, and the old fort, and that repairs be carried out as far as possible; of course, the minister cannot by modern methods restore an old site to its original condition. I suggest also that the rest of the ground be set aside as a playground for the town where the children could be inspired with something of the sentiment of what their ancestors did. During the late war these grounds were used by the 112th Battalion, which was commanded by an esteemed friend of mine, though a political opponent, Colonel Tremain, and other battalions from various sections of Canada were quartered there. Let us do what we can to inculcate a proper sentiment in the minds of the people rather than a love of dollars and cents, which is all too prevalent to-day in this country.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): All I can say in reply to my hon. friend is that the matter he complains of has been discussed by the Historic Sites Commission and they intend to take action to preserve this site and keep it in order.

4 p.m.

Mr. MARTELL: But has the minister considered, or will this committee consider, the advisability of placing this historic site under the Quebec Battlefields Commission? I believe that is its name, but call it what you will, I believe it has more idea of doing what the people of Canada desire than the Historic Sites Commission has. And will the minister also consider the advisability of permitting that portion of the land which is not used for the purposes of the historic site to be set aside as a playground for the children?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I do not know very much about the activities of the Quebec commission. I do know, however, of the work of the commission that has recently been appointed to deal with these sites. There are many historic sites in Canada that the people are desirous of having marked and preserved, and there is a considerable amount of work for this organization. As to the advisability of handing the site he mentions over to the Quebec commission, I cannot give my hon. friend a definite answer as to that at the moment.

Mr. MARTELL: I do not think the Historic Sites Commission are conversant with what these sites represent to the people locally. Fort Edward, or the Indian Fort Pisiquid, which was the Indian name of the shire town of my constituency, is a site of great historic value to every person in Nova Scotia, and particularly the people in the county of Hants. I should like to see adopted, as regards that site, the same rules and regulations as are adopted by the Quebec Battlefields Commission. If the site is not placed under the control of that commission, I should like to see it administered as the Quebec Battlefields Commission administer sites which come under their control. About two and a half acres will be sufficient to enclose the actual historic site, that is, the partly destroyed block house and the old fort as it stands. For many years it has been requested that the land be allocated to the local commission in the town of Windsor, who would be under the control of the representatives of the government there, or of the caretaker, and that the area not fenced in should be used as a playground, for toboggan slides, for camping areas, for the Boy Scouts, and so on. This would result in benefit to the children; it would encourage a proper sentiment, and would help out the Defence department, all at comparatively small expense to the country. I am not asking for anything new. If the right hon. the leader of the Opposition will consult the Minister of Militia of his day he will ascertain that petitions asking for this were received at that time from the town of Windsor—that is, prior to the time this government came into power, and prior to my election for this constituency. Many of the men who are advocating this are political opponents of mine, but I think they are actuated by a desire to see that ample ground should be given to the children of the locality to play in, and where they will be under proper supervision. This fort is right in the heart of the town, the land has an area of twenty-eight acres, and at present it is not used for any purpose. That, I think, is absolutely absurd when this land could be made to serve some useful end. If the children could use this land as a playground under the supervision of the caretaker, the historic associations would tend to inspire them with greater love for their ancestors and their surroundings. Not only that, but the children could there indulge in exercises calculated to develop their physique. If, owing to the influence of red tape, this historic site is retained as it is the children of the neighbourhood will derive no benefit whatever. Let me say, in conclusion, that I intend to keep pressing this matter until I get a definite promise, and not a mere evasive answer, in regard to this particular piece of ground.

Mr. MILLAR: I rather dissent from the expressions uttered by the hon. member and am a little surprised to hear that the province of Nova Scotia enjoys a monopoly in the matter of Canadian sentiment.

Mr. MARTELL: Canadian sentiment? What has it to do with Canadian sentiment?

Mr. MILLAR: I should like to ask my hon. friend if he considers the preservation of the great herds of buffalo at Wainwright park is a mere matter of dollars and cents?

Mr. MARTELL: I may tell my hon. friend that I am not opposing in any way the preservation of the great herds of buffalo at Wainwright park. Do that if you want to, but do not maintain playgrounds out there, which are invaded by tourists, from the mere standpoint of making dollars and cents. We are not asking for such a thing as that. We are asking for the preservation of our historic sites in the province of Nova Scotia. We are asking that this site in the town of Windsor shall be given, under proper supervision, to the town as a place where the children can play.

Mr. BAXTER: I think my hon. friend from Hants is quite right. I sympathize with him in his determination not to be buffaloed in any way out of his historic site.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I am sorry the impression should have been created that I was trying to buffalo anybody out of his historic site. If my hon. friend (Mr. Martell) will make it clear that the town of Windsor is prepared to maintain and take care of the land granted to them there would be absolutely no objection so far as I am concerned, provided a sufficient area is fenced off and preserved as an historic site.

Mr. MARTELL: I am satisfied. That is a satisfactory answer.

Mr. GOULD: I notice in connection with the item of Canadian National parks and historical sites an increase of $284,480 for this year. The minister will recall that I have asked that some consideration should be given to the question of improvements in connection with a pleasure resort in my own district. In making this request let me remind the committee that this is the first occasion this session that I have asked for any concession or any privilege from the government. The need of these improvements has been repeatedly urged not only upon the present administration but upon previous governments. Prior to 1911 the desired work was commenced. It was cancelled after the change of government took place in 1911. The need for this work is just as pressing now as it ever was. I am speaking of the Moose mountains in the district of Assiniboia. We have there five lakes of perhaps six or seven hundred acres in extent, and the towns have expended quite a sum of money in endeavouring to make the spot a pleasure resort for the people of the neighbourhood. I may inform the committee that White Bear lake and Fish lake constitute a rendezvous for hundreds, yes thousands, of visitors who come from the United States. I recall a statement by the leader of the Opposition to the effect that our parks in western Canada formed a source of revenue equal to the agricultural area. I quite believe that statement is true. The Moose mountains resort is far removed from any other place of the kind; it might serve as a stepping stone, if the expression is permissible, to tourists as they proceed through the West in connection with the programme for national road construction on which we are engaged at the present time. I am sure it would be a great source of revenue if the resort in question were further developed. I have in my possession at the present time some beautiful pictures that were taken in the western part of Alberta and the Rocky mountains, but I do not think I err in stating that you can get just as good pictures from scenes in the Moose mountains. I do not think it would involve a very large expenditure on the part of the Dominion government to carry out the necessary improvements. If a road were built around the two lakes referred to, White Bear lake and Fish lake, it would enable tourists to reach those lovely valleys and mountains and view scenery of the most beautiful description. I often have the opportunity of visiting those lakes and I can speak from experience of the magnificent scenery which unfolds itself to view. Tourists from British Columbia come to the Moose mountains. In their own province they have scenery of the finest description, but if they leave that and come to the Moose mountains, as they do, it is surely a great tribute to the natural beauties of that district. I earnestly press upon the minister the desirability of giving this matter his best consideration.

[Mr. C. A. Stewart.]

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): My hon. friend (Mr. Gould) brought this matter to my attention last year and again this year, and we are disposed to do anything we can to make this district, which is very attractive, more accessible to the public. The people in the southern part of Saskatchewan are not over-supplied with recreation grounds of this kind and we think we can do that in order to meet their claims.

Dominion Lands and Parks—Domonion Lands, contingencies, etc., $250,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the minister tell us what amount has been voted for the last three years? Last year I see the same amount $250,000. What was it the year before, and the year before that?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): There are three periods given in the record before me. In 1913-14 the expenditure was $280,000 in round numbers; in 1919-20 it was $252,000; in 1920-21, $249,000; and in 1921-22, $244,000. These are the actual expenditures.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not recall at the moment what services are performed under "Dominion Lands, Contingencies."

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): It is the payment of the expenses of the 18 timber inspectors, the 46 homestead inspectors, the 14 inspectors of land agencies, the range inspectors, and then all the Dominion lands offices in connection with the provinces.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Where are the details?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): None are given.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Are they not given in the blue book?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I think they will be found in page 327 of the Auditor General's report. I will give my hon. friend the details. They are as follows:

1. Expenses of 46 Homestead appraisers, including purchase renewals and repairs, of travelling outfits, such as teams, buggies, harness, etc..	$ 85,000
2. Expenses of 18 timber inspectors, including as in the above item, purchase, renewals and repairs of travelling outfits, etc..	20,000

3. Expenses of 3 inspectors of ranches..	8,500
4. Expenses of 17 Dominion land and Crown timber agencies and of the offices of the inspectors of Dominion lands and Crown timber agencies. These expenses consist in the payment of telegrams, telephones, commission and postage to sub-agencies, clerical assistance of a temporary nature only, janitor service, etc..	40,000
5. Travelling expenses of outside officials when away on government business, including superintendent of western land agencies, assistant land agency inspectors, travelling auditor, etc..	25,000
6. Printing and stationery. This item is to cover the cost of printed forms used in transacting public business, the purchase and repairs of typewriters and for all stationery required in the Dominion land offices and sub-land offices..	48,000
7. Advertising re sale of timber berths; also to cover accounts in connection with lands open for entry, etc...	10,000
8. Miscellaneous:—Freight and express charges, telegrams, etc. paid at Ottawa, and for unforeseen expenses during 1923-24..	13,500
	$250,000

Item agreed to.

Mr. GARDINER: As to the amount of $42,240, to satisfy the claims of the half breeds in the Mackenzie river district; what is that for?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): If the hon. member will wait till we come to that, I have it in detail in the report.

Grant to Canadian Forestry Association, $4,000.

Mr. GARDINER: May I ask why this amount is decreased? It was $8,000.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Formerly, $4,000 was the amount granted to the Canadian Forestry Association. As my hon. friend will see, there is a considerable increase in our forestry vote which we have just passed, and it is becoming increasingly difficult to prevent forest fires—at least it has been in the past few years. I am hoping that the moisture they get in western Canada will make the work less difficult, but we must admit the loss of a tremendous amount of timber. However, comparing the losses of the Dominion forest reserves with that of the provinces, it has not been so severe, because Canada as a whole had a tremendous loss. We were somewhat fortunate, perhaps, in not suffering so much by fire in the three prairie provinces and in the forests in British Columbia. This Forestry Association is doing a very great work. It was instituted by people interested in forestry protection, the manufacturers of lumber and kindred products. For years, as far as I can ascertain, they received a grant of $4,000. They seem to have increased their activities and asked for an increased grant. The Forestry branch of the department is organized, I think, on very good lines and is prepared to do a splendid work in propagating knowledge with respect to forest fires generally. Perhaps we are weak in not having technically trained men to combat forest diseases. If we are weak in one branch, it is that particular branch. I think we should have entomologists to deal with that question, because it is rather a serious one. Outside of that, we have a splendid organization, prepared to disseminate the information we obtain, which we propose to do through the different schools. I feel that, inasmuch as we are prepared to do directly through the department the class of work that was undertaken by the Forestry Association, we might very well revert to the old grant to this association, and expend the money under our supervision, because I think we can do it as cheaply, and perhaps just as well, and in fact I think very much better, than they have been able to do. I am not for a single moment decrying the work this organization has done. They have gone through the country with a car and by lectures interested the people in forest preservation and the prevention of fires, while our work is more of the character of actually extinguishing fires when started. So that on the whole, I think if we revert to the old grant which this association has been receiving, and use the balance for the purpose of carrying on propaganda to educate the children, and adults as well, against carelessness with respect to fires which destroy timber that is valuable, it might be beneficial. I think I am safe in saying that more timber has been destroyed by fire than has been actually cut. That is a serious situation, and we hope in the forestry department to do our utmost to assist in abating this destruction. That is the reason for the reduction in the grant.

Mr. McBRIDE: In regard to forest fires, it has always seemed to me that if this government could pass legislation under which they could conscript the people in the vicinity of the fire, and pay them not more than a dollar a day to fight the fire, our loss through forest fires would be reduced. I have noticed, particularly in haying time in my own district —and I make the statement in this House without hesitation—that more fires are started to get people employment than in any other way. They get bigger wages than the farmers can pay for haying and such work. I have known the men to be taken out of the hay fields to fight fires. The Forestry department would pay a third more than we were able to pay them for making hay. I think if there

were a law passed and people conscripted in the district where the fire was and paid as I have already said not more than one dollar a day it would cause everybody to take an interest in keeping the fires down.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the hon. member's appeal for conscription evoke no response?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): We do conscript to fight fires.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is that known to all the hon. gentlemen behind the minister?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Not for overseas, for home service.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I take it that my hon. friend is complaining about the wages paid.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not gather that members were aware that the service was compulsory. I was wondering though, knowing the principles of the leader of the government and many of his followers, that they would conscript anybody until the fire was right in their own barn, on the principle that they should not do so—that they should wait until, at least, the house was on fire before conscripting.

Mr. LAPOINTE: If there is an ocean between the fire and the barn, there is no danger for the barn.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Some fires can cross oceans. I have known some very recently in the world.

Mr. FORKE: Explain.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister, however, will give consideration to that, because I would not like any interference with individual liberty to emanate from this government.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The right hon. member is improving.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I hope my right hon. friend is not suggesting that we shall not be able to conscript fire-fighters.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I would conscript from anywhere to fight a fire. I believe in putting fires out rather than in discussing the matter. I could not even hear what was being read, but the general item of forest protection is evidently under discussion. There is an increase of $88,000, to which I do not take exception, provided that we are satisfied that the organization the minister has is the best that can be made. Who is the head of it now? Mr. Campbell was head of it, but he was very seriously injured, and I do not know whether he is now at the head of the branch or not.

[Mr. McBride.]

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Mr. Campbell has unfortunately not recovered from his infirmity. For the time being Mr. Finlayson is in charge. My right hon. friend will know Mr. Dwight who was Mr. Campbell's assistant; he is at Toronto University. There has not been a successor appointed to Mr. Campbell.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Who is the acting head?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Mr. Finlayson for the moment.

Mr. SHAW: I notice with some regret the reduction in the estimates for the Canadian Forestry Association; but before disapproving the reduction, I should like to know something about the second item, the Empire Forestry Conference, for which an expenditure of $30,000 is proposed.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I intend to discuss that too. I am prepared to discuss all together the three items referring to forestry.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Which question am I to answer first? We were discussing the general forestry matter. If hon. gentlemen would discuss one question until we get it exhausted, that would be better.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Marcil): The item is "Grant to Canadian Forestry Association, $4,000."

Mr. MEIGHEN: I raised the point that I had not heard the preceding item carried. I thought the Chairman was reading the long item just preceding. I suggest that we discuss all the forestry items together, for really that is the only way we can discuss them. They are all forestry items: The last one, the grant to the Canadian Forestry Association, and the item mentioned by the hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Shaw), the Empire Forestry Conference.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The Forestry Conference is a conference that was started in 1920, the outcome of a meeting in London. It embraces the whole of the overseas dominions as well as Great Britain. It is for the purpose of studying more intimately forestry matters. I believe it was well under way under the regime of the Hon. Sir James Lougheed, and that Canada was offered the conference for 1923. I know that as soon as I came into office the matter came up actively, and I believed it was of sufficient importance to the people of Canada to have representatives from all the overseas dominions come here and hold a conference, because not only will they hold a conference in Canada, but they will travel through Canada and so be-

come more familiar with our forest wealth, and, perhaps, this will dissipate some of the delusions held particularly by overseas people with respect to our timber. Hon. gentlemen will remember that for a considerable period, during the war, notwithstanding the fact that we have splendid spruce timber that can be manufactured for almost any purpose for which that timber is used, a great deal was brought from the United States. I felt it would be good business to bring to Canada these outstanding forestry men from the overseas dominions, and also English people who are interested, and let them see what we have in the way of forest wealth. Moreover, it would give us a better understanding, as well as assisting our officials and others interested in reforestation and kindred subjects, to hold a conference of this kind in Canada.

Mr. FORKE: I suppose the minister is aware of the fact that a large quantity of timber is imported from the United States, for binder tongues, seeder tongues, and nearly all farm implement tongues. We have no timber of that kind suitable for the purpose. I believe it is Georgia pine, red pine I mean.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I know what my hon. friend has in mind, Georgia pine, which is used for the construction of tongues, shafts and that sort of thing. It is a very tough wood. So far as I know, we have nothing to compare with it in Canada.

Mr. FORKE: I think it is pretty poor stuff.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Manufacturers of farm implements must pay more for it than for our Douglas pine. On my farm, when I had a breakdown, I usually substituted by putting in 4 x 4 Douglas fir rather than by buying a new binder pole from the company. We got fairly good satisfaction, with the single exception that the fir, as hon. members know, does not stand the sun very well and will warp considerably. We are giving consideration to matters of that kind in the laboratory of our Forestry branch.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The size of this grant, $30,000, is accounted for by the fact that the conference is to be in Canada.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): To pay for the conference, yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not know how far the matter proceeded under my successor, but I do not think it would have proceeded very far had I been in the department myself. I think the whole conference matter is overdone. In the Interior department scarcely a week went by that a call for a conference was not worked up and presented to the minister in most plausible form. The salvation of the country was to depend upon the sending of some of the officials of the department here, there and everywhere, chasing after conferences and information. I do not want to stand as one who deprecates the education of our foresters in the very best methods that any country in the world can produce. If there is a country that requires the best forestry service it is Canada. I am not reflecting in the least degree on the efficiency of our forestry organization, because I should have had to give more concentrated attention to it and travel more to examine it than I was able to do to assure myself that it was a thorough organization; but I have no reason to say that it was not; that is all I can say. I should think, however, that the publications of foresters the world over, the scientific works that are available to all members of our forestry service, and the literature that exists on the subject and which is by no means sparse, would be all that was required to bring the latest ideas to the attention of the men of our own force. Why it is necessary for somebody in China to come face to face with somebody in Brazil and be met there by somebody else from Sweden, together with all the fraternity of foresters from every part of the world, to hold a jubilee in order that they might get one another's opinions, I never could understand.

Mr. SHAW: And at great expense.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The fact is that it is not at their own expense, and the temptation is very great for them to hold such conferences. And, inasmuch as there is an object to be attained, human nature is such that they can readily and honestly convince themselves that it is a splendid thing to do and all to the advantage of the country. I do not think that this item should be here and I commit myself to that position even though preparations for the conference may have been under way under Sir James Lougheed. I was not aware myself that they were under way, but I think the minister would have been well advised to let the honour pass by, and let them hold the conference somewhere else. Possibly a representative of the department could attend to see whether we could get any advantage from it before making a large commitment. Speaking generally, not with any special reference to forestry, but with as much reference to twenty or thirty other branches of the service, I offer in all humility this advice to the minister and to the government: Be on guard against propaganda for conferences.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Inasmuch as there is a very strong desire in British Columbia to introduce their timber, of which they have a great deal, into New Zealand, for example, as well as the desire for inter-empire trade, I felt that this particular conference might be of some value in the way of spreading a knowledge of Canada's timber resources. In the main, I agree with the hon. gentleman in what he says in reference to conferences. Frankly, I confess that I am not personally very much enamoured of the results to be obtained from conferences, and perhaps we are going entirely too far with an expenditure of this character. But this matter apparently was settled; the offer had been made to Canada and to some extent had been accepted. I do think that the conference will serve to dissipate a great deal of misapprehension in regard to our forest products, and, further, will undoutedly be of advantage to the people who have to do with our forests. I know of no part of our public resources that stands in greater need of proper methods of preservation than does our forest wealth. We have a vast wealth there if we can only preserve it from fire. The insect danger is not so serious; but fire is unquestionably responsible for losses that run into millions annually. While I can assure the committee that I shall not, while I am in charge of the Department of Interior, come back for large votes for forestry conventions, I do think at the same time that if we cannot adequately combat the fire menace with the present force we shall have to extend it. It would pay the people of Canada greatly to extend the force, because the cost of the Forestry branch is a very small item indeed in comparison with the tremendous losses we suffer annually.

Mr. EVANS: Are we following any systematic plan of reforestation.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes. There are stations at the following places: Spruce Woods, Duck Mountain, Riding Mountain, Mute Mountain, in Manitoba; Nisbet, Beaver Hills and Pines in Saskatchewan; Cypress and Cooking Lake in Alberta.

Mr. MILLAR: Has there been any recognition of any sort of the work of Mr. Barnjum for the work he has been doing in this connection? As far as I am able to judge, he appears to be rendering a great patriotic service in drawing the attention of the public to the widespread destruction of our forests by the spruce bud worm and other pests.

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is the member not aware that in the budget the government promised a royal commission to Mr. Barnjum to look into the question he had raised.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): My hon. friend asks if we are going to give him any remuneration?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Any recognition.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I presume he meant in the way of remuneration. Mr. Barnjum gets a great deal of recognition—he is considered an authority on the subject. At the moment he is advocating the prohibition of the export of pulp wood as a means of conserving our forest wealth. Of course, there is conservation on all the Crown lands—no wood goes out of Canada except that which is cut off private lands.

Mr. MILLAR: Mr. Barnjum is drawing the attention of the public to the fact that millions and millions of feet of timber is being lost to Canada annually by the destruction of the spruce bud worm.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): My hon. friend from Victoria and Carleton (Mr. Caldwell) gave us an address on that subject last session. I had that in mind when I was speaking just now.

Mr. FORKE: I do not think I shall be betraying any confidence when I say that Mr. Barnjum told me he was getting far more pleasure out of spending his money to further forest conservation than he ever got when making it. Would the minister tell us what are the activities of the Dominion government in regard to tree planting in the prairie provinces?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Tree planting stations are established for the purpose of furnishing trees to those requiring them. I think my honourable friend is familiar with the regulations under which trees are distributed?

Mr. FORKE: That is, from the experimental farms?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes, from our tree planting stations at Indian Head and Sutherland. There has been no change of methods. I have some knowledge of the way it works out from actual experience, and I think one has only to travel through the Saskatoon district to notice the improvement in that area due to tree planting. Application is made for the trees and they are furnished as far as possible. As far as I know we have been able to supply the demand.

Mr. STEEDSMAN: Could the minister give the committee any information as to the extent or success of reforestation in the Turtle Mountain reserve in Manitoba?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): My information is that the trees planted there are doing well. I think I discussed that matter with Mr. Ward, the member, who seems to be very much interested.

Mr. FORKE: No, Mr. Steedsman is the member.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I beg his pardon. He has asked us to extend the area very largely owing to the success of the first experiment.

Mr. MANION: I have heard the statement made on fairly strong authority—at least, by a man who claimed he had knowledge of the fact—that it was the intention of the government to shortly bring in legislation prohibiting the export of pulp wood from private lands, which is going on in some of the provinces to-day. So far as I am concerned, and I have given some thought to the matter, I think it would be very good legislation. I should like to know if there is any intention on the part of the government to deal with it this session.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I can hardly speak with authority in a matter of this kind. Strong representations have been made to the government to prohibit the export of pulp wood, and the matter has been discussed. Considerable opposition to such a proposal is coming from areas in which perhaps most of the pulp wood is cut which is sent across the boundary, that is, from Quebec and New Brunswick.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister seems to have forgotten the government's policy on this subject. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) announced that they would appoint a royal commission to look into the matter. So the government could not possibly make up its mind until it got the report of the commission. What has been the result of the three weeks' deliberations since that policy was announced? Has the government made any progress towards selecting the members of the commission, and what are the chances of Mr. W. T. R. Preston being chosen?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Is he applying for a position on the commission?

Mr. MEIGHEN: He always applies.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I heard some announcement of a commission, but further than that I have no knowledge. The matter has not been discussed in council, while I have been present.

Mr. MILLAR: Would the minister be favourably inclined to extending the field of operations of the tree planting stations? I know that requests have been made by those laying out memorial parks—and I suppose other parks—for shrubs and trees, but, as the minister knows, the regulations forbid the distribution of trees for this purpose; those living in towns are not supplied.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I visited the station at Indian Head last year, and I found that most of the trees there have been required by farmers. Inasmuch as farm locations are somewhat isolated on the prairies, I think the first work of the Tree planting division should be to supply all the farmers who require trees for shelter belts around their homes, besides, these trees add very much to the appearance of the whole country. People living in towns have a great deal more protection than those in the rural districts. I would not say that it might not be advisable to extend the distribution of trees for the planting of public playgrounds, but we do not propose to make this extension for the present.

Mr. MILLAR: At present, even though there is a demand for all the trees that are grown at these stations, there are times when they have a surplus of certain varieties, it being hard to gauge the exact number to be grown to meet the needs of the country. I suppose there would be no objection to these surplus trees being used for town parks?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): If we had these surpluses I would not be averse to giving them for public parks in urban centres.

Mr. MILLAR: Cemeteries and Parks?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I am told on the authority of one of my officers that the town of Davidson in Saskatchewan did get some trees from us for its cemetery.

Mr. SHAW: I concur in the view expressed by the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) that this grant of $30,000 to the Empire Forestry Conference might well be dispensed with. These conferences are of doubtful value, and certainly I think a forestry conference may be of little, if any, value. I would much prefer to see the minister, instead of yielding to this departmental pressure, continue the grant to the Canadian Forestry Association. This is a voluntary organization with an advisory council representative of every province. It carries on a very valuable educational work not only

among the adult population but among the yonger generation. I presume that the minister has cut down the grant to $4,000 at the request of the association; I do not know. I think, however, that private effort in the direction undertaken by the Forestry Association with grants which it receives from this government and from some of the provincial governments and various private donors has been of a very valuable character, and it is work which I believe cannot be as successfully carried on by any department of government.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Will my hon. friend explain why?

Mr. SHAW: Because the gentlemen engaged in this work are actuated by their desire to render some public service. Nobody is being paid; it is entirely a voluntary undertaking.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The secretary is drawing a very nice salary.

Mr. SHAW: That may be true; you have to pay someone to do that work. But outside of that there is very much work being undertaken that is not paid for at all. For instance, in one of the high schools in Calgary some of the gentlemen who were interested in this organization called a meeting of the parents and children and gave them a very valuable lecture on tree growing, tree preservation and the various methods of fire prevention. It is a voluntary effort, except so far as the central organization is concerned. In addition, they have a very excellent magazine which deals with all problems in connection with forestation. It seems to me that that work can be much better done by this private, voluntary organization than by government with a very heavy establishment, the members of which are all too anxious, perhaps, to magnify the importance of their own individual tasks. Mind you, I am not suggesting that the government's work in this connection is not important; it is a matter of vital importance to this country. But I do not think the government in undertaking this work should discourage any voluntary organization which is equally desirous of promoting the preservation of our forests in Canada.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Both in Alberta and since coming to Ottawa I have discovered that all these organizations which receive grants from the government are in many ways doing work that is government work—or if we are not doing it, we should be. I do not think that officials of the government could go into the public schools and deliver lectures on tree planting, but they could very well send throughout the country a car equipped as the car of the Canadian Forestry Association was equipped, demonstrating proper methods of tree planting, the effects of forest fires and methods of prevention, and so on. We are actually doing that work; we have to perform the service, and we can speak authoritatively about it. As I have said, I do not for a moment wish to decry the work of this organization. But for years they have got along with this particular grant, and the tendency of all organizations receiving these grants—organizations which are outside the control of the government—is to ask for increased amounts year after year. My experience has been that once you encourage a grant of this character—not particularly this one, but any similar grant—you make it about the easiest source of their getting money. I do not know that private individuals with a desire to serve are supporting this organization and that it is doing good work. Of course, the organization was started by people who were directly interested in the preservation of the forests—there is no doubt about that—and their propaganda is undoubtedly of value. But I do think that the grant we are making might very well be continued. Only for two years did they get an increase.

5 p.m. I am quite prepared to stand by the grant given them. The men who supported them in the past will no doubt be quite prepared to support them in the future.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I think there is a great deal in what the minister says about grants and subsidies and the evils to follow from continuing the giving of them. Frankly, for my part, I would be glad to see all that form of subsidization cut out. But since you are going to have it; since you are going to subsidize such things, we will say, as the West Indies steam packet company or the Alpine Club—and the latter is one of the most absurd grants, I think, in the estimates—we can surely afford, if we admit the principle, to continue to give a fairly reasonable grant to an association that is doing such splendid work as the Canadian Forestry Association. I am sorry the minister has economized at the expense of this association in particular. Why not economize on the Alpine Club grant and give the money to something more useful?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The Alpine Club was always a theme upon which there was a very bitter controversy in our province. I suppose they do valuable work—I am not an expert on the mountain business, but I have

no doubt they render some service. But I wish to say again that I do not desire to decry the services of this forestry organization. The hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Garland) is right when he says that governments might very well curtail grants of this character that go outside their control.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Do away with all of them.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I am quite prepared to consider it.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Do not cut a good one and leave the bad one.

Mr. GRAHAM: It is a matter of judgment.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I may say I approve of both these grants—I mean, the Alpine Club and this one; I do not approve of the $30,000 conference. The Canadian Forestry Association represents men in Canada who are financially interested in the preservation of the forest, and they rightly feel that upon them a special responsibility rests. I presume there is a measure of altruism in their action; they are doing it for the benefit of the country, but they are doing it mainly for their own benefit. They are doing it in order that they may create a sentiment which will reflect itself in a diminished forest desolation, and in that way preserve their own property. In doing so, whether that is the motive that animates them or not does not matter, they do serve the state, because just to the degree that they prevent fires anywhere they ward off danger to government property. Not only do they serve the state in preventing fires that would consume government property, but when they preserve their own property they serve the state, because the state suffers if their property is destroyed. Consequently it seems to me that the work they are doing is a necessary work, and as we are interested in it, it is only right that we should help it; it is only right that we should contribute to any measure to encourage them, because we get to a large degree the benefit of the results of their outlay and their work. The same words really apply to the little vote to the Alpine Club. But in the absence of the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) and the other gallant fighter across the way who season in and season out, did brave battle in this House against that $1,000 grant, really I would not want to win the conflict by default this afternoon. I think I should wait until the enemy arrives, and then we can fight it out once more. I notice, however, that their ardour is very much cooled with the change of government.

Mr. GRAHAM: They have climbed higher.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not know that there is much difference as between the $8,000 and the $4,000; if the association feels that it is receiving adequate recognition at the hands of the government when it gets $4,000, all right. I would not, however, object to a grant of $8,000.

Mr. GARDINER: I wish to draw the minister's attention to a very important feature of this tree planting situation. The minister is aware that we have in the southern parts of Saskatchewan and Alberta what we term the semi-arid belt. During the last year of two there have grown up in that southern area tree planting associations the purpose of which is to induce farmers to plant and care for at least one-half mile of trees. I merely mention this matter because I believe we could in this way alter the conditions in southern Alberta and Saskatchewan; so that it is desirable that as many trees be planted there as possible. I trust that during the coming year the minister will consider carefully this phase of the situation. It is true that on the bare prairies we have planted shelter belts of trees, but these protect only the buildings. It seems to me that if that country is ever going to be saved for any useful purpose to Canada we will have to plant large areas with trees, and if we can encourage the farmers to put, say, half a mile of plantation on their farm, I fancy we will solve the problem that awaits solution in that particular area.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I wish to say a word in endorsement of the hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Gardiner), and in doing so to try and press again upon the government the importance of this forest preservation question. As I find one member of the cabinet has forgotten the government policy on the subject, I really fear that its members as a whole are not very much concentrated at the present time on the subject of forest preservation. It is something very easy to make a mountain of, but as it stands it really is a problem quite difficult of solution. There are many things in my judgment that are needed. We should have a single and well-systematized Dominion organization for fighting forest fires, and this vote is rather a contribution to that end. I believe it is true that the federal organization has succeeded better than the provincial organizations. For myself, I would like to see some arrangement made by which the whole responsibility might be assumed by the federal organization. I

would like to see that done, because I am thoroughly convinced the work could be more economically and more efficiently performed under a Dominion-wide organization than it is now, distributed as it is over nine or ten organizations or more.

There must at the same time be a really more effective attack made upon the disease element of the danger. From what I can learn this has grown in peril at a prodigious rate during the last few years, attacking particularly our pine and our spruce. Just how the government is prepared to do battle against this menace I do not know. I would like the minister to explain what is really being done to protect our forests against the spruce bud worm, and against other invasions of pests that have been most marked in the last two, three or four years. Next, being certain that all that we now have in mind is being done in this direction, there are other things, it seems to me, that are equally manifest, perhaps not equally effective, which are obviously the right things to do. First of all, in my judgment there is no excuse whatever for a continuation of the present policy of permitting our raw wood to go out of this country. What there is in the question that should form the subject matter of a royal commission is a mystery to me. It is not something as respects which the basic facts are unknown. Royal commissions are to inquire into facts. The facts are all known. A royal commission appointed to inquire into facts that are known and acknowledged is a mere stand-off and worse. Why does not the government act? I have heard, of course, talk of reprisals. There might be, for example, a duty put on our lumber, an embargo put on American coal, an embargo put on American cotton. Let me repeat what I said the other day. Under present circumstances—we standing on our feet and the United States standing on theirs—I do not fear any reprisal from the United States, none whatever. There are reprisals they might put on that in a very short time would be the very best thing that could happen us; and there is not one that will not bring as much injury, or more, on themselves as it would do to us. So far as any word of mine can affect the government, let me say: Do not worry about reprisals; act in the best interests of the Dominion. The United States will act in their own interests without any incitement on our part. Why raw wood on private lands, any more than on public lands, should be permitted to leave the country at the present rate when our forest reserves are already perilously small, I do not know. The minister says export is only permitted from private lands and not from the forests that are publicly owned. Very well as long as you permit export from private lands you cannot prevent export from public lands. The one channel is utilized for both and any force of inspectors that would prevent the abuse of that channel would be so expensive as to be out of the question. Consequently I hope that this idea of a royal commission will be abandoned and that the government will come to parliament this session with a real policy. Because every session this House meets from this day on the magnitude of the forest preservation problem will grow. Its present condition is of urgent consequence to this country right now. Let me say this—and I do not pretend on this subject to feel quite so sure as I do on the other—it seems to me we should in co-operation with the provinces, try to provide—though it will diminish the immediate saleable value of our forest reserves on our private and public property—some rule whereby there shall be a tree planted for every tree cut. That does not seem to me to be very impracticable; there cannot be arguments brought to bear to show that it is.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I think it is quite practicable.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If it is practicable, it should be done without the loss of another session of parliament. Furthermore, a general policy that will get results from the suggestion of the hon. member for Medicine Hat would be exceedingly beneficial to this country. It would bring the activities of hundreds of thousands of individual farmers into the great campaign for forest growth and would, at the same time distribute the benefits of that forest growth over all portions of our forest country. Some encouragement I should think could be given to that suggestion. Possibly the provinces should take part. But whether the provinces took part or not,, even if they stood quite aside, this government and people could well afford now to plant the foundation of the future wealth and strength of our country.

Mr. GRAHAM: The question of forest preservation, as has been well said by my right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) and the member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Gardiner), means much not only to us but our children, our grandchildren and all those who are to come after us. The older provinces have control of their forest lands. The question of preserving this wealth has been discussed in the various provinces which are blessed with forest growth, as long as I have been in public life.

To my mind we are not, either provincially or otherwise, doing all we can for forest preservation. Although a good deal has been done, yet it is a sad commentary on the Dominion of Canada that year by year we have such extensive forest destruction. In the province of Ontario, in which I live, if the forest wealth had been preserved and regrown by a reforestation policy up to the limit of possibility, it would mean, from a financial standpoint, a never-ending source of financial supply. In the province of Ontario the timber sales and the rental of timber areas have been a prolific source of revenue, but instead of replanting being continually working under the operation of the regrowth of a crop, that we have been decimating, we have continued to cut down our forest wealth till it has—I will not say it has all disappeared, but it is receding very rapidly. From the financial standpoint, if from no other, in our provinces, I believe it is absolutely necessary, as my right hon. friend has said, to have every tree that is taken down replaced by another. That is done in some countries. I have been trying to recall where it is done.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Norway.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): France.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is as to the forest, of which I will speak in a moment. Now, as to the more scattered timber throughout our farming areas—where there have been trees in years gone by, their value was not appreciated by the settlers in many cases. The moisture of our farms can be retained by a sufficient quantity of timber growth. In that respect, where we have cleared the timber away altogether, we have lost much in the fertility of our lands, particularly in dry seasons. I think we cannot show too great energy in the protection of the forest wealth we have and for the replacement of the wealth that is gone. I am in hopes that the use of aviation will in a measure assist in the work of protection from fire. It has been used also in the discovering of the pests that are destroying our forests. I am at a loss to know what results have been obtained in connection with the protection of our forests from these pests. Take even our shade trees; this season they are being attacked very severely by one of these pests, I do not know the name of it. I think that this province has done a good deal towards finding out some method of destroying this pest, but so far as I know, to date no genuine protection against its attacks has been provided.

There is a question now as to the export duty, or the prohibition of export. This is one of the difficulties that arises particularly in Ontario and Quebec. The settler goes into our forests in these provinces, and, unlike the settler going to the prairies, he has no land to plough until he clears a certain area. While he is doing that, working out a little home for himself, as our fathers did by clearing away the timber, his only means of living is by selling his pulp wood in the pulp wood areas. Now he objects very strongly to anything that tends to prevent him selling his pulp wood in the market that will give him the biggest price. I have been waited on by several of these men during recent months concerning this matter, and the contention of the settler is that if a prohibition or heavy export duty were imposed, he would be subject to a price dictated by the mill near his own home, and he believes or fears that the price he would receive for the pulp wood on the little clearing that he was preparing for agriculture, would be lessened to a degree that would be injurious. He might be protected in some way, but that is the objection raised in the two older provinces, as presented to me, not on behalf of the large exporter of pulp wood so much as the smaller settler who derives his living for two or three years from the sale of pulp wood while he is clearing his land. But something very radical will take place in this country before long in the protection of our forests, because it has been well pointed out that they are being denuded very rapidly and that in a few years our vast forest domain will be little more than a memory. I hardly know what to propose, because the government is studying the matter. I agree absolutely with everything that has been said with regard to the seriousness of the situation and the necessity of something being done, and I want to draw the attention of the committee to the objection that has been presented to the government concerning the small settler. Perhaps he could be protected in some way, but I cannot just now indicate how. If we in Canada are not going to look out for ourselves, our friends across the line are not going to do it for us. I may have wrong views, but my own opinion is that the Dominion of Canada, with its still vast expanse of timber area as well as other natural resources, ought to have a policy for the pepole of Canada, regardless of what other people do, treating them fairly, of course. But the further we go along in our national life the clearer it becomes to me that the nation that stands for itself at all times is the one that

will have the respect of all the other nations of the world, so long as it does it decently and without reprisal to any other nation. I am strongly in favour of anything that will bring about better protection of our forests and lend encouragement to regrowing forests that have been denuded, as well as to tree-planting in those portions of the Dominion of Canada that are naturally without forest cover.

Mr. FORKE: I hardly know what the minister means by a nation standing for itself. I think all the nations are doing that with a vengeance.

Mr. GRAHAM: The right hon. leader of the Opposition spoke about reprisals. I feel as he does, and what I meant was that we should go along the line that we think that is best for the Dominion of Canada. The bugbear of reprisals is magnified in our minds, I think.

Mr. FORKE: What about the big stick?

Mr. GRAHAM: The big stick has never hurt us very much.

Mr. FORKE: No, but we talk about having a stick.

Mr. GRAHAM: I know, having something to dicker with. But if we dicker for our own interests first, we will be acting in accordance with my view of a nation's duty. With our resources in coal at both remote ends of this country, with our resources in timber, in fisheries, and above all our agricultural industry, we are in a position to stand erect, to do what we think is in the interest of the people of Canada, and to take chances on what any other nation will do.

Mr. WARNER: I should like to add a word to this discussion. It was my lot to live for many years in a country that was right on the edge of just as dry a country as any place in Canada that I know of. I have had experience in raising timber in a dry country. Looking over the years that have passed, I know something about the effect in those countries of planting timber, and I want to say just a little regarding planting timber on the open prairie, in the West in particular. I agree with all that the minister (Mr. Graham) has said regarding the preservation of our timber. I know that is needed. The country where I live, when I went in first, was practically all bush and timber, at least all that was not cultivated. Now, there is not much timber left in that country. I do not know how much influence this has had on the climate, and we do not know because the climate varies. We have cycles of dry years and

cycles of wet years; but it is my opinion that the clearing away of the timber has brought about more of a dry condition in our country. I know we have more wind in that country, because it is more open.

Coming back to the planting of timber in a prairie country, I think there should be some system, or an understanding of how to plant timber. I have an opportunity of knowing that by seeing what was done in the country where I lived so long. In the beginning the government had a policy to give a quarter section to any man who would plant forty acres of timber and take care of it. He was donated what we call a timber claim for $10, the same price as for taking a homestead. It was learned that enough people would not take up that land, plant forty acres in timber and attend to it, so as to get the results that the government wanted. Therefore the government cut this down, first to twenty acres and finally to ten acres. After they cut it down to ten acres, much more timber was planted in that country than was the case when they gave a man an opportunity of getting the land if he would plant forty acres of timber. That was more than they cared to take care of; it was a greater obligation than they wanted to assume in order to secure a quarter section. When they began to plant the ten acre lots in timber and to take care of them properly was when we began to see the best results. That timber had to be planted a certain distance apart; it had to be planted in a body. The idea was—and I believe it is a good one—that all timber planted should be planted in a body rather than in single rows, and I want to deal for just a moment with the question of planting in rows. I believe in a country where the wind is sweeping the soil and blowing it from one field to another and from one place to another, this can be stopped largely by planting rows of trees in different places. But when you plant one row of trees on one side of a farm, you cannot conserve very much moisture with that one row, because the vegetation there is not heavy enough, the leaves that fall will blow away, and you do not have on top of the ground an accumulation to conserve the moisture as you would have if the trees were planted in a body. The reason for planting timber in a body is to conserve the moisture, and after that the thing will take care of itself with the quantity of rainfall in any part of our western country. Provided timber is planted in a body and gets a start, the leaves falling and the vegetation there will accumulate a certain covering on top of the ground that will hold the moisture. In that way the trees will have better growth,

after cultivation is no longer needed, and, provided there is enough timber, the moisture will be conserved to go into the air and regulate the rainfall in that part of the country.

Some forty or fifty years ago in Nebraska, they commenced that kind of planting in a country just as dry as any part of Alberta, indeed as dry as any part of western Canada that I know of, and the rainfall in that country has been increased until we no longer hear of droughts whereas it was quite a common thing, and sometimes for several years at a time, to have drought in that country, thus preventing the normal growth of crops. That timber is holding enough moisture in the country to affect the climate to a considerable extent. I believe, as the minister said, when we remove the timber altogether, from any part of our country, we shall feel the result and the country will become drier. In the northern parts of China particularly that I have read about and studied more or less, they have floods, and they have droughts because their forests have been removed. Their land is rolling, and whenever rain occurs, the water rushes into the valleys and streams, goes away and does not lie in the country so as to put moisture back into the air, conserve the moisture and ensure a normal rainfall.

Rows of trees may be all right; but as the hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Gardiner) was speaking about the matter, this came into my mind. I knew well how they had to plant timber throughout that country under a system of getting enough trees together to hold sufficient moisture there to affect the rainfall. I believe, if in every quarter section in the western country, ten acres could be planted in timber, that would distribute the rainfall, and they would not have those periodical droughts from which they now suffer. I am satisfied of that from what I have read and from the experience I have had in a country similar to our own West.

I want to add just a word and to give the minister a little of the experience that I have had in growing timber. At first when we went into that country, the people did not think very much of raising and cultivating timber. The prairies were burned regularly, and consequently the people had their difficulties from lack of rain. But after they had had their difficulties they began to want to get away from them, and they saw an opportunity to get out—in that way. They were led to take the government land as the government gave it to them and many of them after they had bought the land, planted timber. I did that myself on a prairie farm and I know it is a pleasure; it is easy to raise timber if you know the right way to go about the work.

If the prairie grass were left untouched, in time it would form a very good covering or mulch. I have had occasion to study this problem and I know that in one particular county in which I lived in Nebraska the burning of the grass was rigidly prevented over a period of about ten years. At the end of that time there happened to be a drought, and experiment was made to ascertain the moisture of the land. Holes were dug to the depth of some ten feet where the land had been covered with the prairie grass during that ten years, and there was considerable moisture in that part; whereas on the other hand, wherever the grass had been burnt, the land remained quite dry, without any possibility of vegetation. So that there is no question, in my opinion at least, that it is possible to retain the moisture in the land if, whenever trees are cut down, others are planted to take their places. I have been much concerned in my part of the country to see the timber all cleared away. Every man seems to want to take an axe and cut down some tree, but he never thinks of planting another in its stead, and I believe that this practice is to be condemned.

We should have some sort of policy in Canada that would induce the people, if they are not willing to do it freely, to plant trees wherever they cut down timber. This is absolutely necessary for the preservation of our forests and for the purpose of ensuring moisture in the land. I know that in the part of the country from which I come, if you cut down timber and leave the land alone without burning you are bound to have a forest again. That has been my experience with land I have cleared if it was not broken at once. Whenever I have cut timber and left it for a few years, a thick growth of trees springs up. On the prairies, however, it is different; you must plant trees if you want to retain the plantation. I believe that if bonuses are advisable in any direction at all, there could be nothing in connection with which they would be more applicable and useful than in this particular matter.

Mr. MacLEAN (Prince, P.E.I.): There is no doubt about the importance of taking care of our forests which are being so rapidly destroyed not only by fire and insect pests, but by the lumber men and owners themselves. However, my object in rising just now is to ask the minister what proportion of this

money for fire prevention is distributed to the different provinces, and whether the province of Prince Edward Island receives anything under this vote? There was a time when the purpose was to cut down the forests as quickly as possible and get the trees out of the way. But that time has long passed, and the people are realizing now the fact that they have destroyed a very valuable asset. The time for undertaking the preservation of what is left of those forests has now arrived, and the people of my province feel that they should receive the same consideration in this matter as the western provinces. I would draw the attention of the government, whether the matter comes directly under this department or under the Department of Agriculutre, to the great destruction that is being caused by insect pests among the shade trees and orchards. I do not think this matter is receiving the attention it deserves. The shade trees are being attacked as well as the orchards, and I am afraid that they will be destroyed completely in the course of a very few years if some very effective methods are not adopted to cope with this menace. I might mention the havoc that has been played among our cherry trees in Prince Edward Island. These trees have been attacked not by the insects that are commonly known to the experts of the Department of Agriculture, but by some pest which has never been discovered, so that the cherry trees of the province have practically all died. Just as the tree blooms the leaves begin to wither, and the cause of this has never been investigated, so far as I know. This involves a serious loss to the province, for these trees are valuable. The minister might inform the committee in what proportion assistance is given to the various provinces for the prevention of fires, and whether anything is given to Prince Edward Island.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) raised a very difficult point of forest administration, namely, that the natural resources of the provinces are owned and administered by the provinces themselves with the exception of the three prairie provinces and the timber belt of British Columbia, which are Crown lands. The vote for fire purposes and indeed for all other purposes under this item is therefore confined to the area owned by the Crown; it does not apply to the provincial forest reserves, which are operated and taken care of by the provinces. So far as insect pests are concerned, however, this is a matter that comes under the Department of Agriculture and has received considerable attention at the hands of the Entomological branch, who have studied the problem altogether irrespective of the locality of any disease.

Item agreed to.

For surveys and investigations of water and power resources and for administration of water powers, etc., $330,000.

Mr. SHAW: Are there any departments of government which undertake duties similar or related to the duties indicated in this vote? What is the attitude of the government with respect to the water-power privileges in the Banff National park?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The Water Powers Board is created by order in council and is given certain well-defined duties: it investigates the potentialities of the water-powers of Canada. I am not positive, but I think we have now made arrangements with every province in Canada in connection with this matter. Of course, the provinces that own their natural resources control their water-powers; but in order that we may have a comprehensive idea of the potentialities of the water-powers in Canada it is the work of this board to investigate, to measure, and in every other way to get accurate information as to where powers are located, what amount of power is available, and so forth. This work is being carried on throughout the whole Dominion. With regard to the second question of my hon. friend, nothing has been done. A good many representations have have been made, pro and con, we have heard a delegation from the power representatives, and the matter will be under consideration by the representatives of our own department on Tuesday next. No decision has yet been arrived at.

Mr. SHAW: Is any other department of the government concerned with the administration of water-powers, or does any other department undertake work similar or related to the work of this department?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): In administration? No.

Mr. SHAW: Then I understand the situation to be that no other department of government is concerned with water-powers at all.

Mr. GRAHAM: I would not go so far.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I do not know to what extent my hon. friend means. The Department of Railways and Canals is to some extent interested in water-powers but not in an investigatory capacity.

Mr. SHAW: The vote indicates that this department is interested not only in the surveying and investigation of the water and power resources of the Dominion but in the administration of water-powers as well. I want to know whether or not there are any other departments of government interested in any way in connection with water-powers; and, if so, what are the departments?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The Department of Railways and Canals has authority, I believe, to lease water-powers. But it is not concerned in measuring water-powers to the extent of controlling them for the purpose of leasing.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: After a survey of a water-power has been made how is the information given to the public?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): If any given water-power has been investigated the report is available to the public. That is the object of making the investigation, in order that it may become the property of the public.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I ask entirely as a matter of information. I notice that some large American firms are getting control of a number of water-powers in the West. We in the city of Winnipeg are faced with that situation at the present time in connection with our supply of water-power from the Winnipeg river. What procedure is taken to secure information in regard to new water-power sites? Is advance information given to any individuals? What is the policy of the government in regard to leasing these powers? In short, how is it that one company can acquire a large number of water-power sites and so more or less control the situation?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I had better explain to my hon. friend that the provincial governments, where they are in possession of their natural resources, own the water-powers. Therefore the investigatory work on our part is merely to co-ordinate information for the whole of Canada, to get a comprehensive idea of the possibilities of water-power throughout the Dominion. We have not a word to say about who shall get control of the power. I think my hon. friend has in mind the situation of Ontario and Manitoba on the Winnipeg river?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Yes.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): We do not control the leasing of those powers. We have the information as to the power available and that sort of thing, which is of course very valuable, but the Ontario government owns and controls the water-powers of the province. At least, the Ontario government maintains that it does own them. Perhaps I am going a step too far.

Mr. FORKE: You are going far enough.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): That is disputed. However, subject to correction, that is the situation. There is an act on the statute books which is contrary to the contention of the Ontario government, for it describes these powers as being for the general advantage of Canada, which of course would bring them under the control of the Dominion government. Personally I have always assumed that the provinces do own their water-powers.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: But in the case of those provinces that have not control over their natural resources the Dominion government becomes trustee, I suppose, of the water-powers. What is the policy of the government as to giving information concerning newly discovered water-powers?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): We are prepared to give the fullest information if we have investigated any particular water-power. Our work is not intended for the benefit of any private person, it is for the benefit of the public generally. Take, for example, in the province of Manitoba, we have investigated the water-powers on the Nelson river and the Winnipeg river; this information is for the benefit of the public.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Coming down to administration, again as a matter of information, on what conditions can a company secure water-power rights? Does the government simply turn these powers over to the first applicant who can give assurance that he will develop them? Or does the government regard these powers as being essentially for the welfare of the whole people and administer them in a broad way for that purpose?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I think I can answer that question by simply saying "Yes." So far as I have come in contact with any application of this character—I do not recollect more than one—the applicants have had to demonstrate the purpose for which the power is to be used, the quantity of power required, and the period for which it will be required, because the privilege is not granted to a private interest outright, it is merely leased for a definite period. That is the method by which control of these powers is maintained by the federal government. I do not know what method is pursued by the provincial governments.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Is the government prepared to take into consideration the development of water powers where they own the natural resources?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): That would entail the operation perhaps of a timber or manufacturing industry in the locality. However, there is another aspect that may loom up in the very near future, and that is the electrification of the railways, in which case undoubtedly, with our publicly-owned railway system, the government should be prepared, in my opinion, to retain the water-powers necessary and develop them for this electrification.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): It was just with that thought in my mind that I made the suggestion to the minister, because it appears to me that if we are to have water powers available for electrification of the National Railway system, the time for the government to act is now, otherwise they will find all the available water powers under the control of private ownership.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I am speaking now strictly of federally controlled power, because after all it will be small in amount in comparison with the total power required for the electrification of our railways throughout the Dominion, as it is only in the three prairie provinces that we have control of the natural resources. No water powers will be leased there except for a definite purpose; that is, we are not going to simply lease water powers to private individuals to enable them to get control.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): But have we not already specific instances of that very thing being done?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): There may have been in the past; I am speaking for the immediate future and for last year. I would insist that any lease should be contingent upon the supply of power being utilized for the purpose for which it was leased. I do not think we should decline to lease power to any private individual for legitimate development, but on the other hand, I do say that no more power should be leased to the individual than he actually requires for the purpose intended, and that on no account should control pass out of the Dominion.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I simply wish to utter a note of warning to the government in this matter. We anticipate within a few years that electrical power will have developed even to the extent of running some of our railways, and if the government does not at once take steps to safeguard these power sites they will find when they require them that they are all in the hands of private owners, who will hold up the government in a manner similar to that of which we have had examples in the past.

Mr. GARDINER: What is the term of years for which these leases of power sites are granted? Is there a specified term, or is it an indeterminate lease?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Regard is had to the use to which the power will be put and the probable duration of the power requirements. In addition, there is provision for the taking back of the power at actual cost at any time. A man may require power for development in connection with his manufacturing concern for, say, twenty-five years. Or take the case that I suppose the hon. member for Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth), is speaking about, power development for Winnipeg—that undoubtedly will be required for all time to come. I am thinking more particularly of mills and establishments of that character; the provision to which I have referred is inserted in all such leases.

Mr. GARDINER: Out in western Canada practically every lease that is issued is transferable. Now, this is a very important point. Does the minister not think the time has arrived when all leases whether grazing leases, coal, timber or power leases, should be made non-transferable so that those who desire to come in and devlop these natural resources will not be held up by speculators for large sums of money?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): With very few exceptions, all classes of leases are made non-transferable; that is, they cannot be transferred without the consent of the minister. In other words, the transfer cannot be a transaction between two private persons, one holding the lease and the other desirous of getting it.

Mr. GARDINER: Does that apply to a situation where a lease has not been developed, or is the minister's consent given only where there has been development?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): It applies to every lease. It is a provision of the lease itself.

Mr. GARDINER: I want to enter a protest against the granting of leases in cases where those who received the lease in the first place have done no development work at all, but are simply holding the lease up for the purposes of speculation. I would not have

so much objection in cases where there had been development and there was a desire to transfer the lease, but where no development has taken place I maintain that it is a wrong principle to permit the transfer. It is my belief that one of the real reasons why our country has not developed as it should have is because the speculative element have got leases for our natural resources and are holding them up so that those who desire to use those natural resources will have to pay large sums of money for them. I would ask the minister to allow this item to stand until after we come here to-night, because the matter is a very important one.

At six o'clock, the Speaker resumed the chair and the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 167 (from the Senate), for the relief of Christina Julia Hamilton.—Mr. Simpson.

Bill No. 168 (from the Senate), for the relief of Smith Kain.—Mr. Church.

Bill No. 169 (from the Senate), for the relief of Gladys Malcolm Mushett.—Mr. Shaw.

Bill No. 170 (from the Senate), for the relief of William Francis Rafferty.—Mr. Irvine.

Bill No. 171 (from the Senate), for the relief of Gladys Teague.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 172 (from the Senate), for the relief of Elizabeth McKinley.—Mr. Chew.

Bill No. 173 (from the Senate), for the relief of Algernon Cecil Aubry Moran.—Mr. Baxter.

Bill No. 174 (from the Senate), for the relief of Emily Adlene McCausland.—Mr. Boys.

Bill No. 178 (from the Senate), for the relief of Winifred Scatcherd.—Mr. Church.

Bill No. 179 (from the Senate), for the relief of Grace Lees Smiley.—Mr. Boys.

Bill No. 181 (from the Senate), for the relief of James Dunnett.—Mr. Gordon.

Bill No. 182 (from the Senate), for the relief of Laura McBrien.—Mr. Sheard.

Bill No. 183 (from the Senate), for the relief of Chester Abbott Redmond.—Mr. Church.

SUPPLY

The House again in Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

For surveys and investigations of water and power resources and for administration of water-powers, etc., $330,000.

Mr. GARDINER: When we rose at six o'clock we were discussing the possibilities of leasing the water-powers in the three prairie provinces. I should like to bring before the House some information with regard to the manner in which leases, not particularly water leases, but other leases, have operated in this country. First, I say that it is necessary to put into force such regulations as will conserve these water-powers in western Canada for the use of the people, so that we can utilize them. No doubt we hope in the near future that western Canada will develop more rapidly than in the past, and, because of the fact that our water-powers in that country are strictly limited, it should be necessary to see to it that they are conserved for the use of the people.

I will cite one or two examples of what I mean by conserving the water-powers of Canada, and I am going to present some examples which have occurred recently. About two years ago there were supposed to be in the Fort Norman field large quantities of oil, and people made a rush to that particular portion of the Northwest Territories for the purpose of taking out oil claims in the district. I will tell the House how it worked out in the long run. I will give one example of a man who lived in Edmonton, and perhaps the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart) is well acquainted with this case. This man went to Fort Norman, and I believe it took him about two months to go there and return, at a cost of less than $5,000. He staked out his claim at Fort Norman, came back to Edmonton, registered the claim, and a few days after he had registered it he sold it for $310,000, making a profit of $305,000 for approximately two months' work. The position we take is that that man contributed nothing to the well-being of this country. By using the form of lease that we have at the present time he was enabled to make a large sum of money without contributing one iota to the welfare of Canada. We maintain that those conditions of leasing are not in the best interests of Canada.

This statement is applicable also to our water powers. At the present time there is an oil development in southern Alberta. When I was in Calgary a few days prior to coming to Ottawa for the session, I noticed in the streets placards advertising oil leases for sale. Hon. members can well understand that those oil leases were offered for sale by men who were speculating in them, and the House will also understand that an operator must pay the price that these speculators demand before he can start operations with these oil leases. That, Mr. Chairman, is not in the best interests

of Canada, and I believe one of the reasons why Canada has not developed as she should have developed is the fact that we have allowed speculators to monopolize our natural resources to the detriment of the country.

I will give the House another example of something that happened in Alberta. Hon. members will remember that Saskatchewan and Alberta came into the confederation in the year 1905. Parliament at that time thought it advisable to retain the natural resources, not only of these two provinces but also of Manitoba. The federal authority, of course, had to deal with these natural resources. Since 1905, in the province of Alberta, over 800 coal fields have been opened up. Coal leases have been sold by speculators ever since the time that coal leases were available. Coal mines have been opened up to such an extent that five times more coal is mined in Alberta than we can profitably utilize under present conditions. About the year 1913 the Canadian Northern completed its branch line from Saskatoon to Calgary, and the line runs through the Drumheller coal fields. On the first coal that we received from Drumheller we had to pay the construction rate, which was a higher rate than we are paying at the present time. At that particular time we could buy screened coal, for from $4.75 to $5.25 per ton. To-day we cannot buy that coal under $7.75. For what reason? Simply because we have in Alberta five times more coal mines opened up than we actually need. There is, I am told, $50,000,000 invested in coal properties in Alberta alone, and, for the small amount required for western Canada, it means that they have to charge a high price for the coal, in order to take care of the overhead that they have invested in these coal mines. I think it would be good policy if the department over which my hon. friend has control at the present time should take cognizance of conditions, and say whether it is necessary to give leases, for instance, for coal mines, and so forth in Alberta. What is the use of allowing people to put good money into properties that will not be a paying proposition, unless they are in a position to charge more for their product than it is actually worth?

I should like to bring another matter to the attention of the Minister of the Interior. He will remember that in the year 1909 the southern part of Alberta was opened up for settlement. Up to that time this portion to the south had always been reserved, for some reason or other, but the department decided to open up this particular part of southern Alberta. They sent literature to the United States, sent it all over Canada, and to Great Britain, for the purpose of inducing people to come to that particular section of the country; they advertised that the land was good, that they would have free homesteads, and stated also that you could buy a quarter section of land which was known as the pre-emption, for $3 an acre. We have had hard conditions there, but the people in that district at the present time believe they could make a success of their enterprise if they had some of the rough land that is around there for community grazing purposes. The minister will remember the Alberta members interviewing him more than once last year for the purpose of trying to get some of these areas opened up for community grazing leases. At the time I was in Calgary prior to coming down for the session I saw advertised in many of the windows in places where they were selling land that grazing leases were for sale. For instance, I might give you a particular case.

The CHAIRMAN: I should like to draw the attention of the hon. gentleman to the fact that the question of grazing leases can hardly be debated under the item of water and power resources.

Mr. GARDINER: I submit to your ruling, but I am leading up to the question, inasmuch as I desire to draw to the attention of the minister the effects of past policy in respect to the manner in which leases have been granted. That applies to water-power leases as well as to grazing leases. I cite these cases merely for the purpose of giving the minister an outline of the situation. When I was in Calgary prior to coming down to this session of parliament, I saw grazing leases there for sale, and if I remember well, there were five thousand acres of leased grazing land. The price that the leased land was offered at was $1.10 an acre. Those who had this particular leased land had a lease on it only for grazing purposes; but because of our system of leases, these get into the hands of speculators and become a speculative proposition, instead of one for the development of Canada. I trust that, with the few examples I have given to the minister, he will try to evolve some different system, whereby all leases, including water-power leases, shall be issued only to those who are going to use them, and they shall not be made transferable until such time as they have been fairly well developed.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: The minister gave it as his opinion that we should continue to regard water-powers as belonging to the various provinces. I am quite aware of the fact that such

has been the general idea in the past. I do not know how the matter stands from a strictly legal point, even according to the old conception; but I should like to suggest that with the developments which have gone on in connection with the use of electrical power, the time has come when we shall have to alter our opinions in this regard. We have been told that the air is free, and yet within very recent years, with the development of aerial navigation, the whole idea has been absolutely changed, and to-day we have certain conventions with regard to aerial navigation. We also have some very definite regulations with regard to the transmission of messages through the air. That just illustrates the changes that are taking place because of changed conditions brought about by these newer inventions. I submit that recent developments in the electrical world have made necessary some change with regard to our ideas in connection with these water-powers.

I do not desire to-night to anticipate to any extent the debate which is likely to take place with regard to the Lake of the Woods, a bill concerning which is now before the House, but I should like to refer to that very briefly just as illustrating this point and the necessity of altering our policy. I think we all recognize to-day that the question of the electrification of railways must come before us in a practical form in the not distant future. Anyone who knows the northern stretches of Canada must realize the immense possibilities of electrifying our railways without any very serious trouble, if we have control of the water-powers that exist almost from coast to coast across Canada. The fact that we have already as a part of the national property, a great railway system, makes it essential that we look a little bit ahead in this matter. We were told the other day in this House that the children of darkness are wiser in their day and generation than the children of light. It would seem as if some of the private exploiters in this country are a great deal wiser than those who are charged with the administration of our public affairs. Perhaps very naturally we are proceeding on the old idea of local administration and private exploitation of these resources. But when we consider that if we are going to electrify our system, that would have to be done, not by the possession of this, that and the other water-power, but by the possession and exploitation of water-powers over a distance of three thousand miles, then we begin to understand the necessity of taking a different line of action from that which we have taken in the past.

In passing, I should like to call attention to another development which must take place in the near future, and that is the use of electricity for heating purposes. I was reading only the other day an article dealing with the report of the American government with regard to super-stations. According to that report, it will be feasible in the not distant future to supply great central stations which will provide for the heating of many of our cities. We are considering doing this in my own city of Winnipeg as supplementary to the coal supply. These things are matters that are not simply in the realm of the ideal or speculative; they are rapidly becoming matters of urgent public importance.

I would urge upon the minister that in making these surveys, he do so, not with the thought of securing information that would be available merely for local enterprises, but rather having in view the development of the whole of our electrical power as one great system. The minister a little while ago suggested that he was afraid that if we began to operate some of these water powers, we might have to go into certain industries, such as the pulp or the lumber industry. I do not know that that is essential, at least not in the immediate future, because we could do as is done in other places, sell this power to those who are going into these industries. That might be an immediate solution; but I would emphasize that we should regard the whole undertaking as one great system. For instance, the Lake of the Woods is fed by a series of streams, having many water powers, and the Lake of the Woods in turn feeds the Winnipeg river which is the source of our power for the city of Winnipeg. On the other hand, there is tributary to the Winnipeg river the English river which is fed by other lakes, sepecially Lac Seul. All these bodies and streams of water, some in Ontario, some in Manitoba and some along the boundary line between Ontario and the United States, form naturally one unified system, and it is impossible to deal with one particular waterfall. If one attempts to exploit one waterfall, there is great danger that other waterfalls may be interfered with. If one raises the levels on certain lakes, as we all know, that may have a very serious effect hundreds of miles away. This has happened in this particular instance and raised questions of international importance, and we have had our International Joint Commission dealing with the problem. The particular dispute that is to come before this House is an interprovincial proposition. I am not going to go into that matter to-night. To me it is a minor matter as to which province controls the situation. The fact is that neither can adequately develop the water powers without

having regard to the rights of the other, and the system should be regarded as a unit. Let me offer one particular illustration of how seriously dealing with one part may affect another. In 1922, the town of Sioux Lookout was promised a lease by the Ontario government of the Pelican rapids power site on Lac Seul. This power site is so situated that it can only be of commercial value provided that the water level on Lac Seul is maintained at its normal height, hence the raising of the lake level for regulations and storage purposes destroys Pelican rapids as a power site. The promise of this lease was immediately recognized by Manitoba as a serious menace to the scheme of regulation recommended for adoption, as it sacrificed the development of 160,000 horse power on the English and Winnipeg rivers for a possible 3,000 horse power at Pelican rapids. A net loss of 157,000 horse power to the two provinces.

This illustrates the situation all over the country, and is a matter of urgent public importance, so I suggest that in the making of these surveys we should not regard the problem merely as one of providing for particular private enterprises, but rather should draft a general scheme for the exploitation of water-powers, with their wonderful electrical energy, for the benefit of all the people.

Mr. MILLAR: I want to ask three or four questions touching this matter, but first of all I want the minister to answer this query: What concessions in the way of water-power have been granted to the adjoining republic by this government in northern Manitoba?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): There was one on the Saskatchewan river, but it has been cancelled. There was also one on the Nelson river over which there has been considerable controversy, and it too has lapsed. At the moment, therefore, there are really no concessions extant in the north of Manitoba. I might say to my hon. friend from Medicine Hat (Mr. Gardiner) with respect to the question of grazing leases, that these leases cannot be transferred except with the consent of the minister. Upon the expiry of a lease we notify the provincial government, who undertake the work of community grazing; and this is done in Alberta and Saskatchewan. In Saskatchewan there is a ranch being utilized for this purpose. If the provincial government desires land for community grazing, then the lease is held for that purpose.

Mr. GARDINER: I understand that this is not the case. I have had interviews with the officers of the department who inform me that the Justice department interpreted one of the sections of the regulations to give preference to the owner to renew the lease within four years of its expiry.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): That is true; that applies to the owners. But we have an arrangement with the Alberta government whereby, when a lease expires, we transfer it to the provincial government for community grazing, unless the lessee renews the lease; and this is not very often done. It is news to me to learn that there has been trafficking in grazing leases. I was not aware of the fact, but I take my hon. friend's word for it. Evidently someone must have been endeavouring to dispose of leases in that way. With respect to water-powers, practically 80 per cent of what is stated to be desirable has already been done. The controversy between Manitoba and Ontario is a considerable one and will come up for discussion, no doubt, when the bill proposed by the Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin) is under consideration. I am not going to touch that question to-night, because I shall probably have something to say about it later on. But that is one of the difficulties we have to contend with.

Mr. MILLAR: In view of the answer given by the minister with regard to water-power concessions cancelled in northern Manitoba, is there any concession granted by this government in Ontario near the boundary of Manitoba? I was talking with a friend a year and a-half ago and he told me there had just been granted a very valuable concession in the way of water-power and pulp wood in northern Manitoba, as I understood. It might have been in Ontario.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The officer informs me that there are none except at Great Falls on the Winnipeg river, to the Manitoba Power Company.

Mr. MILLAR: Is that the one?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No, that is the closest one to the Ontario boundary.

Mr. MILLAR: Is that the company whose territory was extended and over which there was a discussion in the House on a former occasion?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No. My hon. friend asked me what concession had been granted close to the Ontario boundary. That is the closest one to the boundary.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): What is the meaning of "investigations of water and power

resources"? Does that include underground water such as well water?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No, that is under the supervision of Mr. Dowling of the Geological branch.

Mr. COOTE: Has the minister's department any jurisdiction over the water-powers in Ontario and Quebec? Do I understand that all this money is spent in Alberta and Saskatchewan?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No; I explained that this afternoon. We are making an investigation, measuring the possibilities in every province, and we have an agreement with the provinces to facilitate this work. We do not control the water-powers; we simply investigate and find out the possibilities of water-power throughout Canada as a whole.

Mr. COOTE: Is this government reimbursed by the provinces for that work?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No.

Item agreed to.

For the investigation of the fuel and power resources of the Dominion and for the expenses of the Dominion Power Board, $10,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I thought we had a vote for this board the other day under another item.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): This is special work that was started before my time. It consists in an investigation of the St. Lawrence river which is carried out by two engineers of the department, Mr. H. A. Matthewson and Mr. A. B. Lamb, who are engaged in a study of the St. Lawrence river power and navigation project. The expenses of the investigation are charged up to this item.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Have they anything to do with fuel?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I do not know why fuel should have been included in the item; I have been asking that question myself.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Mr. Chairman, did the minister explain the word "fuel"?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I was asking why that word came in. It should not be there. Mr. Challies himself is on the Fuel Investigation Board for which we passed a vote in the Mines branch. The word "fuel" should be eliminated. This is purely an investigation of the St. Lawrence canal scheme with respect to the power possibilities in the event of the scheme being undertaken.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Why not put that item under the preceding one? It covers very much the same work.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I think my hon. friend is correct about that, but evidently this is the way the item was started and it has not been changed. If it was to be continued, I agree with him it should all go in the one item.

Mr. COOTE: Has the power board made any investigation of the possible water-power which might be developed in the Highwood river?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The officers are not sure that they made a thorough investigation of the Highwood river, but they suggest the power would be very small judging by the flow—although I see by to-night's paper they are having a considerable flow there these days.

Mr. HOCKEN: Has any report been made by the Dominion Power Board on the St. Lawrence power possibilities?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No. A report was made by the International Joint Commission, and in discussing this with Mr. Challies he mentioned that a careful investigation might disclose several inaccuracies in that report, although he was not reflecting upon the report itself. Indeed, that is one of the difficulties we have to contend with, that we have not any definite knowledge of the possibilities of the scheme.

Mr. HOCKEN: I presume this is to check up the report of the International Joint Commission. In this connection, I hope the government will study the project seriously, because it is of very great importance to the province of Ontario that exactly what is possible there in water-power development should be known.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My memory is that this vote was started largely for the purpose of getting data so that Canada's representatives would have something definite to go on in connection with the St. Lawrence scheme when they appeared before the International Joint Commission. I think the vote was a good deal larger formerly.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): My recollection is that it was the same.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It was a larger vote for the purpose of securing data to be used for that inquiry.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The vote covered the work of the board generally. Is it the power board my hon. friend is speaking about, or the direct investigation of the St. Lawrence possibilities?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Yes.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Two men are engaged on that work this year.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What are they doing now?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): When the matter was introduced last year by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Church) I discussed it with Mr. Challies, and I learned then that we had two men engaged on this work continuously checking the report of the engineers of the International Joint Commission, investigating the backflow that appears to be in evidence here, particularly at what would be the mouth of the canal, and the power possibilities for the purpose my hon. friend has pointed out.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Can we look forward to an interim report? Because I should like to get the data as soon as possible.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes, we could get a report of the situation as it is up-to-date.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: In the near future?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Mr. HOCKEN: How long is it going to take to check this up? These men have been at it now for a year. Surely the work ought to be done by now. Is it a continuous job so that these men may be kept on whether there is anything to be done or not?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No, I would not say that. It is difficult for a layman to state how much has been accomplished by these men. My hon. friend will agree, however, that accurate information should be had in connection with this project and the power possibilities, because it is a tremendously big undertaking and some day undoubtedly Canada will have to come to a decision about it. I shall be glad to get an interim report in respect to what they have discovered up to date. It should not take more than this year to thoroughly check up the whole thing.

Mr. HOCKEN: I quite agree with the minister that it is very important for us to get accurate information, but I would be somewhat critical of a couple of engineers who have been working at this so long and as yet have made no report. I do not pose as a technical man, but it seems to me two years ought to be sufficient to check up a report of that kind.

Mr. MILLAR: I understand the report of the International Joint Commission dealt only with the water-power on the part of the St. Lawrence which flows between Canada and the United States.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): My hon. friend's information is at fault; the report included both the Canadian and American.

Item agreed to.

For surveys and inspections in connection with the administration of the Irrigation Act, etc., $200,000.

Mr. KELLNER: What irrigation project is this?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No new work in irrigation surveys was undertaken; they are practically completed with the exception of the centre Alberta irrigation scheme, which embraces the area north of the Red Deer river through the constituency of the hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Gardiner) and the Bow river valley. I concluded, however, that the surveys had gone to that point where we could get an indication of the probable cost of the project and that it would not be necessary to continue the lateral surveys. Our vote this year is to pay for the completion of the various projects and meet the cost of the staff in Calgary. We spend $54,945 in Calgary, for the permanent staff and $40,335 for the field staff. The permanent staff at Ottawa, which takes care of both reclamation and irrigation, takes $10,470 and the field surveys and experimental and demonstration work, $68,060. Then, there are the travelling expenses of officers of the staff, amounting to $11,510; equipment at Calgary, instruments, camp equipment, transport, and so on which are required yearly, $4,280; expenses of office at Ottawa, $10,400, total, $200,000 this year for both services.

Mr. KELLNER: Do I understand from the minister that the federal government makes the surveys in all these various projects that are under way in Alberta?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes, they made all the original surveys.

Mr. KELLNER: What is meant by the words in the item, "administration of the Irrigation act"?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): That is for field inspection, surveys, etc. There has been some demonstration work; at Brooks in southern Alberta we have a farm on which demonstration work has been carried on, to indicate proper methods of putting the water on the land and generally how best to run an irrigated farm.

Mr. KELLNER: Is that a Dominion government farm?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Mr. KELLNER: I understood they were called experimental farms. I notice you refer to them as demonstration farms.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): It is an experimental station, but it is under the control of the Irrigation branch for irrigation purposes alone.

Mr. JELLIFF: I hope no one will question for a minute this item of expenditure; it is one of the most important items that appears in this whole list. It is an attempt by the Dominion government to accomplish work in southern Alberta that should have been accomplished before settlers were ever admitted there. When we came into that southern Alberta country in the early years it seemed to us that we had everything that nature could give us to make it a successful farming district. We had as rich soil as could be found anywhere on earth. The settlers who came in there had the necessary capital with which to go to work, and they had implements and equipment. They had intelligence; they had the industry, and they had above all else the glorious sunshine of that country. The people in the northern part of the province apparently do not have as much of the sunshine that we glory in. All these things combined, however, were of little effect, we found as the years went on, without water. Water was king, but an absent king in that southern country.

9 p.m.

Now the government has been aiding us to the limited extent of providing for the necessary general and preliminary survey work to determine the quantity and source of our water supply and to lay out the systems which would help us to bring that water on to the land so that we would have all the elements necessary for a permanent and profitable agriculture. That has been the whole purpose of the government work, and the amount expended to that end is not a drop in the bucket when you think of the importance of placing agriculture in that country on a firm and dependable foundation.

Let me illustrate that: Take one of our wet years—for we have wet years in that country. The district that was covered by a survey board that went over that country in 1921, known as the drought area—that district in 1915 shipped out 41,000,000 bushels of grain. That was a wet year. In the following year, 1916, 37,000,000 bushels were shipped out; the drought period had begun to come on. In the next year, 1917, there was comparatively little moisture in the soil and our shipments dropped to 18,000,000 bushels. The drought continued; in 1918 our shipments dropped to 5,000,000 bushels, and in 1919 to 4,000,000. Not only was the output of our grain affected to that marked extent, but at the same time the forage of that country became depleted; there was no feed for the stock, so that there was a heavy loss in all the branches of stock raising as well as in our grain production. These losses have involved also the loss of hundreds of thousands of dollars to the Dominion of Canada, to its railways, to its banks, to all the various commercial factors connected with the business of farming.

The work covered by this vote was an attempt on the part of the Dominion government to help us correct these difficulties due to lack of moisture. We have gone ahead with this minimum of assistance and have developed large irrigation areas. In the first place we had to start with the old A. R. and I. area, comprising about 130,000 acres, and later we developed the Taber area, comprising 17,000 acres.

We have just recently completed the Lethbridge northern irrigation district of 105,000 acres. We have laid out besides a district running south of Macleod and embracing 60,000 acres. We have completed the United Irrigation project of 23,000 acres west of Cardston. All over that country people are at work endeavouring to overcome the difficulties which nature has placed in their way from lack of water or moisture, and this is but a minimum of expenditure on the part of the government in helping us to overcome those difficulties. I hardly believe that a word is necessary from anybody in this House to sanction this expenditure on the part of the federal government. It is not only essential to the welfare of the farmers there, but it is necessary to the upkeep of your transportation agencies, necessary for the success of the merchant, of the banks, and of all business interests throughout that district. Had I known this item was coming up this evening I think I would have talked to you for about an hour and a half or two hours as some of our friends do on this side, but

it is so apparent that this expense is entirely wise on the part of the federal government that I scarcely feel it is necessary to add another word.

Mr. KELLNER: I do not wish to criticize the vote at all in view of what my colleague from Lethbridge says but as I understand it these surveys always precede the work. The minister said there are no new projects contemplated or under way. Why is it that surveys need to go on after the work on the undertaking has started?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): When I say that no new work is contemplated or no new works are to be started it does not mean that the works that are being examined are completed. There is completion work to be done on one or two of them. As a matter of fact, I do not know any area in the province of Alberta at the moment that is not surveyed—that is where it would be possible to irrigate. We are simply completing the work that has been undertaken.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): What is the situation with regard to the irrigation project known as the William Pearce, or the Northern Saskatchewan?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I spoke of it a moment ago. However, I will tell my hon. friend that we have a report on that project which would indicate that it is feasible. It will cost in the neighbourhood of $50,000,000 and embraces a considerable area of the province of Saskatchewan north of the Red Deer river. There is still a considerable amount of preliminary survey work to be done. For example none of the laterals have been surveyed, just the main ditch and proving the feasibility of the scheme. In view of the fact that it will involve such a huge expenditure I thought it was premature to expend money on survey work until there was some likelihood of the scheme being gone on with.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Do I understand the survey work on that project has ceased?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Except to the extent of proving the scheme feasible and its probable cost.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): There is no more surveying going on there then?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): None this year.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): What is the amount that will be spent in the province of Alberta under this item?

[Mr. Jelliff.]

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): It is practically all spent there. I gave the items a moment ago. They will be in Hansard.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: This is almost entirely an Alberta project, in fact it was started, as I recollect, some years ago, I forget the exact year, for the purpose of showing the province, what could be done, where the money could be spent to the best advantage, and how these arid lands could be made fertile? The idea always was that we should be in advance of the work of the province. I wanted to find out from my hon. friend whether we are still properly in advance of the province's work?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes. I do not know of any other project except a small scheme that might be undertaken by private individuals for their own particular benefit as to which we have also been giving advice. In such a case as that it is not a very costly process. One man can take the levels and ascertain whether or not a private individual, or three or four individuals, could have a small scheme of their own. Outside of that the province is well covered.

Item agreed to.

Reclamation of Dominion lands by drainage, (including revote of $36,000), $129,000.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): What is the policy of the department with regard to the reclaiming of these lands? In my own constituency there is quite a number of reclamation projects that have been surveyed. Some have been handed over apparently to private individuals with the understanding that they reclaim the land, while others have simply been surveyed and nothing done. Is it the minister's intention to have these lands reclaimed by the government, for instance the one at Lesser Slave lake, or simply adopt a waiting attitude for the present?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The Slave river project, I think, is what my hon. friend has reference to.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): That is one of them.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The Slave river is navigable and comes under the jurisdiction of the Public Works department. I cannot give my hon. friend information as to what can be done, although I know that application has been made to the department for surveys to determine the probable cost of straightening the river and lowering the level of the lake.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): There is another at High Prairie west of Dewar. Then there is also one south of Entwistle.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): High Prairie? That is off Slave lake.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): Yes.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): There were surveys made by our department there last year.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): What is the intention in regard to those lands? They cannot be homesteaded. Is it intended to reclaim the lands and then sell them?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I might say I have gone over this several times. I do not know what the attitude of the department was in the past with respect to this work but this is our present attitude: We will do the initial survey work and prove the scheme. We are glad to undertake that responsibility and expense just as we do in irrigation work, but when it comes to the actual carrying out of the scheme either the municipality or the province, preferably the province, would have to undertake the supervision of the work because they are close to the scene and will know the value of the work much better than the Dominion government would. There is a good deal to be said about draining areas that are Crown lands prior to settlement. Most of these lands, with the exception of some projects that are under way, such as the Carrot river scheme, are a considerable distance from railway facilities. The sending of people into these new areas where there are no railway facilities does not appear to be good business, when we have such a large amount of land lying within reasonable distance of a railway. If the province cares to undertake projects of that sort we have an arrangement with both Saskatchewan and Alberta to turn the Crown lands that may be involved in any of these schemes over to them, the lands to be sold on a basis similar to the provisions that govern the sale of school lands at a fixed price per acre.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: How much was spent last year?

Mr. MILLAR: I want to say a word in regard to the matter the minister touched on. It seems to me many of our difficulties particularly the railway difficulty have been brought about by spreading our settlement over too large a territory. A group of people have been encouraged to go into a district, perhaps good enough in itself but far removed from railway facilities, and of course, in a short time they are asking for railways. I was glad to hear him say that it did not look like good business to encourage people to settle in districts far removed from railways. I think the department should incline to the policy of consolidating our settlement, rather than spreading it out.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): In answer to the question of the hon. member for West York, the amount spent last year was $170,000. I may say we are cutting down this work and we will not require that much this year.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What did we get for that money last year? Where is the work going on?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): There was work at Waterhen lake in Saskatchewan and in the Carrot river district in Manitoba. Those two projects referred to are still incomplete.

Mr. HUMPHREY: Would the minister say what progress has been made in regard to reclaiming what has been termed the Kootenay flats in the Creston district? It is an international question, I believe. There is an area of 70,000 acres that ought to be reclaimed. What progress has been made in the last year?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): We have not done anything on any of these projects. Would it be the work of the provincial government the hon. member refers to? They have the Sumas lake project, and they have the project at Chilliwack.

Mr. HUMPHREY: This project is located in the eastern part of British Columbia, bordering on the state of Idaho. It is an area of 70,000 acres. Half of it is in British Columbia and half in Idaho. There has been a good deal of correspondence in the last ten years, I think.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): That would be in the territory controlled by British Columbia. All the area we would be operating in would be the block on each side of the railway.

Mr. HUMPHREY: I believe it has developed into an international question, and the negotiations would have to be carried out by the federal government. Certain negotiations have been in progress for years between the Canadian and United States governments, and, if possible, I would like to find out what progress was made along that line last year. Up to a year ago, I had a copy of the return of the progress made in previous years and I believe it was left to the federal government to carry on the negotiation with

the United States government, but, as far as the work that has been done is concerned, it has been between the province of British Columbia and the state of Idaho. I believe they are being held back awaiting certain negotiations to be carried out by the federal government.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): This particular branch of the government's service knows nothing about it. I will get any information we may have with respect to any negotiation between our government and the government of the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY: I realize that this matter probably does not come directly under this vote, but I was at a loss to know under what vote it did come. I do not think it is under Dominion Lands although the Dominion government has certain jurisdiction.

Mr. KELLNER: Are there any reclamation projects where there is a contract with private individuals, or is the department carrying out all these projects in the way the minister suggested a little while ago?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I did not catch the question. Did the hon. member ask if we were making contracts?

Mr. KELLNER: Yes. I asked if there were any contracts?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes, in Saskatchewan.

Mr. KELLNER: None in Alberta?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No.

Item agreed to.

Canadian national parks and historic sites, $1,250,980.

Mr. MARTELL: I would like to have something definite from the minister as to whether the department is prepared to have an independent board of managers control, for public purposes, lands which are not used for historic sites but on which historic sites have been erected. Would the minister consider the use of lands given for historic sites as playgrounds, so long as there was no interference with the particular portion used for the historic site? I want something definite on that, right away, on behalf of my town.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): If the hon. member will get his municipality to make an application we will be very glad to give them for the use free of charge this particular area or any land we are not utilizing for the definite purpose of placing memorials and whatever may be necessary in connection with those memorials.

[Mr. Humphrey.]

Mr. MARTELL: With all due deference, I do not think the municipalities are particularly concerned. We are a public body of citizens making application, the best citizens of the community. Will the minister put these sites in the hands of a committee who will safeguard the matter, under a lease from the minister, on proper terms to be set forth by the minister? In my constituency we have four or five municipalities, East Hants, West Hants, Hantsport and other places seeking incorporation. In cases where there are twenty-eight or twenty-nine acres of land, where an acre or two would embrace all the historic sites, we ask that the public citizens of the town be entitled to have a committee appointed to manage the remaining lands in the interests of children and to provide playgrounds. The site in my town is the best sliding ground for children in the winter time, and in summer it is a fine place for children to play. I do not think any official of the department should have the right to say to the young children who are playing there "Get off the ground" or "Do this" or "Do that", because this is an historic site, and I want to get a direct understanding from the minister that when we make an application to him we will have a right to use the lands that are not absolutely necessary for the historic sites, not leased because we are not prepared to pay anything for them. A poor man like myself could not pay any money for them.

What I want is that the children shall have the right to use this land as a play ground, for a toboggan slide in the winter time, as a place in the summer to put their tents, and in every way for them to be accorded the proper rights for youngsters who want to get out and play. We may all be men, and we are apt, when we ask for things, to stick too much to technical rules. I do not want to recite the old poem of "The Children" and that sort of thing; but on behalf of the citizens of that town, I want to apply to the Minister of the Interior, under whose administration this matter comes, to have the land which is not used specifically for the site allocated under a proper committee for play grounds for the children. I want a definite answer.

Mr. WALLACE: Will the minister inform the committee as to how much of this appropriation is for marking historical sites?

Mr. MARTELL: If my hon. friend will permit me, I should like to have a definite answer from the minister. I do not want to go to the department when parliament has prorogued and to be told that this is the rule,

the law; that the other regulation has to be abided by. We are prepared to accept every reasonable regulation, but what we want is something definite. If my hon. friend thinks he is going to put me aside in that way, he is far astray. I want to see fair play for the children. I have youngsters of my own, and I want to see the children of to-day in my town get what I will demand for my youngsters one or two years hence. I want play grounds for them.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Let me say for the information of my hon. friend, that many of the speeches that have been made in this House this evening have been pointed directly at the preservation of these very grounds, the preservation of the property of the Crown for the purposes of the Crown. I have no particular objection to the hon. gentleman or his friends; I think they would be perfectly reliable and responsible. That is not the suggestion at all. But in the past it has come to my notice that grounds of this character, that ought of necessity to be preserved for the public interest, have been secured by private people who have then proceeded to exploit the public. Therefore, there is only one safe course for the department to pursue, and that is to have the municipality behind any application of this sort. Then one knows that the public interest will be preserved in connection with matters of this kind.

Mr. MARTELL: With all due deference to the opinion of the minister, there may be a divergence of opinion. Sometimes in small towns there are members of council who have no children or whose families are grown up, and who have absolutely no sympathy with children on that account. We find that in connection with school boards. The men on them are mature; their families are grown up, and they have no regard for the fellow with a young family growing up. I do not think the minister should impose any condition as regards municipalities stating what should or should not be done. As long as the minister is satisfied that the proper portion necessary for historical purposes is conserved, where it is shown by responsible citizens that they are prepared to see that the balance is set aside for playgrounds, that should be done. Nobody is going to exploit the public in a small place like mine; but municipal councils move slowly; often they are actuated by politics, and the children suffer. There are twenty-eight or twenty-nine acres on this site in the town of Windsor. I do not want any municipality or anybody else to control it; I want to go to the minister and to be able to say to him: Here is a place, old Fort Edward in Windsor; you can fence up a couple of acres on which the old block house and other places stood; but let the children have the balance for toboggan slides to play in the winter. We do not call them toboggan slides in country places. It is only in Ottawa where the ministers of the Crown reside that they are called toboggan slides. We in the country places call them ordinary slides; that is all. Then, in the summer time let us have some place where the children can put their tents. I will guarantee to the minister that there will be no politics in the matter; that only the children will be provided for. If the minister will ask me to-day, I will give him the names of three people in my town, two of whom are opponents, one an active opponent of mine, and others who will manage this place because they have children the same as I have. Men with families which are grown up have no right to deny to a man who has youngsters, or who expects one day to enjoy looking at his youngsters around him, the right of having a playground for his children, nor to tie up the matter with a great deal of red tape. If there is anything of that sort, I am going to oppose this item. No municipal control for me.

Mr. WALLACE: I should like to know how much of this appropriation is for the marking of historic sites, and what historic sites the government propose to mark this year.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Twenty-five thousand dollars.

Mr. MARTELL: Before I conclude, I want an answer. If the children are not entitled to be represented here, I am their representative.

Mr. WALLACE: Can the minister inform the committee as to how far advanced the work is on the cairn which is being erected at Port Dover to mark the wintering site of Fathers Dollier and Galinee?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The contract for the cairn is let at Port Dover at a cost of $600, including a wharf, I believe.

Mr. MARTELL: May I ask the minister what I am to expect? I want for Fort Edward, in the town of Windsor, apart from the site which is absolutely necessary for public purposes, a park to be placed under the direction of a proper committee for the use of the children. I am not going to waive that issue, and I want a direct answer. I am not asking that the whole thing be set aside for a few people to get together, say in the city of Hali-

fax or any other place, to recite fancy papers about what Sir John So-and-So said years and years ago. That is all very fine. If they will see what has been done in the town of Windsor at Fort Edward by allowing physical training in the good free air of Nova Scotia, they will realize that that is a great deal better than having Colonel Edwards or some of the historic commiteee come from Ottawa and do a lot of fancy work. I am going to oppose this appropriation unless I get a definite answer.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I am sure that I would almost take the word of the hon. gentleman for the preservation of child life in Windsor. All the hon. gentleman need do is for him and his friends to go to the municipality, and surely the municipal authorities will be public-spirited enough to back up a project of this kind. He is not asking for any money from them; he is not asking for any assistance in a financial way. Surely they will be quite willing to join him in the matter. That is all I ask. We ask for no money; we will give them all the ground except the small quantity required for the purposes of the site, to utilize as they see fit, to make toboggan slides or skating rinks, or ski-ing places, or any mortal thing they wish. But as I pointed out to him before, not that I have any objection to him or his associates, I must be definite that we must have the municipality behind all projects of this kind. Let me give the committee an instance in Saskatchewan. After I came into office in this government, I found, with the best intentions in the world, three gentlemen had got possession of the shore line in a certain locality. The municipality had a portion of it. When the municipality wished to extend, they found that these three gentlemen held privileges there, and we had a great deal of difficulty in getting them to surrender to the municipality. It is only because I am more insistent than the hon. gentleman that child life and the playgrounds be protected, that I am asking that the municipality be behind the project.

Mr. MARTELL: With all due deference to the minister, I beg to say that applications were made in the past, and through too much red tape in his department, for which I do not blame him, because it was prior to his administration, the people could not get their request granted. It seems that a few people in Ottawa, who happen to have some high-falutin ideas of what is right and wrong, are going to be allowed to rule the whole country. Now, what is good in Saskatchewan is not necessarily good in Nova Scotia; for example, my hon. friend would not have many supporters in the latter province. Applications have been made time and again from the province of Nova Scotia to have Fort Edward in the town of Windsor converted into a public playground, and we are told to-day that we must go to the municipality. The minister does not know our conditions. We have several municipalities in my county; at least, there are two municipalities, East Hants and West Hants, together with the corporation of the town of Windsor and the corporation of Hantsport. The minister does not know how we run things there, nor have his officials any idea of our conditions. I say this with all respect to the minister. But we do not wish to have a few people in Ottawa think that they can drive things down our throat. Whether the minister gives it or not, I say that there are twenty-eight or twenty-nine acres in the heart of the town of Windsor that can be converted to the purpose proposed; a fence can be placed around the old block house of the fort so that the children might have a playground. I can name persons in the town who are in favour of this scheme. Mr. H. W. Sangster, an opponent of mine who ran in the election, and my hon. friend Dr. Baxter, from St. John, are interested in it. The latter gentleman has been very much interested in the matter, because he has children, as I have also. His children, however, are grown-up while mine are not; and speaking in behalf of those similarly circumstanced, I say that we should not be held down by rigid rules and regulations, drawn up by people sitting in offices in Ottawa, which shall deprive us of this right to which we are entitled. I do not want to see any vote passed to-night that will provide for the appointment of certain officials in Ottawa who do not know anything about our local conditions, to prevent us from having a proper request granted.

Mr. MILLAR: Will the minister explain the very large increase in this item?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The increase of $284,480 is made up of a variety of items. On August 1, 1923, the Bankhead Mines plant which has supplied electric current for Banff will close down and the department has to install an electric plant. There is an item of $150,000 for this purpose. All these expenditures, I might explain, are charged, rightly or wrongly, to revenue account. There is no capitalized expenditure; the system is "pay as you go." Sanitary conditions at Canmore, a town in the Banff park, are bad on account of polluted wells. It is proposed to expend $17,000 there to meet the situation. The Canadian National Railway is carrying on an extensive campaign to attract tourist business

to Jasper Park and the department is co-operating by proceeding with development work which will make Jasper's attractions accessible. The new road programme provides for an increase of $45,750. There is also an item of $5,000 to build a golf course at Jasper. The commercial value of a tourist naturally is increased by lengthening his stay, and experience has shown that a golf course is very effective in this connection. It is expected that 1,000 buffalo will be slaughtered at Buffalo park next winter. An appropriation of $13,000 is being made to provide suitable buildings for the slaughtering operations and the care of the meat. The range at Buffalo park is now not equal to the demand on it in consequence of the increase in the buffalo. It is proposed to expend $6,000 fencing in additional lands now belonging to the park.

The range at Elk Island has also become too limited for the buffalo, elk and moose herds there. An extension of the park into the Cooking Lake Forest Reserve has been arranged for. This will require 22 miles of fencing and, with fireguards, and so forth, will cost about $40,000.

Waterton Lakes park is visited by very large numbers of campers, chiefly Canadians from Alberta. It is proposed to spend $11,500 on a water supply for the townsite and campsites and to improve conditions at the campsites. There are now so many visitors there that it is feared the water in the lake may at any time become contaminated and unfit for drinking.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: At Banff the Canadian Pacific Railway has a most profitable tourist traffic, largely because of its hotel. The fact has sometimes struck me, when I have visited the place, that the park is maintained in no small degree for the benefit of the company, who have been able to erect this large hotel on the line of the railway. What tax is the Canadian Pacific Railway paying for this great privilege?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The administration of a municipality such as Banff is rather difficult, and we have to co-operate largely with the provincial authoritites. So far there has been no power of taxation; we apply the licensing system to the lots which are practically all on the same basis. We have no power to tax but we charge water rates, light rates and so forth. That is a matter in regard to which we shall endeavour to come to an arrangement with the provincial government.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I suggest that since the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) is exploring new fields of taxation there is one that lies close at hand there. I do not know what the profits are from that great hotel, but I do know that there is a very heavy tourist traffic there, and an immense amount of advertising of the place is carried on throughout the whole world. We have spent an enormous sum on the park, which is maintained largely for the benefit of that hotel. There are similar hotels in the vicinity and a certain number of people travel by motor car to the park. But on the whole this large corporation is the chief beneficiary, and it seems to me we have a perfect right to see that a certain part of the revenue comes back to the state.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): We have the Banff park in fairly good condition, and I think that in order to direct traffic along the Canadian National line we should begin to make expenditures in the parks through which our own railways run. I do not know that the rates the hotel charges are unreasonable, but even the rates they charge tourists will pay them very handsome profits on the hotel investment. Of course the park is a great attraction for tourists and brings business to the railway.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: If they do not get it directly out of the hotel they get it indirectly out of the railway.

Mr. GARDINER: It was stated that the item included a sum for providing an electric light plant at Banff. Was that work let by tender?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The excavation and the general labouring work has been carried on by day labour under the supervision of our own engineers at the park, but all the plant has been purchased by tender.

Mr. MARTELL: Will the minister kindly answer my question as to whether or not if the people desire to have a park for the children at Fort Edward, that they shall have authority to enclose the ground, apart from the historic portion, on making proper representations to the minister without reference to the officials in his department?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I promise my hon. friend that if he will have the mayor of Windsor come to me as the official representative of the town the whole matter will be settled in five minutes.

Mr. MARTELL: You will grant us that right?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Mr. MacLEAN (Prince, P.E.I.): The estimates we are passing to-night are largely for the western provinces. Sometimes we in the East wonder a little at the large expenditures on this account, but we understand that the natural resources of the three prairie provinces have not yet been handed over to the provincial authorities, and therefore the Dominion government is under obligation to take care of certain works. However, I hope when the time comes for these natural resources to be turned over to the prairie provinces the eastern provinces will receive something in return, if not by way of compensation for our equity in those natural resources, at least something in lieu of the expenditures made by the federal government from time to time.

We have a lot of pretty little sites in the Maritime provinces where public parks could be laid out to which a large tourist traffic might be attracted, thus benefiting both the province itself and the Canadian National Railway. A large number of people of this beautiful city come down in the summer time to our seaside resorts, and I believe that a little government assistance towards the laying out and beautifying of parks, such as has been done in other places, would greatly increase our tourist traffic. I hope the minister in looking over the different provinces will not pass by the "little island province" down by the sea.

Mr. SHAW: I am rather amazed at the suggestion made by the last speaker. If he will examine the Estimates I think he will find that the West has considerable ground for grievance in so far as expenditures in western Canada are concerned as compared with those in eastern Canada. The expenditure in this particular case of $150,000 on an electric lighting plant for the town of Banff is an absolute necessity.

Mr. MARTELL: Why do they not go to the local government?

Mr. SHAW: The minister has already indicated that by reason of the failure of the government to give the people there municipal powers, they cannot themselves function as a municipality at all; they have not the necessary legislative jurisdiction.

Mr. MARTELL: Why do they not go to the local government?

Mr. SHAW: It is not a question of going to the local government. These lands are reserved by the Dominion government as a national park, and the local government have no jurisdiction. But that is not what I want to speak about for the moment. An electric lighting plant is an absolute necessity owing to the fact that the old plant has been closed down. You cannot leave the people in darkness. According to the last census Banff has a population of something over two thousand, and during the tourist season I am sure it must be increased by several thousands more. An adequate lighting plant must be maintained for the convenience of these people. I regret the minister did not see fit to have the work done by tender. I think it would have been desirable to call for tenders, with the stipulation that the all-the-year-round inhabitants of the town of Banff and the neighbourhood should be given an opportunity to do whatever work they could handle. I think that would have been desirable because in the winter time the people are to a large extent isolated from other sections of the country.

The minister has suggested a very interesting problem—the municipal government of these small towns within the park area. As I said before, this land was reserved some thirty or forty years ago for a national park. The communities within the park area have no authority to organize themselves in the regular way. I think the late administration formulated a policy by which a considerable measure of local government was granted to these people, which is desirable, and the policy has been continued by this government. I think the power of the local authorities should be enlarged to the fullest possible extent. I do not know any method of governing people satisfactorily other than by letting them govern themselves. Certainly they should not be governed from Ottawa in connection wtih their local affairs. It is true that under some arrangement—I do not know how it is worked—these people have a right to tax themselves for school purposes. However, I think that in regard to municipal government they should be given the widest possible latitude in order that they may attend effectively to their own local affairs.

There is one other suggestion I want to make. I agree with the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Martell) that we have altogether too much government from Ottawa. Undoubtedly the tendency during the next few years is going to be towards decentralization in government.

Mr. MARTELL: Hear, hear.

Mr. SHAW: I think the Parks Commissioner should be located out in western Canada where the main area of the national parks is situated. Hon. members may be

surprised to know that of the national parks and historic sites in Canada, comprising altogether approximately eight thousand square miles, only one hundred and sixty acres are located in eastern Canada, these being composed largely of historic sites such as that indicated by the hon. member for Hants. In the provinces of Alberta and British Columbia considerably over seven thousand nine hundred square miles of our national parks are situated. I see no reason why the Parks Commissioner whose duty it is to superintend these parks should not be located at a convenient spot—probably the town of Banff—where he can admininster these vast areas with the least possible difficulty, instead of being detained down in the city of Ottawa far from his work and unable to keep in immediate touch with it. For that reason it is desirable that the Parks Commissioner should be located there. With regard to the historic sites, I think there is much in what the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Martell) says. Perhaps the Quebec Battlefields Commission could take them over, or some special commission might be created in eastern Canada to look after these matters which, though very important, are of comparatively minor importance from the point of view of administration. I therefore suggest to the minister, as I have previously suggested in the House, that the Commisisoner of Parks—and I say now, even in his presence, that he is a very competent official, one who is extremely anxious to work out this park situation to the greatest possible advantage to the people of Canada—should be located in a spot which is central and which is close to his work. There is one other matter that I want to draw to the attention of the committee at this time, namely, the completion this year of what is known as the Banff-Windermere highway. This is an event not only of national but of international importance. The completion of this highway, the construction of which was commenced under the late government through an agreement with the province of British Columbia, completes what is known as the circle tour. One may start by motor, on foot, or by carriage if he likes, from the city of Calgary and go to Banff; proceeding thence through the Rocky mountains by way of Vermilion pass, and down to Windermere, thence south almost to the boundary, returning by way of Crowsnest pass, if he so desires, in the southern part of the province, to Macleod, and then north again to Calgary, a distance, I think, of some 567 miles. That route is not only of interest to the people of Alberta and British Columbia; it gives many people an opportunity to traverse this country and get in touch with the great highways of the United States. One can commence, we will say, at the town of Banff, can proceed practically to the Mexican boundary, over the very best of highways, and can then return by an altogether different course through Colorado canyon and the American parks in the northwestern United States, returning thence to the point of commencement.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Will he ever come back?

Mr. SHAW: I am sure many will. But it is not only that it gives an opportunity for Canadians to travel over this vast area of Canada and the United States, but, what is of infinitely greater importance, it gives a large number of American tourists an opportunity to traverse the Canadian Rockies by way of the circle tour. There have been numerous inquiries—I have no doubt that the Parks branch have also received them without number—as to the time of the completion of that highway.

Mr. MARTELL: How much will that highway cost and in whose constituency is it situated?

Mr. SHAW: My hon. friend will be glad to know that a considerable part of it runs through the constituency of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. King); part of it runs through the constituency of the hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Coote), and a comparatively small portion of it runs through the constituency of West Calgary. But I may tell my hon. friend for his information that perhaps before he was born I was familiar with the situation at Banff. I have watched the development of the national park for over thirty years, and I am tremendously interested in the completion of this project. It is a great work; it has been splendidly carried out, and it is going to attract tourists not by hundreds, not by thousands, but by tens of thousands to the great national recreation ground of Canada. I am sure that the result will not only be beneficial to the Canadian people but it will create in the United States a tremendous interest in Canada which will be followed, I hope, by a very large immigration into various parts at least, of our western country. Our national parks—and I include in that not only the Banff National Park but also Jasper Park and others—constitute one of the greatest heritages of Canadians to-day. Some who are familiar with the facts have pointed out that the Rocky

10 p.m.

mountain districts constitute ten Switzerlands rolled into one. There is not a member of this House who can visualize the possibilities of these parks within, say, the next fifty years; one hesitates even to suggest those possibilities. There is one thing about a park; man may harness and destroy waterfalls and natural attractions of every character, but when parks are preserved the people have the privilege of enjoying them, and they are not destroyed; they remain there. So I say that the opening of the Banff-Windermere highway on the twentieth, I believe, of this month, is a matter of very great national importance. I regret that the House will be sitting at that time; for there are many who urge that one of the first duties of members of parliament should be to travel from one end of this country to the other. I think it should be done; it is in the national interest that it should be done. It would result in the elimination of much of the sectionalism and provincialism with which members are sometimes charged, and I could not possibly think of a better occasion for hon. members to visit western Canada than at this particular time, when they may traverse at least the small circle tour within the confines of Canada. I simply want to say this, Mr. Chairman, because I think hon. members should get some idea of what has been done, of what these parks are, and of what are their possibilities, not only for the present but, I trust, in the not too far distant future.

Mr. JELLIFF : Is anything provided for the improvement of this route by its being connected up through the Waterton park region?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I know the ground so well that I appreciate what my hon. friend is interested in. It is a matter primarily for the province, and Mr. Greenfield has given his promise that it will be attended to this year.

Mr. JELLIFF: I want to call the attention of the committee to that portion of this tourist route, because it is one of very great interest to my constituency and will in time, I believe, become of very great interest to the people of Canada generally. A great many tourists go through our part of the country every year, especially from the western states of the union. We have a great many things there that might well claim the tourist's attention. We have Waterton Lakes and its park, in the first place, which is as beautiful a bit of scenery, I think, as can be found anywhere in Canada. Then we have other things which lend peculiar interest to that part of the country. One of the things which attracts tourists to that district is the great Mormon temple that has been built during the last few years at Cardston, near the place where I live. That magnificent building probably attracts more of the attention of tourists than any other building in the West; they flock there by the thousands. At the present time the park—the little park surrounding that building—is being beautified by the planting of trees and shrubs and is becoming, I think, one of the nicest spots in the entire West. Besides that we have to show to the people journeying through that part of the country the results of the irrigation projects which are going on there and to which I referred a little while ago. We want people to go through that district and see what can be done by artificial methods of providing water. We want them to see our splendid fields of alfalfa, of timothy, and of forage of all kinds, our well equipped creameries and fine herds of cattle. We have all these things to interest tourists, and to bring money,—ready money—into the western part of Canada. I hope that the minister in providing for these highways—tourist highways especially,—will see that that south-western corner of Alberta is not neglected, for I feel that it has not been sufficiently advertised in Canada, and that it is a part of the Dominion to which the eastern residents of this country might well direct their attention.

The member for Calgary West (Mr. Shaw) has called attention to something which particularly interests me, and that is the necessity of the East and the West coming together more frequently, thereby causing the various sections of this country to understand one another's problems. Since I came down here last year I have been taken on three trips in eastern Canada through the generosity of different organizations, boards of trade, harbour commissioners, and other bodies of that kind, and it has opened my eyes to many things of importance which the farmer, especially the western farmer is wont to overlook. Now, in turn we want you people of the East, who are interested in your manufacturing enterprises, interested in a different class of enterprises to what we are in the West to return those visits, to come to the West and glean a thorough understanding of our problems. I believe that by such an interchange of visits we shall gradually knit this country more and more into a complete whole and that as a result we shall work together in greater harmony and with a better understanding

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The minister tells us that he proposes to slaughter a thousand buffalo and that he is going to put up a plant for the purpose. What is going to be done with the carcases?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Many of the animals that are being slaughtered are animals that were purchased when the herd was first started at Wainwright and consequently are of mature age. We intend to make most of the meat into pemmican. But my hon. friend will readily understand there is only a limited demand for the sale of that product. It can be sold in the northern country, and we have some thought of trying to introduce it into the navy where meats have to be stored—in other words it may, perhaps, take the place of corned beef on shipboard.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That is a land force now.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Not immediately.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend cannot have reference to the Canadian navy because that is always ashore.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I have reference to the British navy. As we get to the period when we will slaughter the younger animals the meat will undoubtedly sell very rapidly. The animals are increasing in that park reserve now at the rate of approximately 2,000 a year so that it is beginning to be a serious problem to provide pasturage for feeding. They are also increasing in the Lamont park, where the first buffalo were placed, and in the north. Although we have not accurate figures we think there are in the neighbourhood of 2,000 head at least in the Hay river district on the Mackenzie. We have set aside a park area there, appointed rangers, and propose to take care of these buffalo because they may prove a very important factor in the future in feeding the Indians if that becomes necessary. They are doing very well. They are much larger than when they are kept in a confined area, and seem to be very healthy. Since the Eskimo has been armed he is beginning to shoot the caribou which are so numerous in the north country. Not only that but he is beginning to shoot the seal which heretofore he has always captured. Indeed, I think it was a mistake to arm him because his food supply may become a problem in the very near future. The Indian in the Northwest Territories is not a very energetic individual, in fact he is a very poor hunter, and we must provide for the possibility of having to take care of the Indian, perhaps even in the near future—that is to conserve a food supply for him. We hope this herd of buffalo will increase very rapidly in that country if given reasonable protection. That we propose to do by having herders riding in the area in which those animals are ranging. I may say that we have met one rather serious difficulty that has induced us, perhaps, to slaughter a little more rapidly than we first intended. In the animals we slaughtered this year we found traces of tuberculosis, some of it not serious, some rather serious, some of it in the tongue. My hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture could explain the operations of this disease very much better than I can but, as hon. gentlemen know sometimes after its inception it heals over. That is the case in connection with the buffalo. We cannot catch them and inoculate them, we cannot treat them the same as we do cattle, and that is rather a serious feature of the situation. We are hoping, however, that it will not be as serious a proposition as it appeared to be after the slaughtering of 160 or 180 head this year.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Do you blame the cattalo for the introduction of tuberculosis?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Possibly it developed by reason of what I have told my hon. friend. There were animals in which it appeared that were thought to have been cured. The disease developed at the root of the tongue. I cannot describe the origin and progress of this disease in technical terms, I can only speak of it as a layman. These animals must have been infected several years ago. The experiment carried on with the cattalo cannot be blamed for the infection of the herd. The veterinary seems to think that the herd is getting entirely too numerous.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: As the minister needs funds very badly he will be very glad to know that buffalo heads are worth quite a sum of money. I understood there had been a sale at auction some time ago, and that prices as high as $500 had been paid for good buffalo heads. Is that correct?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): As much as $1,025.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Instead of putting through any vote this year, the minister should have a balance to hand over to the Finance Minister. Here the minister has 1,000 buffalo to slaughter, and he has sold the heads as high as $1,025.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Only three sold.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I suppose the hides and pelts are worth something.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The hides are worth something.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is proposed to be done with them?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): We propose to offer them for sale. We propose to advertise very extensively in Great Britain. It was proposed that we should have an exhibit at the carnival in Montreal this winter, but we did not carry it out. The intention is to advertise extensively in the United States, both the hides and robes, in order to secure buyers for them. If the herd continues to increase, and we are slaughtering 2,000 a year, the number will remain about normal. If we had 5,000 head in the Buffalo park, I think it would be all we are entitled to have in that enclosure, to keep them healthy. We would need to sell between 1,500 and 2,000 a year, and possibly the price of robes and heads would go down very rapidly, if those large numbers were put on the market, but they have been very valuable.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What has become of the electric plant at Calgary, now going out of existence? Why can the government not operate that? They could easily obtain it. It cannot be worth anything to the owners.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The plant was a steam plant, and rather an expensive operation.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The department is putting in an hydraulic plant?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Mr. TOLMIE: What percentage of beef do those animals dress at? What percentage of beef is there in the carcase?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I am informed they averaged 700 pounds.

Mr. TOLMIE: Would this include bulls and cows?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): All bulls.

Mr. TOLMIE: Are they troubled with actinomycosis, or lumpy jaw?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No, no lumpy jaw.

Mr. TOLMIE: Do you follow the ordinary plan in feeding range cattle, of putting the hay on the ground?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

[Mr. C. A. Stewart.]

Mr. TOLMIE: Unless the ground is frequently changed, that is one of the causes of range cattle becoming infected with tuberculosis. A high piece of ground is selected on account of its dryness, and they continue to feed hay on the same ground. The ground becoming foul, when there is a thaw the hay gets infected from the moist ground, and the animals become infected through the intestinal tract, and that is one reason why these animals living in the open air are affected to a considerable extent with tuberculosis. What results have been derived from the treatment of infected animals?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I could not give the hon. member that information. The Department of Agriculture is in charge of that.

Mr. PUTNAM: The discussion on the national parks has taken a somewhat wide range, and possibly I may be permitted to detain the House a moment to state that in Truro, my own town,—and if this is out of order I may say I am not asking for anything—

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: You are rather out of order, if you do not want anything.

Mr. PUTNAM: The irregularity may last a moment. We have a small park there, and it is the most beautiful inland park east of Stanley park in British Columbia. It is in a wooded ravine and gorge in which there are a never-failing brook and falls of dignified proportion and rare beauty called the Joe Howe Falls, after our great orator of earlier days. He had visited those falls frequently and he had committed to print some of his beautifully descriptive language concerning those falls. This park is almost immediately adjoining the depot of the Canadian National Railway, and if any of my hon. friends happen to be down that way, I would bespeak that they try to devote an hour or two, to meandering through the bewitching walks of that park, and when I meet them again I shall not be afraid to repeat my protestation that this is the most beautiful natural park east of Stanley park in British Columbia. It is maintained under a local board of trustees in conjunction with the local municipal authority. In happier financial years a request was unsuccessfully made to the federal government for some grant for the further support and care of this park. During the present need of national economy I am not meantime repeating the request. But I hope that all who may henceforth see Truro will treat themselves to a stroll in this park: and they will agree that I have not told half the truth.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I can remember very well, when we had the park estimates, meeting some pretty vigorous objections to their size and to their character, and the criticism made that every principle of economy was being sacrificed, the depleted treasury being bled and the country's money being wasted. I am going to ask my hon. friend for a little serious consideration of this vote to-night. I want to point out to him that for the year 1921-22, when accusations of this character were made against us, the vote for these parks amounted to $800,000, while the vote for the parks to-day amounts to $1,250,980; that in a short period those expenses which at one time were described as being so high and extravagant, have been increased under this administration over 50 per cent. I am going to ask the minister to let us have the full details of this vote, showing us where this money is going. The parks are not running away. I do not know that in any year any finance minister of Canada had more reason for concern in connection with extravagant expenditure than my hon. friend the Minister of Finance has this year, when he is budgeting for a direct deficit. Can my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior not have a little consideration for the Finance Minister, who, after all, I suppose, is more deeply interested in this question than any of us. We have only one thing given us to-day in connection with the so-called emergency expense payments that have to be made, and that is that plant which has been referred to. That is the only matter of emergency that I have heard of so far, and that one little matter of emergency amounts to $162,000, if I heard my hon. friend correctly. Now what else is there? What else is there to-day of immediate necessity that was not present in the year 1921-22, when we got along with $800,000? There were reasons why money was spent then that do not obtain to-day. The departmental officers will recollect very well that work was entered upon the year after the war for the express purpose of giving employment when employment was so badly needed—I am not sure it was 1920-21 or 1921-22, I think it was the former year—when Governor General's warrants were issued just for the purpose of doing work which, although it was proper work, could have been postponed, were it not for the question of unemployment. Some of the roads were gone on with at that time, having regard to that issue, and bridges were undertaken. None of those matters is pressing my hon. friend to-day. We hear protestations of economy. I would like the minister to show us exactly how those protestations work out, with an increase of over fifty per cent in a two-year period.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): In the year the hon. member mentions, the total expenditure was $966,328, instead of the $800,000 mentioned by him.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I have the appropriation under my hand.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I am giving my hon. friend the expenditure.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I have the appropriation under my hand, and for the year 1921-1922 it was $800,000. As I said, in addition to that appropriation orders in council were passed for the express purpose of meeting the unemployment situation. That is the only reason why the appropriation was increased, and my hon. friend will find, I think, that my statement is correct—

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I am not disputing it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: —that the extra amount over the $800,000 represented commitments which were taken up for the purpose of relieving a very pressing need, having regard to the unemployment situation. Apart from that there is the $800,000 appropriation.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Do I understand my hon. friend to ask for the whole of the items?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Yes. Perhaps it would save time if we were to let the item stand and go on with the other items.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I would rather give my hon. friend the items and be done with it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I would suggest to my hon. friend that the quickest thing to do would be to let us have a little memorandum on that without wasting the time of the committee now. The minister has several other items to go through.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I have the memorandum here. I will give my hon. friend the total amount spent.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am not dealing with the total appropriation. What I want to do is to analyze these payments. I want to see why it is that in a two-year period—that is the thing that I am finding hard to believe —in connection with this work which is a very nice thing to have, although many other things are more essential in the country's

business, it is necessary to have an increase of over fifty per cent. I cannot do that without an analysis.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I do not know just what my hon. friend wants. Does he want me to give him the expenditures in detail for the two years or for the one year?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: For the three years under consideration. Perhaps we would make better headway in this manner. This matter was drawn to my attention by my leader who knows much more about it than I do, and I know he wants to speak on it anyway. Perhaps time will be saved if this item is allowed to stand.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I would be glad, if there is any information I can get, if the hon. member would give me a statement

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I will see the officials afterwards and give them a statement so that there need be no delay.

Mr. COOTE: What is the policy of the government regarding the granting of leases of water-powers in national parks?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): There has been only one lease granted, that is the grant to the Calgary Power Company. They are making application for increased power, and I announced before six o'clock that the matter had not been settled. The application has been before us for some considerable time. They asked for increased power in lake Minnewanka, and we have definitely refused that. They subsequently asked for power on the Spray lakes; the matter has been given consideration, and it will be given further consideration on Tuesday evening when officials of the department and one or two of the ministers are to hear representations from the power company in connection with the matter.

Mr. EVANS: Is this the company that has made application for permission to construct a dam somewhere near Banff in the national park?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Mr. COOTE: I understand there is no settled policy yet by the government regarding the general matter of granting water-power leases in national parks. I know many people are very much interested in this question, and I think most of them take the view that water-powers in these parks should not be leased to any parties, although one was granted near Banff some years ago. I was just trying to find out, if possible, what the policy of the government was. I sincerely hope, if the government have no settled policy, they will decide that the water-powers in these parks should not be leased. It seems to me that, in the national parks at any rate, these water-powers should be kept for the people. In fact, I hope in most cases, for a good many years to come, it will not be necessary to interfere with the natural beauty. If these water-powers at least in the national parks, are ever to be harnessed, that certainly should be done under the control of the people. I would like to impress upon the committee that I think the people of the country generally are very strongly in support of such a policy.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): In the province of Alberta particularly, most of the heads of streams will be in park property or properties of the Crown, and to say definitely that at no time under no consideration will you grant leases for power purposes, will be, perhaps, going a long distance. I agree thoroughly with my hon. friend that the scenic beauty, particularly within the area of national parks used by tourists and others, should be preserved. I may say to my hon. friend who has just spoken in such high terms of the country from which he comes, the Waterton lake area which is a park area, that the people there are very anxious to utilize that for irrigation purposes, and this will be exactly on a par with the application of the power company. There are many aspects to this question. The United States government, however, who have given this matter very considerable attention, have adopted the principle as far as possible to conserve the natural beauty and to refuse applicants for power sites within the boundaries of their parks.

Mr. COOTE: I was hoping the minister would give us the opinion that the policy of the government in that particular case would follow the policy of the United States government. As regards the case he mentions of the Waterton lakes, I think just as many people are opposed to the using of Waterton lakes as an irrigation reservoir as there are who are in favour of that proposition. I do not want to go into that at all. I hope the minister will see that the water-powers in our parks are preserved.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Marcil): I understand that this item stands.

Mr. McBRIDE: Why does it have to stand?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) is not here

and he desires to say something in reference to the item.

Mr. McBRIDE: Is there any reason why he should not be here to say it now?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I think he has a very valid reason. He had to take the train to-night to attend the funeral of a friend in the East.

Item stands.

Administration of the Migratory Birds Convention Act, $55,000.

Mr. MARTELL: Who are the officers that administer this act, and what salaries do they receive?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): They are: Chief Game Officer for the Maritime provinces, R. W. Tufts; Chief Officer, Ontario and Quebec, H. F. Lewis; Chief Officer, western provinces, J. A. Munro.

Mr. TOLMIE: Can the minister give us a brief outline of the work?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): All the provinces, except the Maritime provinces, have amended their laws with respect to migratory birds to conform to the federal law, and the provincial officers are assisting to carry out the act. In the Maritime provinces the work is being done by federal officers, apparently for the reason that the provincial laws in that part of the Dominion do not conform to the Dominion regulations. The game guardians in the other provinces are assisting as preventive officers.

Mr. TOLMIE: Is there an international arrangement with the United States?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Mr. TOLMIE: Are the results satisfactory?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I am informed that they are very satisfactory.

Mr. MARTELL: The minister has not supplied all the information I asked for. I requested a list of the migratory birds officers and their salaries. Perhaps the minister has not the information now; he may be able to get it later.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The following are the officers together with their salaries:

Hoyes Lloyd	$3,000
Technical Assistant, new position	1,900
Chief Game Officer, Maritime Provinces, R. W. Tufts	1,680
Chief Game Officer, Ontario and Quebec, H. F. Lewis	1,635
Chief Game Officer, western provinces, J. A. Munro	1,635
5 Game Officers, Maritime provinces, J. L. DeVany, P. G. Rowe, H. A. P. Smith, R. T. Christie, C. B. Day	6,290
Part-time Game Officers	500
Special Guardians, bird sanctuaries	300
Jack Miner	300
Total	$17,240

Mr. MARTELL: Do they get a bonus in addition?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I do not know.

Item agreed to.

Engraving, lithographing, printing, and preparation of maps, plans reports and kindred publications of the Dominion, including salaries and necessary materials for same, etc., $120,700.

Mr. COOTE: What is the reason for this increase of $15,000?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): We have not had a sufficient amount to meet the demand for the maps which are now very widely used. We do not send these maps out indiscriminately; we simply supply them on demand; but they are used very largely throughout Canada, the United States and elsewhere and are of immense advantage in advertising our national resources. I believe that they also play an important part in inducing capital to come to Canada. That is why I am asking for the increase.

Mr. COOTE: Does the grant cover all maps issued by the government, or are there some maps issued by other departments.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): It does not include the maps of all the departments, but I think I am safe in saying that 95 per cent of the maps that go out from the government service come from the Interior department.

Mr. COOTE: Are these maps furnished free on application to anyone in Canada?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Item agreed to.

Ordnance lands—salaries and expenses, $14,505.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: There is a considerable increase here.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): All the ordnance lands in the Dominion are being turned over to the Interior department for the purpose of listing and ascertaining their values and getting them into shape, if need be, for sale or lease, or for any other similar purpose. Formerly, the lands were scattered around under half a dozen different departments, but now they will be all under the control of this one department, and naturally there must be a larger appropriation for administrative purposes.

Mr. BAXTER: In my own constituency we have some ordnance lands in connection with the Martello tower on the west side of St. John. Have they been taken in?

Mr. STEWART(Argenteuil): Yes; all government lands are being taken over.

Mr. BAXTER: Is there any caretaker there at the present time?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I do not know.

Mr. BAXTER: I should like to know, but I will not press the question to-night.

Mr. STEVENS: Are the salaries of the clerks in other departments who are looking after the lands that should come under this department being transferred to the Department of Interior?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): As nearly as I can gather, very little attention has heretofore been paid to these lands, and even in Ottawa I doubt very much whether any department knew what lands came under it. We have discovered that all over the country. I do not think that there has been any clerical staff of any importance maintained in any of the departments looking after this particular work.

Item agreed to.

To satisfy the claims of the half-breeds of the Mackenzie River District, N.W.T., $42,240.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: This is a new item.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): I think the committee would like to have an explanation of this item.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): These claims arise out of the treaty settlement with the Indians of the north. On former occasions hon. members will recall that half-breeds who happened to be on the reserve were given scrip, not being entitled to treaty money. Under the arrangement the late Mr. Conroy made when in the north country he proposed to settle one hundred and fifty half-breed claims by giving them $240 apiece. I am inclined to think that is a good arrangement, for we have always had complaints regarding the transfer of half-breed scrip. I believe my hon. friend from West Edmonton (Mr. Kennedy) is still anxious to probe claims arising out of such transfers. On this occasion Mr. Conroy recommended a settlement in cash.

Mr. KENNEDY (West Edmonton): Just a straight cash grant?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes, of $240 per head. Thirty-six claims have been submitted for further investigation to ascertain whether they are entitled to consideration. One hundred and forty claims have been settled, representing a cash payment of $33,600, and thirty-six claims outstanding will require another $8,640, making a total of $42,240.

Mr. KENNEDY (West Edmonton): How is it that parties entitled to payment were not settled with in 1900?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I cannot tell my hon. friend, but these matters always entail some considerable time to make sure the men are entitled to consideration.

Item agreed to.

Seed Grain Advances—amount required to meet uncollected portions of advances of seed grain made in the western provinces by the chartered banks to holders of unpatented Dominion Lands under the guarantee of the Dominion government, also including commission payable to banks for collections, fees to secretary treasurers of municipalities and officers of the provincial Departments of Agriculture, clerical assistance, travelling expenses, etc., $160,000.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: How much is outstanding in the three prairie provinces in reference to this item?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): My record goes back to the inception of the relief in 1876. In that time there has been advanced by the federal government $15,685,325.55, there has been collected $11,483,572.34, and there is outstanding $4,201,753.21. Some $300,000 or $400,000 has been collected since these figures were computed.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Do settlers who break up school lands make application to the minister's department for seed grain advances?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): That has been rather a vexed question, and I had to deal with it in the province of Alberta. The provincial authorities found, as far as I know, that they could not advance seed grain in such cases; the federal authorities did not think they were entitled to do so either. There is not very much security on school lands for the advance of seed grain. I am now informed that the federal government never makes these advances to purchasers of school lands.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: I have a letter under my hand from the reeve of a municipality in my district in regard to school lands that are sold and brought under cultivation by the purchaser and then allowed to revert to the Crown. Possibly a short extract will explain the point I wish to direct attention to. In this letter dated March 27th last the writer says, in part:

> Quite recently a purchaser of school lands in our municipality has turned these lands back to the Crown and received his clearance papers. He owes the municipality in taxes about $400. He had at least two thousand bushels of wheat on these lands this year, and had the council been notified that the lands were reverting back to the Crown we could have collected by distraint. As well as losing the taxes, we are now confronted with the expense of destroying noxious weeds on these lands without any hope of recovery.

The point this gentleman wishes brought to the attention of the department is that the municipality should be notified when school lands revert to the Crown. Would it not be possible for the Department of the Interior to adopt a certain fixed policy so that when any school lands are about to revert to the Crown they would notify the rural municipality? Then in such a case as this letter refers to the municipality might take action in time to recover the taxes. I know of another case in my locality where the taxes amount to $2,800 on a quarter section which reverted to the Crown. These taxes are lost to the municipality. Would it not be possible to notify the municipal officials prior to the cancellation of any contract for school lands?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): There would be no objection if it were possible, but we only know of the cancellation when the surrender is sent in. There may be very rare cases in which we have notification of intention to abandon, but in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred the first notification we have is the notice that the purchaser has decided to abandon. By that time any notification to the municipality would not be of very much value.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Does that mean that the owner of the land would notify the department and then immediately leave?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I am afraid he does very frequently. In some cases where they are owners of other land in the municipality of course there is a remedy. But where they leave the municipality we seldom get notification of their intention to abandon until they have moved away.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Can a settler grow 2,000 bushels of wheat, get the proceeds from that, tell the department he is leaving, and then leave the land without making a payment?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Of course we would have the right of ordinary action against him.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: But if he is gone, what then?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): That is the difficulty. If we proceed to seize his crop there would be a hue and a cry—I am assuming now he was in arrears. The usual procedure is to notify the purchaser when payments of principal or interest are due, and we expect these to be forwarded. If they are not forwarded, it is seldom that we take any drastic action against the purchaser. Naturally, if he decided to relinquish he would not leave very many of his assets around on which we might recover.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Is there any local supervision of the owners of these lands at the crop threshing time?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: It is left entirely to the individual to make the payment to the department?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Mr. FORKE: Has the government been making any advance for seed grain during the last few years? Are they continuing that policy in the West?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Last year we did; not this year.

Mr. FORKE: Have you the items there by provinces?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes. In 1922 there were 85 advances from Calgary, amounting to $7,214.40; from Grand Prairie, $122.15; 213 from Lethbridge, $15,995.59; 4 from Peace river, $232.85, making a total of $23,564.99 in Alberta. I assume my hon. friend will be satisfied with the totals for the provinces?

Mr. FORKE: Yes.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Saskatchewan, $44,616.64; Manitoba, $1,180.25, making a total last year of $69,361.88.

Mr. COOTE: How much was collected last year?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): From seed grain alone we collected last year $255,438.75.

Mr. CHAPLIN: A few minutes ago the minister stated that there were arrearages on seed grain amounting to something over $4,000,000. Can he say how much of that is considered collectible?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I could not say that.

Mr CHAPLIN: Does the minister say that some of the arrearages have been overdue since 1876?

Mr STEWART (Argenteuil): Oh, no, I cannot say to that. There would be some of it not collectible.

Mr. FORKE: That must have been the Selkirk settlers.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): It would be very difficult to tell what the ultimate loss will be; for there is no doubt there will be a loss when everything is straightened out. I think an indication of what we may expect is given by the amount we collected last year, $255,438.75.

Mr. CHAPLIN: That is, out of a total amount due of $4,201,000?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): That amount has been reduced by $300,000 since the figures were computed.

Mr. COOTE: How much of this $160,000 is being used for payment to banks, and how much is for clerical assistance, travelling expenses, and so on, as mentioned in the item?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I could not say that.

Mr. COOTE: What I am trying to get at is this: What percentage of the amount goes to pay fees? In some cases it takes more to pay the fees for inspection and the travelling expenses than the main items themselves involve. I do not want to bother the minister, however; if he has not the figures before him I can get them from his department later.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): It would be difficult to segregate the amounts—what is paid to the banks, and what are the travelling expenses of the collectors and their salaries. However, we can furnish the hon. member with the information.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: In the figures the minister gave a short time ago in regard to advances and collections, did he include the advances made in 1914 for fodder and relief throughout the western provinces?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

[Mr. C. A. Stewart.]

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Does the four million outstanding include all that is outstanding in reference to that fodder and relief?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes, that is the total amount.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: I have in mind one municipality that has assumed an indebtedness in this connection of some $70,000 or $75,000, and they are still paying interest on that loan in addition to the regular municipal loan. Is it the intention of the department to relieve the local unit of that financial obligation, or is it intended to let them bear the whole burden?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): There is an arrangement between the federal and the provincial governments under which they will ultimately share in the loss that may accrue. Outside of that, it is not the intention to do what my hon. friend suggests. I am afraid if that were done the municipalities would cease trying to collect.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: I am not advocating that it should be done immediately, but this particular municipality has been paying 8 per cent interest to the bank on about $70,000 since 1914. I was just wondering how long the local unit was going to be required to shoulder the burden.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Well, it is a burden they themselves assumed. A bond issue was undertaken to relieve the municipality—to relieve them not of ultimate payment, but of the burden of constantly renewing a note at the bank.

11 p.m.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Does that mean that the municipality eventually has to pay back all the amount?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Oh, yes.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: In the district to which I refer a great many persons who got loans of from $800 to $1,000 or $1,500 have left the municipality. Is it the intention of the department to compel the local unit to pay the full amount of the loan regardless of that condition?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): As I say, the municipalities took that responsibility on themselves. They were responsible for the loan, and I do not see how either the provincial or the federal government could come to their rescue by assuming a liability which is clearly the liability of the municipality.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: This particular unit to which I refer is under the impression that

the provincial and Dominion governments are going to assume the liability, and they are waiting for them to take steps to that end.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I have not heard of any steps of that kind being proposed.

Mr. FORKE: I should just like to say that I went through an experience thirty years ago in connection with the handing out of seed grain and because the government guaranteed the payment of debentures individual farmers got it into their heads that the government were advancing the money and went into debt. Consequently the debt is one belonging to the municipality. The same thing has been happening year after year, I know that from personal experience in the province of Manitoba, so that in that province the municipalities will not make advances in connection with seed grain any more. Before I sit down I should like to ask if all this money was advanced upon loan from the Dominion government?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes. I think the system has prevailed for the past seven or eight years.

Mr. FORKE: What about the 1876 loan? I cannot make that out; it puzzles me, a little.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I do not know what was done.

Mr. MILLAR: Are the seed grain transactions we are discussing entirely separate and distinct from the purchases made by the Seed Purchasing Commission?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The latter are under the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. MILLAR: They are not included in this item?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No.

Mr. JOHNSTON: I understood from the answer given by the minister to the hon. member for Kindersley (Mr. Carmichael) that part of this money being voted is for relief given in the year 1914. If that is so I think the matter would stand close investigation. I think it absolutely wrong that municipalities should be shouldered with the debt incurred in the matter of granting relief. It was the result of that campaign because you can term it nothing else. The dried out areas in the West were supposed to be given relief. It was on what was expected to be the eve of an election and the relief extended far beyond the bounds of the dried out areas; it was granted to people who were in no way in need of relief. Considerable relief was given to people in the municipality in which I live, and since that time we have come through much worse periods of stress. With respect to my own municipality all that an individual had to do was to get on the train, go up to a certain town on the line, make his own representations to the so-called relief officer who knew nothing whatever of the circumstances and come away with relief in the shape of an order on the stores in the district for groceries, flour or fuel. Now, why should a municipality be made to bear the expense of that relief?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): They are not responsible for it.

Mr. JOHNSTON: I understood the minister to say that in reply to a question.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): They are not sponsible only for the obligations they assumed themselves, not for any obligations assumed by the government to the homesteaders. Obligations were taken on in 1917, 1918 and 1919 by the municipalities themselves. When the government of the province and the government of the Dominion refused to go on with relief, the municipalities issued relief in their own names under municipal officers. That is the relief I was discussing with my hon. friend from Kindersley.

Item agreed to.

Amount required to provide relief by way of necessary supplies of food, clothing, fuel etc., also fodder for animals to needy settlers of the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan by co-operation and agreement with the provincial governments or otherwise, and under regulations to be made by the Governor in Council, $125,000.

Mr. COOTE: Would the minister tell us what was spent of the amount voted last year under this item?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): We spent $232,250 out of what was voted last year.

Mr. McBRIDE: If grants have been made for this purpose to other provinces I should like to know why the minister could not extend any assistance to settlers in the Nicola valley in British Columbia. The minister was out there last year and he learned for himself that the Nicola valley was practically cleaned out owing to depredations by grasshoppers. The minister will remember that we applied for some assistance but were turned down. Now, am I to understand that fodder was supplied to other provinces and not to British Columbia?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The assistance only applied to homesteaders or people

on Crown lands in any of the western provinces. I do not suppose my hon. friend's representations would come under that category. Some of the settlers would be on lands owned by the province but in most of the cases the lands would be privately owned and under municipal organization, would they not?

Mr. McBRIDE: There are some under the provinces and some in the railway belt. There are quite a number of homesteaders there.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I do not recollect an application being turned down where it was warranted. This was paid out generally by the provincial government and the Dominion. I cannot recollect any application coming from the homesteaders in the Nicola valley.

Mr. McBRIDE: The minister surely remembers being out there, and that the provincial government were prepared to stand their part of the expense.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): We usually leave the matter to them but, of course, we are prepared to co-operate with them.

Mr. McBRIDE: Yes, but if the Dominion government was spending money in other provinces it certainly should have spent some in the Nicola valley.

Mr. GARDINER: I think my hon. friend from British Columbia does not understand the circumstances. In British Columbia the government own and control the lands in that province.

Mr. STEVENS: Not in the railway belt. The Dominion owns the railway belt.

Mr. GARDINER: Then I do not see any reason why the same treatment should not have been extended to settlers on Crown lands there as was extended in the case of other provinces.

Mr. MILLAR: There may be another reason. It is very seldom justifiable to accord relief where there has only been a loss of one crop. In many districts in Saskatchewan and Alberta the settlers lost four crops in succession. I do not know whether the conditions are the same in the valley to which my hon. friend (Mr. McBride) has referred. If so I do not see why they should not have received the same relief. However, that was the situation in the prairie provinces.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: Is it not a fact that part of this relief work had to be done through an arrangement with the provincial governments?

[Mr. C. A. Stewart]

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Two of the provincial governments entered into that arrangement whilst other provincial governments did not.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: We could not very well have refused to enter into an arrangement with the province of British Columbia had they so desired it.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): That is what I say. It was a matter in the first place of the provincial government entering into the arrangement we have now.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I should like to understand whether this is being done as charity to the farmers out in Alberta or whether it is a case of granting credit and taking a lien?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): It is a loan.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Last year the appropriation was $325,000 and the minister has said that $232,250 was spent. This year the appropriation is $125,000. I presume the expenditure will be considerably less. Is that an indication of the general prosperity of Alberta and Saskatchewan?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): We cannot form any definite opinion of the requests. Of course, they come from the provincial government. They assume the responsibility of making advances and we become responsible for our share of them. So far as I know the Alberta government have done nothing in that line, or very little, and the government of the province of Saskatchewan have been exceedingly careful. I think the estimate of $125,000 will meet the case.

Item agreed to.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Graham the House adjourned at 11.15 p.m.

Tuesday, June 5, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST READINGS

Bill No. 193 (from the Senate), for the relief of Lillian Beryl Brayman.—Mr. Ryckman.

Bill No. 194 (from the Senate), for the relief of Roland Bergeron.—Mr. Carruthers.

Bill No. 195 (from the Senate), for the relief of Florence Cohn.—Mr. Church.

THE DAIRY INDUSTRY ACT, 1914, AMENDMENT

BILL No. 186 WITHDRAWN

Hon. W. R. MOTHERWELL (Minister of Agriculture) moved:

That the Order of the House for the second reading of Bill No. 186, an act to amend The Dairy Industry Act, 1914, be discharged and the said bill withdrawn.

He said: On the occasion when this bill was before the House last week I made a fairly full explanation of the reasons why I ask that this motion be carried, and I do not think it calls for any further explanation at this time.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): This bill has rather a checkered history, which I think should be reviewed. The bill was introduced pursuant to a resolution about a week ago. As introduced it provided merely for certain corrections in the Dairy Industry Act of 1914. The corrections were of a minor character, rather numerous in total, but none of them of far-reaching consequence. The minister, on introducing the resolution and carrying it through committee, told the House that there was nothing in the bill respecting oleomargarine at all. He did so in response to a query from the hon. member for Victoria City (Mr. Tolmie): Nor was there in such bill any reference to oleomargarine. The subsection which dealt with that subject in the original act of 1914 was left intact. That was the form in which the resolution went through, and the form in which the bill was introduced and was passed on by this House for a second reading. If there is any rule of parliament that is obvious, and that at the same time is vital, it is that when parliament passes an act, first, second and third reading, or any stage, the act remains as so passed by parliament, until varied by parliament.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Is my right hon. friend not mistaken in saying "second reading"?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I said "first." The bill received only a first reading.

Mr. FIELDING: The right hon. member said "second reading."

Mr. MEIGHEN: If so, I should have said first. The preceding resolution doubtless received its regular readings. The bill was introduced and read a first time only. Having been read a first time, the bill so read was the bill before the House and that was appointed for second reading, and no other bill. Rule 53 of this House provides that bills when read shall be certified by the Clerk of the House in order that the terms of the bill so read may be officially stated and officially known. The time for second reading arrived; the Order of the Day was called by the government on Thursday last, and instead of moving the second reading, the minister rose and stated as follows:

Owing to certain changes having been made by parliamentary counsel in the drafting of this bill which while not changing the meaning of the measure, make it more different and more difficult to explain, I move that the bill be discharged from the order paper with a view of redrafting and resubmisson to the House.

Whereupon I asked the minister:

Will the minister explain how the bill is more difficult to explain if the meaning is not changed?

I invite the attention of the House to the minister's reply. This is an example of vacuous profundity which I do not think has any parallel in the annals of parliament:

As drafted by parliamentary counsel portions of the former bill were inserted that were not in the bill submitted to me.

Does any hon. gentleman know what that means? In the first place, after a bill passes this House a first reading, parliamentary counsel has nothing to do with it. It is the bill as passed that comes up for second reading. In the next place, what should come up for second reading was all that was in the bill as passed. But the minister says that parliamentary counsel put in the bill something that was in it before and that was not submitted to him. I really do not know what was in the minister's mind and I have sought, though sought in vain, to delve to the bottom of it. He proceeded:

That makes the bill appear quite different from what was contemplated, and the intention of the draftsman and counsel would be more difficult to explain.

Subsequently the minister proceeded to read the bill as printed, for the bill as printed differs wholly from the bill as passed. The bill as printed provided a clause excluding oleomargarine from Canada in the plainest possible terms. I have the bill before me, and it says:

Section 5 of the said act is repealed, and the following is substituted therefor:

This is the new bill:

5. No person shall—(a) manufacture, import into Canada, or offer, sell or have in his possession for sale, any oleomargarine, margarine, butterine, or other substitute for butter, manufactured wholly or in part from any fat other than that of milk or cream.

The minister's explanation of the meaning of this addition, which he says was inserted by parliamentary counsel after the bill was read a first time, is really equally interesting. The minister told the House that the bill

had been so changed that, as it stood now, it appeared to authorize the manufacture or sale of oleomargarine.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: That should be "prohibit."

Mr. MEIGHEN: It should have read "prohibit"?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I think you will find that is corrected in the revised Hansard.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I will read those words:

> Notwithstanding that, however, on the face of it the bill as now drafted appears as if we were authorizing the manufacture or sale of oleomargarine.

The minister now says that he should have said "prohibit."

Mr. MOTHERWELL: In the revised Hansard my hon. friend will find it reads that way.

Mr. MEIGHEN: On the next page I find the same thing repeated, so the minister duplicated his mistake. Perhaps, as is suggested from behind me, that is on the principle that two negatives would make an affirmative.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: It does not affect the situation, anyway.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It affects the minister. The minister says at page 3456:

> Yet I find another bill on the order paper apparently authorizing the manufacture of oleomargarine.

He used the word "authorized" for "prohibit" twice, in two separate speeches four or five pages apart. I do not know what was wrong with the minister. I could not understand his explanation then.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: That is the reason why I wanted a new bill.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He made no explanation. He simply either deliberately or otherwise befuddled the House. Why is he withdrawing this bill? What is the object of withdrawing it? The bill before this House is not the printed bill; the bill before this House is the very bill which the minister introduced. Because something else is printed, that does not make it a bill of this House. I was not aware, when the discussion was on in the first place, of the actual facts. I sought to become aware by listening to the minister, but I made no progress.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: That is what I thought.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have learned the facts since. Certainly the minister thought no one would make progress. No human being would make progress listening to him. He had everything upside down. What I argue is this: The House passed the bill a first reading and this is the bill before the House.

Mr. MACKENZIE-KING: My right hon. friend says that the House passed a bill on the first reading. He says that this is the bill which passed the first reading. I have the bill that passed the first reading with the mark on it. This is not the bill to which my right hon. friend refers.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I know that. The Prime Minister does not get my point. Somebody might get up a bill purporting to be a bill up for second reading on the order paper; but no bill can be up for second reading that is not passed by this House on the first reading. It is the government's business to get the bill passed in the House. The bill passed the House exactly as it passed it for first reading. Because this is a bill printed on a sheet and called Bill 186, that does not make it Bill 186. Bill 186 is Bill 186 as it passed this House on its first reading.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I read the clause of the bill as it passed this House on the first reading?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If my right hon. friend will look at the legislation, he will find there are five clauses. Clause 1 there is no question about. Clause 2 in the bill that passed this House on a first reading begins:

> Section 5 of the said act is amended by adding at the end of paragraph (b) thereof the words "or less than 80 percentum of milk fat"; and by striking out in paragraph (c) thereof, in the second line the words "what is generally known as", and in the third line thereof the words "nor add any milk or cream or butter."

That is all there is in the second clause of the bill which passed the first reading in this House. When the second reading was called there appeared on the order paper the bill which I hold in my hand now, section 2 of which reads:

> Section 5 of the said act is repealed and the following substituted therefor:
>
> 5. No person shall—
>
> (a) manufacture, import into Canada, or offer, sell or have in his possession for sale, any oleomargarine, margarine, butterine, or other substitute for butter, manufactured wholly or in part from any fat other than that of milk or cream.

That section was inserted by the law officers of the House after the first bill had gone to them. It was inserted without the knowledge of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell), who knew nothing whatever

about it and who, as soon as he learned that the clause had been incorporated in the bill, immediately took exception to it and on that ground asked to have the bill withdrawn.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What the Prime Minister has stated, up to his assertion that this clause was inserted without the consent of the Minister of Agriculture, or without his knowledge, is exactly what I said myself. The Prime Minister puts it this way: He says that when the bill came up for second reading another bill appeared on the order paper, and he proceeds to quote a clause referring to oleomargarine as section 2 of that bill which repeals section 5 of the act. What I am arguing is that such a bill did not appear on the order paper; what was on the order paper was a motion that Bill 186 should be read the second time. Because another printed bill appeared—not Bill 186 that passed the House, but another bill with an added clause in it—that did not make it Bill 186. Bill 186 is Bill 186 as passed, and consequently that is the government measure yet, the measure they intended to introduce and to have to go through all the stages in this House. Neither parliamentary counsel nor any other officer of the House, with or without the instructions of the minister, can alter a bill as passed by parliament. It is a strange thing to me that parliamentary counsel should do anything of the kind without the authority of the government, or at least the authority of any department of the government. I cannot see how he can, without any authority whatever, add to a bill a clause a hundred times more important than all the rest of the bill.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is exactly what I have stated—without the authority of any minister of the Crown.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Did he have the authority of any officer of the department?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I cannot say as to that. The ministry is responsible for the measures it introduces.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The ministry is responsible for the conduct of its officers, and if any officer of any department or of this House took upon himself to alter the records of the House, then it is the business of the government to bring him to book. I cannot believe that parliamentary counsel would insert a clause of this consequence without any authority at all from the department. It may be that the minister did not directly confer it; but whoever did, if he did it without any authority, it is the duty of the government to get the explanation which that officer can give. And beyond the question of the responsibility of the government for the conduct of its officers and of the officers of the House, there is this further fact which I would impress upon hon. members again: the bill before parliament now is not the altered bill, because a bill cannot be altered by an officer; it can be altered only by parliament. The bill now before us is the original bill the government introduced. Now, why does the minister withdraw a bill which he introduced and which, in every speech that he has made since, he has stated to be all right?

Resolution (Mr. Motherwell) agreed to: bill withdrawn.

OLEOMARGARINE

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move:

That the notice of motion in the name of Mr. Carroll, respecting a measure to amend the oleomargarine act, have precedence over all other business, except the introduction of bills, questions, and notices of motion for the production of papers, on Wednesday, the 6th June instant.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that this is the closing scene of the drama; we are now at the stage that the government wished to reach. What is the result of it all? The government is afraid to, or it cannot, bring down a policy with relation to the subject of oleomargarine. One minister smiles in delight over the impotency of an administration of which he is a member. This government is going around like one of the birds of the air—I think it is the cuckoo—that lays its eggs in the nests of other birds knowing that those other birds can take care of them, hatch them and rear the young better than it can itself. This is a cuckoo government. It cannot propound or give birth to any policy on oleomargarine, but it hopes in some way or other to escape governmental responsibility by laying this egg in the nest of the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Carroll), trusting that fertility may result. Why cannot the government face the situation? Governments have faced greater difficulties.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): What is your policy?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Our policy is on the statute books to-day, where it has been for years. We faced the matter as a government.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): What is your policy now?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Let the government bring down its policy.

Mr. BUREAU: Cuckoo!

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is to be thought of a member of the government sitting in his seat helpless to propound what should be a government measure, calling upon the opposition to furnish the administration with a policy? The government, in a word, is simply endeavouring to escape the responsibility that rests upon it by seeking if possible to get over a difficulty along some by-path, led by the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Carroll).

Mr. LAPOINTE: Fine!

Motion agreed to.

JUDGES ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. E. M. MACDONALD (Acting Minister of National Defence) (for the Minister of Justice) moved that the House to-morrow go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, (1) that it is expedient to amend section seventeen of the Judges Act, as enacted by chapter thirty-eight of the statutes of 1914, and to provide that the salaries of the judges of the Circuit Court of the district of Montreal shall be as follows:—The senior judge of the said court, $8,000 per annum, and three other judges of the said court each $7,000 per annum; and to provide that the provisions of section ten of chapter fifty-six of the statutes of 1920 shall not apply to judges of the Circuit Court;

(2) That section two of the Act to amend the Judges Act, chapted fifty-nine of the statutes of 1919, relating to the salaries of local judges in Admiralty, be repealed.

He said: His Excellency, the Governor General, having been apprised of the subject matter of the resolution, has given his consent thereto and commends it to the consideration of the House.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

FURTHER LEGISLATION

On the Orders of the Day:

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): On a previous occasion I promised my right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) that I would submit a statement regarding any legislation which the government intends to bring down before the close of the session.

The Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment (Mr. Beland) has already given notice of a bill to amend the Pension Act arising out of the recommendations of the royal commission that has been investigating the subject of pensions.

[Mr. Macdonald.]

There are also to be introduced a bill to amend the Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act and a short amending bill to the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment Act arising out of the report of the royal commission on lake grain rates, there will be a bill to amend the Shipping Act, giving the government power by order in council to suspend the coasting laws.

A bill concerning a close season for halibut fishing in Pacific waters.

A bill to amend the Fisheries Act to reduce the fee for salmon cannery licenses.

A bill for further advances to the harbour commissioners of Montreal.

A bill to amend the Biological Board Act.

In connection with the Department of Finance there will be a bill to amend the Income Tax Act and bills respecting the Finance Act and the Audit office respectively.

There will also be a bill respecting the guarantee of railway bonds already authorized.

A bill providing for the three-year branch line construction programme, of which mention has been made by the Minister of Railways and Canals.

A bill to amend the Dry Dock Act of 1910

A bill to amend the Feeding Stuffs Act.

A bill to amend the Dairy and Cold Storage Act.

A bill to amend the Public Archives Act. It is proposed to change the name to the Department of Historical and Public Records.

Possibly there will be other legislation based on the reports of the committees to which have been referred the Bank Act, Redistribution, the Civil Service Act and matters pertaining to agriculture. There will also be Supplementary Estimates.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): I would suggest the Prime Minister might go back and get another Speech from the Throne.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: To oblige my right hon. friend, I would be pleased to do that, Mr. Speaker, if any of these measures were of considerable length. Most of them are brief or of relatively slight importance.

MORNING AND SATURDAY SITTINGS

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. L. H. MARTELL (Hants): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the right hon. leader of the government when we may expect to have morning and Saturday sittings? Many of us in the extreme East, and probably most of those from the extreme West, are anxious to get home.

Mr. JACOBS: What about Sundays?

Mr. MARTELL: Sundays are all very well. We have been waiting five or six weeks to get home. When may we expect morning and Saturday sittings?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It will depend on the progress we make with the legislation brought down.

ST. JOHN EMPLOYMENT OFFICE

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. MURRAY MacLAREN (St. John City and Counties of St. John and Albert): Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw the attention of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock) to the report that he proposes to discontinue the Dominion-Provincial employment office at St. John. If this report is correct, will he state to the House the reasons for his proposed action?

Hon. JAMES MURDOCK (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, there has never been a Dominion-Provincial employment office at St. John. We have now in the hands of the Premier of New Brunswick a copy of the agreement which has been utilized by the premiers of the other provinces for the creation and maintenance of Dominion-Provincial employment offices, and it is the hope of the Labour department that such agreement will be signed by him and that thus, we will have a Dominion-Provincial employment office in St. John and at such other points in New Brunswick as may be desired.

Mr. MacLAREN: Do I not understand there is or has been an office in Moncton, as well as another in St. John, and a third somewhere else in the province?

Mr. MURDOCK: These have been Dominion-municipal employment offices.

Mr. MacLAREN: I think only partly.

Mr. MURDOCK: The agreement has always been between the municipalities and the federal Labour department.

MOOSE MOUNTAIN FOREST RESERVE

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. O. R. GOULD (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask the government if they have been advised of the serious state of affairs in the Moose Mountain Forest Reserve due to insect pests, and if they are taking active steps to prevent the threatened destruction of this reserve?

Hon. W. R. MOTHERWELL (Minister of Agriculture): Yes, Mr. Speaker. The Entomological branch of the Department of Agriculture has the matter under consideration and has sent an official to my hon friend's constituency.

IMPERIAL AND ECONOMIC CONFERENCES

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. J. S. WOODSWORTH (Centre Winnipeg): Mr. Speaker, will there be an opportunity for discussion of the matters that are to be placed upon the agenda for the Imperial and Economic conferences?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The government will have occasion to ask for the passing of an estimate to make provision for expenses in connection with these conferences, and at that time I should think there would be ample opportunity to discuss matters pertaining thereto. If not, a time can be specially arranged for the purpose if so desired.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the Prime Minister propose to state to the House the lines of policy he intends to follow or the specific proposals he will himself advance on the occasion of these conferences?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I shall be glad to answer any questions that may be asked. I happen to have here the latest information the government has received with respect to what is anticipated to be taken up at the proceedings of the Imperial Conference, and I might give it to the House. The despatch requests that the information be given in a general form, and therefore I will only outline the main features.

As in 1921, the opening meeting will include statements as to the general position on the main issues of Imperial policy. The preliminary statement may be followed by a report on foreign affairs since 1921, and by a consideration of the present problems and future policy. A discussion as to naval, military and air defences. A review of the naval situation resulting from the Washington Conference and arrangements for future co-operation in all branches of defence. At some stage of the proceedings attention will be given to the principles referred to it from the Imperial Economic Conference regarding Imperial air and wireless communications. There will probably be certain economic questions of special importance. Australia suggests the discussion of the marriage of women with foreigners. That I think, Mr.

Speaker, by way of an outline of what is anticipated for the coming conference, contains about all the information the government has thus far received.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Prime Minister stated that he would answer any questions asked him. I would like him to regard my question now placed before him as a request that he do lay before the House a statement of the lines of policy he purposes following on behalf of this Dominion at these conferences and of any proposition he intends to advance himself. I do not mean at the present moment; but that a time be fixed for his doing so.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My right hon. friend will appreciate that it is only possible to do that in so far as the government is aware of the questions to come up for discussion at the conferences. I may say broadly that certainly with respect to anything of importance involving expenditures our attitude will be that it must be subject to future ratification by this parliament.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It always has been.

WAYS AND MEANS

CUSTOMS TARIFF

The House in Committee of Ways and Means, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): I desire to invite the attention of the committee, Mr. Speaker, to the first resolution to be found on page ii of Votes and Proceedings of Friday, May 11, providing for a 10 per cent discount in regard to goods coming under the preferential tariff when imported direct through our Canadian ports:

1. Resolved, that the Customs Tariff, 1907, be amended by repealing section five, and substituting therefor the following:

5. That the importer of goods entitled to the benefits of the British Preferential Tariff shall be entitled to a discount of ten per centum on the amount of duty computed under such tariff, when such goods are conveyed without transshipment from a port of a country enjoying the benefits of the Britsh Preferential Tariff into a sea or river port of Canada.

Provided, however, that this discount shall not apply to duties on any of the following articles, viz., wines, malt liquors, spirits, spirituous liquors, liquid medicines and articles containing alcohol, sugar, tobacco, cigars and cigarettes.

Provided further that this discount shall not apply in the case in which the duty does not exceed fifteen per centum ad valorem, or, in the case of a specific duty or a specific and ad valorem duty combined in which the computed rate does not exceed fifteen per centum ad valorem, or to goods admitted into Canada which have the benefit of reductions provided for in the Canada-West Indies Trade Agreement, 1920.

2. Resolved, that the Customs Tariff, 1907, be further amended by adding after section 8A the following as section 8B and 8C:—

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

8B. The Governor in Council may authorize any Minister of the Crown to enter into negotiations with any authorized representative of the government of the United States with a view to the making of a commercial agreement between the two countries on terms that may be deemed mutually beneficial. Any agreement so made shall be subject to the approval of the parliament of Canada.

8C. If the President of the United States, under authority of the United States Tariff Act of 1922, determines to reduce by fifty per cent the duties imposed by such Act on the following articles, that is to say:

Cattle; wheat; wheat flour; oats, barley, potatoes, onions; turnips; hay; fish as enumerated in paragraphs 717, 718, 719 and 720 of the said Tariff Act of 1922, the Governor in Council may by order in council make such reductions of duties on similar articles imported into Canada from the United States as may be deemed reasonable by way of compensation for such reductions on Canadian products imported into the United States.

Mr. FIELDING: I desire to change a word or two in paragraph 8C. It reads:

If the President of the United States, under authority of the United States Tariff Act of 1922, determines to reduce by fifty per cent—

And so on. The American Tariff Act gives the President power to reduce by fifty per cent. It might be that he would make a reduction not of the full fifty per cent, and to meet that possibiliy I propose to leave out the words "by fifty per cent". The effect will be that if any reduction is made we shall be prepared to make corresponding reductions.

Mr. STEVENS: Before we come to the latter clause I wish to refer to a matter which relates to the first clause you read, Mr. Chairman. I submitted to the minister a situation which was brought to my attention by the Vancouver Board of Trade and asked him to give it his consideration. The point is that quantities of British goods are shipped via the Suez canal and transshipped at Hong Kong en route to the Pacific ports of Canada. The Canadian Pacific liners, for instance, and the Canadian Government Merchant Marine run their vessels from Vancouver and Victoria to Hong Kong. They rarely, except on special trips, run further, but they do proceed between these points regularly and they pick up merchandise which is brought by British vessels to Hong Kong. In that there is no violation of the spirit of this clause, but if the act is interpreted as at present I think the goods could not be shipped in that way and still obtain the benefit of the new provision. Will the minister say whether or not that point has been considered?

Mr. FIELDING: The hon. gentleman (Mr. Stevens) was kind enough to show me a communication he received on the subject, and later I received a similar communication. I have given the matter some consideration, but

the point raised is a debatable one and for the present I prefer to reserve a definite answer. If on further reflection it would seem desirable to interpret the clause in that way, I think the Governor in Council would have the power to do so. But we should like to give the matter further attention before making a definite reply.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Does my hon. friend not think that the Governor in Council has to be given the power to which he refers?

Mr. FIELDING: I think the Governor in Council has the power now.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Under what resolution?

Mr. FIELDING: Not under any resolution here, but under the Tariff Act, which provides as follows:

> The Governor in Council may by order in council extend the benefit of the British preferential tariff to any British country not named in paragraph (1) of section 3, and from and after the publication of such order in council in The Canada Gazette the British preferental tariff shall apply to goods the produce or manufacture of such British country, subject to the provisions of this act.

I think that is broad enough to give the government power; I am not sure we might not interpret it in that way without any further action. If it be a matter of debate I am persuaded the Governor in Council could so interpret the act at a later date. However, the point is new, and I would like to hear both sides of it before coming to a conclusion.

The CHAIRMAN: The question is on the first paragraph of the resolution, dealing with the British preferential tariff.

Mr. STEVENS: I appreciate any consideration the government may give to the matter, but I would point out that we are passing the resolution and I am apprehensive that we shall not have a later opportunity of discussing the point that I have raised. I am doubtful whether under the Customs Tariff Act that power is given to the Governor in Council. It gives the government power by order in council to apply similar provisions to other countries, but in this case we are dealing with the British colony port of Hong Kong, which is merely a transshipping point. I know this question is new; that is why I brought it to the minister's attention a few days ago. The minister says he is open to argument. Well, the point I wish to impress upon the committee is that such procedure as I have referred to would be no violation of the principle of this clause. The principle of the clause, as I understand it, is that British goods brought to Canadian ports shall have the advantage of this reduction. But when it comes to our western ports the steamship lines do not travel the whole route without transshipment, and that is the point of the matter. If the minister would include the port of Hong Kong in the resolution—or perhaps it should be Singapore—it would cover the whole question and would give to the Pacific coast the advantage of this provision. If that is not done, I suppose two-thirds of the British goods coming to Canada via the Pacific will not come under this proviso. Let me emphasize the point by one further observation. Some of the old established British steamship lines—the Blue Funnel line, the Elder-Dempster line—run what they call the around-the-world route. Their ships start from Great Britain, call at Hong Kong and then go direct through the Panama canal or to the South American ports; but Canadian goods, British Columbia goods, are transshipped at Hong Kong. I think I have made it clear that no violation of the principle of this clause is involved and it seems to me that if a definite stipulation in this regard is not made, the government should take the power to do what the minister declares he will do if he is convinced of the merits of the case.

Mr. FIELDING: If we have not the power to deal with the matter, before the bill is finally through I will have it further investigated. I think we ought to have the power, and if it is not within our power now I will have an amendment considered at a later stage. Hong Kong is a British colony but it does not enjoy the British preference. If it were a preferential tariff colony, the case might be very simple. However, I do not wish to give judgment; the point is of sufficient importance to justify further consideration, and I would like to reserve decision on it. But if we have not power to deal with it by order in council I can give my hon. friend the assurance that power will be taken before this bill is finally through.

Mr. LOGAN: I rise to congratulate the government upon the adoption of this policy which has been very dear to my heart for a good many years. It is now nineteen years, I think, since I first introduced into this House a resolution embodying the principle of this part of our present tariff, and in 1907 I was able to move a resolution in amendment to the budget resolutions also embodying this policy. At that time, Mr. Chairman, it was accepted by the government as a principle, but the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier, then Prime Minister, stated that it could not very

well be brought into force then because it would give a monopoly of transcontinental trade in British preferential goods to the one line of railway then constructed across this continent; but speaking upon this resolution and in moving an amendment thereto he said that it would be brought into force in December, 1911, when the National Transcontinental railway would be completed across this continent. Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, in December, 1911, Sir Wilfrid Laurier had ceased to be Prime Minister, and so from that time until the present nothing has been done in the way of amending the British preferential tariff along this line. Last year I moved in this House a resolution embodying this policy, but advocating it be extended to the whole amount of the British preference. I regret that the present budget does not include my contention of last year in its entirety. I believe that the British preference in its entirety should be confined to goods brought into Canada through Canadian sea and river ports. But at last, Mr. Chairman, after long years, the principle has been adopted in the budget, and therefore it is that I feel personally pleased and very grateful to the government. I believe that even the ten per cent increase of British perference which will be allowed upon goods brought through Canadian sea and river ports will be of great benefit to the ports of the Maritime provinces. This is in line with the policy of building up Canadian trade which we have preached in this country since Confederation; it is in line with the policy of the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier of building up our Canadian ports; and I only hope that in another year it will not be ten or twenty per cent, but that we shall finally adopt the policy of confining the British preference in its entirety to goods thus brought into Canada.

Mr. GOOD: It seems to me that the policy of the government in this respect is rather unsound. I do not know why we should not have the advantage of the further reduction in the British preference on goods coming through American ports. I cannot sympathize, although I would like to with the remarks of the hon. member (Mr. Logan), who has just spoken. Of course, if he looks at the matter solely from the viewpoint of the inhabitants of some Nova Scotia ports, it is another matter, but looking at it from the viewpoint of the Canadian public I think the policy in this particular respect unsound, and I wonder how far it may result in the shipping of goods by the long haul instead of the short haul. The more direct route into the central part of Canada is, I think, from Portland. I understand that there at least the traffic could be made tribute to what are now the Canadian National lines, whereas if the goods come through Halifax or St. John they will go over the Intercolonial railway by a very long route or over the Canadian Pacific from St. John to Montreal. I have not very much to say further, but I would like to express my dissent from the principle involved.

Mr. FORKE: I would like at this particular point to express my appreciation of any preference that has been given to British imports. I think a great many of our difficulties so far as marketing is concerned would be solved to a great extent had we a larger import trade from Great Britain. Great Britain is our principal market for all our surplus products, and if we could in some way purchase what we have to import from the British Isles we would have return cargoes and perhaps could do a more profitable trade.

4 p.m.

In regard to the ten per cent increase in the British preference, while I appreciate the sentiments of the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) in respect to encouraging Canadian ports, it seems to me, looking at it from a western standpoint, that that ten per cent of British preference will be altogether blotted out by the increased transportation costs that will result from importing these goods through the Maritime ports and bringing them over the long haul westward. It is all very well this spirit of patriotism and encouraging our own ports, but when that is done at the expense of some other part of the country, it remains to be seen how much patriotism is in the matter after all. If we can find in the West that by the increased transportation cost over the long haul all the increase in the British preference is lost, then perhaps some excuse may be found for us if we are not very enthusiastic over the idea that is propounded in this scheme. It seems to me that if we are ever going to get anywhere both in taking our products to the market and in buying the stuff that we in this country want, the cheapest and the shortest haul will eventually be the one taken. I do not care for this trying to build things up artificially. It seems to me it will never get us anywhere. We must be prepared to do that which is best for all the people irrespective of what part of the country they happen to live in. In looking over the items I notice in the last clause dealing with cattle, wheat, wheat flour, oats, barley, potatoes, onions, turnips, hay and fish:

—as enumerated in paragraphs 717, 718, 719 and 720 of the said Tariff Act of 1922, the Governor in Coun-

cil may by order in council make such reductions of duties on similar articles imported into Canada from the United States as may be deemed reasonable by way of compensation for such reductions on Canadian products imported into the United States.

I do not see any reason for that word "similar". I think the clause ought to read:

make such reductions of duties on articles imported into Canada from the United States as may be deemed reasonable by way of compensation for such reductions on Canadian products imported into the United States.

Because in the articles here enumerated we have really no trade with the United States, and to insert the word "similar" takes away the meaning of the whole passage. I would move, Mr. Chairman, that the word "similar" be deleted from the resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. gentleman permit us first to dispose of paragraph (1) dealing with the British preferential rate? That has not been disposed of by the committee.

Mr. ROBB: Just to show that this is not altogether a Maritime province question, I may say that one of the ideas in making the British preference applicable to Canadian ports was the hope that we might bring more ships to Canadian ports which would carry back across the water the products of Canada, and in that way divert to our Canadian ports some of the traffic that is now going to United States ports. Hon. members will surely understand that on the east the ports of Montreal and Quebec are nearer the West than the ports of Portland or New York, and on the west coast the port of Vancouver is nearer to the West. I submit it is more desirable that business should come into those ports than into the ports of Washington territory.

Mr. FORKE: Why the necessity for putting in the paragraph? Why the necessity for making that regulation, if that is the proper route for them to take?

Mr. ROBB: With the hope that we will get vessels to carry away the products of our own country, and that we will get the long hauls for our own railways. My hon. friends must share in paying the losses we have been making upon our national railways, and if we can do anything to divert the long haul to our own railways, instead of shipping our wheat down to New York, if we can have more vessel space available at Canadian ports for that wheat, it seems to me that it will help not only the man on the prairies who is growing the wheat, but it will also help the eastern ports. It is not altogether a Maritime question, it is a question affecting all Canada, in the hope that we may get greater revenues for our national railways.

Mr. FORKE: Will wheat go to Montreal, if it is cheaper to go by some other port?

Mr. ROBB: No; that is why we want to make it cheaper. We want more vessels in Montreal, and that will make it cheaper.

Mr. FORKE: It seems to me the trade will go where it has been going most of the time. If you are going to increase the British preference 10 per cent, to bring goods from British ports, the chances are that increase on the cost will be paid by the people who buy the goods. I cannot see it any other way.

Mr. BUREAU: Why?

Mr. ROBB: If they get it back in reduced freights from Canadian ports, they will be benefited.

Mr. BUREAU: The distance is no greater between Montreal and the West than between Portland and the West. Then you have the lake route, or you can have an all-rail route from Montreal, and St. John and Halifax all through the winter time.

Mr. FORKE: Then why is it necessary to pass legislation to bring it about?

Mr. BUREAU: To induce people to do it. The more ships you get in Canadian ports to carry back wheat to the Old Country, the more competition there is, and the lower the rate will be.

Mr. EVANS: I am glad to see the British preference is reduced. It is to Britain that we shall have to look for many years to come for a market, particularly for our agricultural products, and while agricultural products are our chief exports from this country, the one thing to do, it seems to me, is to look for a return cargo, and the easier we make it, the surer we are of getting a return cargo. At the present time it is getting more unreasonable, as time goes on, to expect that our agricultural exports shall bear the cost of the trip both ways. With reference to the endeavour to compel British imports to come into Canadian ports, all I can say is that the trade of this country, and the trade of all countries of the world, has to go in its natural channels, and no legislation can give any advantage to any Canadian port if it is cheaper to ship through other channels. I wish the government could have seen fit to increase the preference without any of these restrictions.

Mr. FORTIER: Of course I agree with the government in the policy of the British preference, because I think it is really an opportunity for the development of our Canadian ports. But the government saw fit to make exceptions in regard to certain articles which are not affected by the British preference. I observe in this resolution the discount shall not apply to duties on certain articles—wines, malt liquors, spirits and so on. But woollen articles are not included. I have in my hand a petition from some of my constituents concerning woollen goods, and of course they protest against the British preference on British woollen goods coming into Canada, and they state that this preference will be of no benefit to the woollen mills in Canada. They also say the commerce, especially of that section of my constituency in which they reside, will be very much affected by it. This petition expresses the opinion that the farmers in that part of my constituency, joining with the industries interested in the woollen mills, are in sympathy with that part of the petition which refers to Canadian woollen goods. I think this special industry in which the farmers are so interested should receive the special consideration of the government, and I cannot help lamenting that this preference is given to British goods.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) was not altogether correct in his remarks. He was quite right when he stated that he had been a constant and ardent advocate on the question of preference to our own ports, but he was quite wrong when he said nothing had been done towards crystallizing that principle in any way. For in the preferential agreement with the West Indies, in 1913 and again in 1920, there are sections covering this very question. Just confining my remarks for a moment to the question of the port, I want to ask my hon. friend the minister why it is right to extend the principle to 10 per cent—there is 10 per cent reduction in duty—while it is wrong to apply it in connection with the main British preference? It appears to me that the position as to each is exactly the same. The duties are the same, the articles are entirely the same. We have a further reduction made as a matter of principle. If that reduction has to be earned by going through Canadian ports, what is the minister's reason for withholding it from the larger question?

Mr. FIELDING: I am not quite sure that I gather the hon. member's question. We are making certain exceptions because the duties are low, is that the point?

[Mr. Evans.]

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: No, the point is this: In connection with the present 10 per cent reduction the government are congratulated by the hon. member for Cumberland upon having crystallized into action a principle, that principle being the carrying of Canadian commerce through Canadian channels. What I am trying to find out is this. Why is it that the principle applies only to this 10 per cent reduction and not to the general preference?

Mr. FIELDING: The idea is to bring a gentle pressure to bear upon importers to ship by way of our own ports. We do not want to go so far as to say that they shall be penalized beyond the 10 per cent reduction for going to other ports. This is a gentle pressure to do the thing which we hope they will do anyway, but we do not want to be so drastic.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: We are not getting the business. It is not coming.

Mr. FIELDING: This has not been tried yet.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I rather thought it had been tried, and if the minister consults the people who are engaged in the transportation business, he will find that they have done their best to get the trade. I was just wondering whether there was not another reason—that, in the opinion of my hon. friend, this provision would result in this 10 per cent not being taken advantage of. If my hon. friend wants to get the business, I cannot see why he starts with something that can be looked upon only as a pin-prick. Is not the real motive or is the real motive—I do not know which it is—that what is given with the one hand in this 10 per cent reduction is taken back with the other by this "Canadian port" provision?

Mr. FIELDING: That is my hon. friend's unhappy way of putting the matter. I cannot put it more simply than I have. It is a gentle pressure to bring the goods through our own ports. We think this will come. If it does not come, experience will be the best teacher for us.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I suppose we shall have to leave the matter in that way for the moment. The principle is wrong—

Mr. FIELDING: What principle is wrong?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The principle of the "Canadian port" is wrong when applied

in connection with the lower duty which might bring results. It is right when we have it dealt with in connection with this 10 per cent reduction. The hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. Evans) pointed out something which I thought would have weighed a good deal with my hon. friend. I confess that the hon. member for Saskatoon, after having made the argument, did not apply it. He pointed out that at present agriculture is carrying the cost both ways on the ocean trip, because we do not have proper return cargoes. I thought he would have been greatly interested, therefore, in seeing that there were return cargoes to our Canadian ports where we could have proper methods of control in connection with grain movements. That, however, may be something which the minister will consider further in making up his mind whether it is possible to make this something real or not.

What does my hon. friend think as regards the position of the woollen mills? In the first instance, I would ask him whether he found any decrease in the cost of woollen articles during the past year?

Mr. FIELDING: I do not think there was any decrease. Of course, I would not like to answer that definitely. The question of the cost did not quite enter into our minds in this matter. If my hon. friend means: Are the woollen mills satisfied with this?—frankly, no, they are not.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not mean that. I asked my hon. friend if there had been any difference, since his last budget was brought down, in the cost of woollens to the consumer?

Mr. FIELDING: I would not like to answer that. I am not aware that there has been.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend is very wise in not answering—

Mr. FIELDING: Perhaps so.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: —because the figures of the Labour bureau, if I read them aright—and I am willing to accept at once any correction that comes from my hon. friend or his expert, if I read them wrongly—show that there has been an actual increase in the cost of woollen goods to the Canadian consumer.

Mr. ROBB: Has there not been an increase in the cost of the raw material—wool?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend answers one question by asking another.

Mr. FIELDING: He is Irish.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am dealing simply with one thing at a time. There has been an increase in cost, notwithstanding the fact that my hon. friend reduced the duty on woollens last year and increased the preference. Does my hon. friend know—and again I am going to accept his figures—if it is a fact in connection with woollens, having regard to the textiles turned out, that the yardage has decreased and importations have increased by about 52 per cent, I think the figures are?

Mr. FIELDING: There has been an increase; I have not the figures at hand. If the cost of woollens has increased in the meantime, might that not be a reason why an effort should be made to reduce the cost by reducing the duty?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The unfortunate thing is that the cost went up with the reduction in the duty.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Then we will increase the duty in order to reduce the cost.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I hear an echo from my hon. friend.

Mr. LAPOINTE: That is the logic of the matter.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: We might as well deal with things as they turn out. It might be that the taxes on Canadian business, the added burden of production in this country, are the real reasons why we have so much more importation coupled with a higher price. Will my hon. friend dispute this figure that there has been an increase of over 52 per cent in the importations of woollen textiles.

Mr. FIELDING: There has been some increase. I do not quite see the bearing of this on my hon. friend's question as regards reducing the rates of duty.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Does my hon. friend desire to increase that importation at the present time by lowering the duty?

Mr. FIELDING: I would like to increase the importation and to increase the manufacture at the same time, in order that all business might be promoted and encouraged.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Does my hon. friend know how that can be done?

Mr. FIELDING: That is a matter of opinion.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Does my hon. friend know that the textile mills in Canada—and we heard from one of them in Quebec to-day—are working on an average only 30 per cent of their time, so that the net result

is that Canadian workmen are working 30 per cent of their time, importations are increased accordingly 52 per cent, and the public are paying a higher price? Does my hon. friend want to aggravate that situation?

Mr. FORKE: Would the hon. member increase the duty and have another mill started?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That question, of course, I do not think my hon. friend is very serious about. It is a splendid thing to have a real sense of Scotch humour, but at present I do not know that my hon. friend is doing much more than making a joke. New mills?—of course not; unless something occurs in this country to improve conditions, we shall not need any mills at all. What is the use of talking about putting up new mills when our own mills are not operating more than 30 per cent of their time?

Mr. FORKE: That is just what I was wondering.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is the price of knitted woollens since my hon. friend's last budget? Did they go up or down?

Mr. FIELDING: I will let my hon. friend answer if that affords him satisfaction.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: No. I look upon this as a serious question.

Mr. FIELDING: Certainly.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I would have thought my hon. friend had studied Canadian conditions with a view of seeing what ought to be done in connection with his fiscal changes. I would have thought he would know conditions; I think he does know, and I again ask him.

Mr. FIELDING: I assure my hon. friend that we have considered all conditions. I never knew a time when an interest touched by the tariff did not become alarmed. Honestly and sincerely, I have no doubt, the woollen mills to-day are disturbed. I hope and believe that with the improved condition of business which is near at hand, their fears will prove to be mistaken. There is no industry which you touch in the tariff which does not represent to you that it is placed in peril. I quite respect the views of these manufacturers. I have been through a similar experience in days gone by. But I am glad to know that in most cases their anticipations of disaster proved unfounded. I hope it will be so in this case.

[Sir Henry Drayton.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister has been through a similar experience, he says. He did in the previous case what he will do here if he is in power; when in power before he put the woollen duties down to 23 or 23½ per cent. Everything that was predicted at that time happened; everything that was foretold from the opposition benches took place. He destroyed about half the woollen industry of the country, while he did not help the woollen consumer at all. With what result? He came back to parliament a few years afterwards and admitted that he had gone too low and that instead of helping the country he had hurt it. He therefore asked parliament at that time to restore the woollen duties back to 30 per cent, which rate just kept the woollen industries in existence. They have struggled along, but they have not done more than that. There are a great many of them; there is not just one large concern, but a goodly number have been kept in existence under the duty which the hon. gentleman decided to restore after an experience which alone could teach him. I suspect that he is travelling around the circle again at the expense of the people of the country; he will again learn by experience, but the people will suffer. He will realize his mistake after perhaps two or three years, and at a very great cost not only to the Canadian woollen producers, but to the Canadian consumer as well. What happens is this: The outside goods come in and displace the Canadian product; those goods are able to do this through the lower tariff. And this having happened, the Canadian manufacturers are forced to limit their hours of work, while their overhead goes up and their unit costs of production increase; and with each such increase the outsider gets the benefit because he is competing against a crippled industry. That is what the minister himself discovered twenty years ago. Why should he have to be taught it all over again? The reason is just in order that he may do his share of the log-rolling to get his budget through the House.

Mr. FORKE: I hope the minister will be benefited by the advice he is getting.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He will benefit by "experience."

Mr. FORKE: It seems that this tale of the woollen manufacturers is a pitiful one indeed. I would tell my good friend, the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) that one of the tragedies of Mark Twain's life was that people would not take him seriously. Now, I want the hon. gentleman to take me seriously; I am not joking. One of the troubles in

connection with this industry is the inability of the people to purchase. There has never been any over-production; so far as I can see, the difficulty has always been in under-consumption. If the people could buy these goods there would be a market for all the woollen goods produced in Canada as well as for woollen imports. I wonder if my hon. friend knows how many people in this cold climate are obliged to go without proper underclothing in winter because of high prices? I do not think that increasing the tariff will help that condition of affairs in any way.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I really thought that my hon. friend was joking when he referred to a new mill at the present time. I want to pay this tribute to him, however, that although he jokes he always does so delightfully. He must be joking, too, when he talks about the present situation. Does he think that he improves the purchasing power of the poor people by making woollen goods dearer, as we had them last year, with the Canadian mills not operating? There is no good purpose to be served by talking generalities; the simple fact is that the rates went up materially. I will ask the minister whether that was not true in connection with woollen knitted goods? My information is that it is absolutely correct; I am informed that the prices went up. Is that correct?

Mr. FIELDING: A great many articles went up in price, but I do not see what that has to do with the question of the duties that are to be levied.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am trying to get at the facts.

Mr. FIELDING: The hon. member knows what the facts are; there is no need for him to ask me.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is this correct or not,—

Mr. FIELDING: You say it is correct, and I have not disputed it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is this correct—

Mr. FIELDING: Probably not.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: —that the importation of knitted goods increased in bulk over one hundred per cent—I think it was 104 per cent?

Mr. FIELDING: It may be so; I have not the figures before me. But of what consequence is it?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Of what consequence is it? Was it not bad enough before, when the home industries were shut down and men were out of work, without having an increase of 104 per cent in the importation of these goods? What harm is it?—the hon. member wants to know. No harm at all; of course not. It is of no consequence, of course, that Canadian workers go without work and that Canadian consumers are to-day paying higher prices than before. I should have thought that there was great harm in all this; I should have thought that my hon. friend, when he was considering the question of reducing duties, would have thought it advisable at least to reduce the duties as they would affect the output of such companies as could well afford to stand the reduction and still keep going. My hon. friend well knows that since his last budget was brought down some of these mills have had to cease entirely. For example, is it a matter of no concern that the York Knitting Mills should have stopped operations?

Mr. EVANS: Can the ex-Minister of Finance tell us why these mills are shut down?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It is generally known that the woollen industry, things being as they are in this country, is worked from the top down rather than from the bottom up, as it should be. The woollen industry has to go to Bradford for its tops, there being no place in Canada where our own raw materials could be put into proper shape for our manufacturers.

Mr. EVANS: I thought that was the cheapest place of all.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Well, let us see what happens at Bradford. As I recollect, before the war Bradford converted woollen tops at an average of a penny half-penny; I am not sure of the figure, but I think it was around that sum; and the price of the tops was something around sixpence. Now, there is a combination in Bradford between the man who knits the tops and the man in the other branch of the business; and when Canadians have to pay an advance in the price of tops from 200 to 300 per cent, it is not difficult to see where the trouble lies. With wages in Canada much higher than they were in England, it is not hard, either, to realize the difficulties that our manufacturers have had to face. We have a mill started now; I do not know whether it has actually started, but at all events there is a mill being built at Trenton to-day. If that mill is allowed to get going and is properly operated, if it is not put out of business by sales taxes and cheque taxes, by this thing and the other thing, we ought to be able to get cheap tops in

Canada on the one hand, and a decent price for Canadian woollens, on the other. There is no secret to-day as to why the Canadian woollen industry requires protection; the reason that these concerns are going out of business is simply that the protection has been cut down. They are working thirty per cent of their time, while they have to face an increase of one hundred per cent in imports in knitted goods. If the minister is satisfied with such a state of affairs, I do not know that the committee can do anything by detaining him very much longer. He does not seem to be concerned about these tremendous increases in our imports; he does not seem to be moved by any consideration such as, for example, the fact that these businesses are running thirty per cent of time. And as a corollary, it is obvious that it does not in the least affect him that an industrial exodus from this country is now going on,—we need not wonder why.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I am assured that the difference will not bring to us any decrease in the price of material. But there is another matter of interest in this: If we close down our woollen mills we are certainly putting our wool at a disadvantage because we are permitting the importation of material manufactured from the wool of southern countries, and it is a well-known fact that this wool will produce a finer fabric than the wool of northern countries. This is a matter of great importance to our agriculturists.

Mr. FIELDING: My hon. friend has given us some interesting theories of political economy. It is quite fairly established by the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) that if you reduce duties you are increasing prices; that is his argument. We reduced the duties on certain goods in the budget a year ago. and the prices of such goods have increased; that is cause and effect, he says. That is a new doctrine altogether, and I give my hon. friend the benefit of it. Let us not misunderstand him. We reduce the duties and thereupon the prices increase; therefore you should not reduce the duties. I remember some years ago in a debate of that kind when a distinguished statesman was advancing the argument that by increasing duties they had reduced prices, a small boy interrupted "If you had only doubled the duties we would have got the goods for nothing." That is the logical result of my hon. friend's argument. My hon. friend distinctly declares that by reducing duties I am increasing prices. I am sure for the sake of his reputation my hon. friend does not wish to be taken seriously.

Mr. FORKE: He is joking.

Mr. FIELDING: I am suddenly discovering that these tariff changes are of vast concern and importance. I understood from the speeches in this House and elsewhere not long ago that the changes made were insignificant. Hon. gentlemen opposite could hardly find words sufficiently small to indicate the insignificance of the duties; but now we are discovering that these insignificant, trifling duties are destroying the industries of the country. So I am getting some new theories of political economy. I let my hon. friend, the ex-Minister of Finance, have his own statistics, I do not question them. He is advancing the view that large importations of woollen goods are injurious to the country. We have admitted for last year an importation of wearing apparel and knitted goods amounting to $472,000—a large sum. I can imagine my hon. friend picturing to the woollen people of the country the awful evil that came to them by the importation of that one year. But if he will turn back to the year 1921, when the country had the good fortune of having the guidance of my hon. friend as Minister of Finance he will find the importation not $472,000 but $890,000. Now then, what happened? If the woollen industry of the country is bad under this importation of $470,000, what must it have been in 1921 under an importation nearly double?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I wonder if my hon. friend is dealing with the latest figures? I said I was prepared for correction, I invited it. I want to try and get at the truth in connection with these matters. We too often have general statements made and not enough facts behind them. I stated what I had been told and I asked my hon. friend for the information.

Mr. FIELDING: I have given it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I have been told that during the latest period in connection with the manufactured articles of textiles there had been an increase of 52 per cent. Now, what period is my hon. friend referring to?

Mr. FIELDING: I am referring to the year 1921 in comparison with the year 1923—one of the last years of my hon. friend's experience in office in the new year in which I had the pleasure to have something to do with public affairs.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My friend says that instead of being an increase there was a decrease?

Mr. FIELDING: A little more than one-half of what it was in 1921.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend says that there is a decrease?

Mr. FIELDING: Yes, in knitted goods.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Take stockings, which are knitted articles, during the last period what does my hon. friend say the figures are?

Mr. FIELDING: I have no doubt my hon. friend does not need this information for his argument. He can go on.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Oh yes, I should like to know we are right.

Mr. GOOD: Mr. Chairman, may I submit to the hon. member for West York and others also the danger of being led into a fallacy when comparing the prices of woollens now with the prices at some time in the past when the general price level may have shifted in the meantime?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I was dealing with quantities, not prices.

Mr. GOOD: But I understood the hon. member to say that the price of woollens had gone up, therefore the British preference was of no value. I simply point out the danger he is being led into by comparing the price now with the price in the past without any reference to the general price level.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Quite right.

Mr. COOTE: There has been such a note of pessimism injected into this discussion by my hon. friends to my right that I think it may be helpful to bring to their attention something which may cause them to regard the woollen industry with at least a little optimism. I have before me a short article taken from the Financial Post of recent date in regard to the stocks of two of the leading textile companies of Canada.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Does not that refer to the Dominion Textiles?

Mr. COOTE: It refers to the Dominion Textile and Penman's.

An hon. MEMBER: They have nothing to do with wool.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is worth reading, though.

Mr. BUREAU: Penman's are all right, their products are all wool.

Mr. COOTE: Even if they manufacture cotton goods this article is pertinent. I was disappointed that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) did not in his budget propose a larger increase in the British preference, particularly on cotton goods. I think if there is one thing the people of this country are entitled to it is cheaper cotton goods, because very often they cannot afford to buy woollen goods, but as things stand we are making it exceedingly difficult for them to get even cotton clothing. This article says, in regard to Penman's and Textile:

> Montreal.—Here are two stocks that have shown rather startling increases in their market values during the past year. Penman's which sold at 99 in 1922, is now at 159 and recently touched the highest point in its history.

That does not sound pessimistic.

> The stock is paying 8 per cent this year, including a bonus of 2 per cent paid in February and taking this as the dividend return the yield to the investor at 159 is about 6.30 per cent, not a very high yield for a common stock. Dominion Textile during 1922 sold as low as 133. To-day's market prices are about 68 and allowing for the "three to one split" early in the year—

I hope hon. gentlemen will take note of that.

> —this is the equivalent of 215 for the old stock. Dominion Textile's dividend rate is 12 per cent for the old stock, $4 a share on the new and the yield is 5.90 per cent, which is very low.
>
> It is obvious, therefore, that the investor who buys either Dominion Textile or Penman's is looking for something beyond the present income return. There is justification for believing that these additional attractions are in the offing for both securities.
>
> Penman's may follow the example of Dominion Textile and divide its stock into smaller units. There are disadvantages in having a stock selling at too high a price.

I suppose one of the disadvantages, Mr. Chairman, is this: That it makes it a little bit harder, or it takes a little more nerve, to go to the Finance Minister and ask for further protection for that particular industry.

> Penman's at 157 has a somewhat restricted market that would be broadened if, for instance, a new company were formed that gave each shareholder two or three shares of stock perhaps of no par value for each $100 share he now holds. The number of shares available for trading would be increased and an increase in the dividend might be more likely. Now this scheme of dividing up Penman's stock has not been decided upon; but it is just what was done in the case of Dominion Textile and it is what many investors are looking for and it is because so many investors look for something of this kind that the stock has advanced to its present point.

It seems to me that it is time we got some worth while reduction of the tariff on some particular lines, and these are two of the lines on which a reduction is due to the people of Canada.

In the case of Dominion Textile the high price of the stock is based upon the prosperity prevailing in the textile industry which ensures that the company's earnings will again be very satisfactory. For many years Textile has earned a substantial margin over its dividend requirements. Dividends have been increased from time to time with regularity and now $4 per share is being paid on the new stock, equivalent to 12 per cent on the older shares. The present price of the stock discounts an early increase in the dividend, perhaps to $5 a share, which would mean that at 68 the stock would yield over about 7.30 per cent.

Remember, Mr. Chairman, that this is stock which has recently been split up to the extent of three shares for one.

Penman's is in the business of manufacturing knit goods, chiefly woollens.

I give you the authority of the Financial Post against the word of some hon. gentlemen to my right and also to my left who have insisted that Penman's is not a woollen industry. I will repeat that sentence:

Penman's is in the business of manufacturing knit goods, chiefly woollens. It has had a somewhat remarkable earnings record. During the five years ending in 1920 it earned over and above the dividends paid, the full value of the common stock. This went back into the business.

Remember that this is an industry which is chiefly concerned with woollens.

Since 1920 earnings have not been so great, but increased in 1922 over the previous year.

Apparently the little reduction that the Finance Minister made last year did have the effect of increasing the earning power of this woollen industry.

The working capital position is excellent and the company has liquid investments greater than the amount of its bonds outstanding.

Dominion Textile has almost as excellent a record earning during the past five years a total of 116 per cent, out of which dividends, totalling only 45 per cent, were paid. This meant that 71 per cent went back into the business. There has been a steady sure growth to Textile's earnings.

When two stocks are selling at the highest levels in their history and have discounted, marketwise, the possible developments, is that the time for the investor to purchase them? A lot depends upon the general business and investment outlook. Be it said though that both Penman's and Dominion Textile are common stocks that offer a wealth of real assets that have demonstrated an ability to earn a substantial margin above dividends paid. They are both capably managed, the president of each company being the same able executive, Sir Charles Gordon. They are operating in a field that has not been overdone and that is practically controlled by Canadian mills with little competition from foreign firms, to some extent due to the tariff.

That is quite an admission, surely, for the Financial Post.

Therefore granting the solidity of the stocks themselves the question of purchase price remains the problem.

I do not want to weary the committee by reading the rest of it, because it is not particularly interesting so far as the main point is concerned. But before I leave this question there is one other thing I want to point out, namely, the profits that have been made not only by cotton mills, which I think every hon. gentlemen will admit were excessive, but also by woollen mills. It was admitted before a committee of this House, I think in 1919, that a certain woollen industry in the province of Quebec had earned 72 per cent on the capital invested. I would like to read some of the evidence taken before the Drayton tariff commission in 1919, but I do not want to weary the committee by reading too much. I may mention, however, that down in New Brunswick evidence was given before that commission by the Hon. Senator McSweeney, who had asked permission to relate some experiences he had had in connection with the cotton combine, if I may be allowed to use that word. According to him the experience had been very disastrous for some of the shareholders down there. I shall read only the last part of his statement. He said:

The last report of Dominion Textile is a very good one showing net earnings, on a business of $23,000,000 of about $3,500,000. They are now paying ten per cent. But the worst feature of the whole thing in connection with Dominion Textiles was the $5,000,000 of stock given by these gentlemen to themselves. The directors in Dominon Cotton were directors in Dominion Textile, A. F. Gault, Sir Rodolphe Forget, Sir Herbert Holt, and the others, and this stock pays them, according to the investigation held in Ottawa, I think before Pringle, 312 per cent annually. In other words, stock that cost them $10—

Mr. MARLER: Perhaps the hon. member would give us more details. He is offering a bald statement about 312 per cent per annum, about $5,000,000 worth of stock, and so on. It seems to me that he is placing on Hansard statements that are not quite accurate. I am not definitely contradicting him, but what he has stated does not seem to be the case. I take exception to these large figures being placed on Hansard without some reasonable explanation of them.

Mr. COOTE: I was just quoting from the evidence given by the Hon. Senator McSweeney before this commission, that is all.

Mr. MARLER: We are not bound, I suppose, to accept what Senator McSweeney says as absolutely right, any more than we are bound to accept the statement of my hon. friend himself as absolutely right. Why should we take it for granted—why should the whole country take it for granted—that the statement now being placed on our journals by the hon. gentleman are correct? I

repeat that I take distinct exception to that proceeding.

Mr. COOTE: Might I be permitted to quote from the Sessional Papers, volume 55, 1919, page 362. Mr. Daniels was being examined before the House of Commons Cost of Living Committee and was asked this question by Mr. Pringle:

Q. For 1918 you earned about 291 per cent?—A. Yes.

I will admit there is a slight discrepancy between the evidence given by Mr. Daniels and the statement made by the Hon. Senator McSweeney, but it is not very great. The Hon. Senator McSweeney says 312 per cent, and the witness says 291 per cent.

Mr. MARLER: Who says 291 per cent?

Mr. COOTE: Mr. F. G. Daniels in his evidence before the Cost of Living Committee of the House of Commons.

Mr. MARLER: He says, 291 per cent on what?

Mr. COOTE: It says:

Q. For 1918 you earned about 291 per cent?—A. Yes.

I could read two or three pages of the evidence to make it more clear, if my hon. friend desires.

Mr. MARLER: I would not like to impose as much as that upon the hon. member.

Mr. COOTE: I would be very glad to do it if the committee would like to have it.

Mr. FORKE: This is old stuff anyway. We all know it is the fact. It has never been refuted.

Mr. COOTE: Now, Mr. Chairman, I will complete the reading of this article:

In other words stock that cost him $10 a share is now in this depressed market worth $1,620 a share. Can you find any gold mine in the world doing better than that?

Mr. MARLER: Stock at $10 a share worth $260 a share?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Worth $1,600.

Mr MARLER: Is my hon. friend (Mr. Coote) aware what condition the Dominion Cotton Mills Company was in when it was originally taken over around 1892 by the Dominion Textile Company?

Mr. EVANS: What has that got to do with it?

Mr. MARLER: A great deal. I will tell my hon. friend in a moment what it has to do with it. The Dominion Cotton Mills at that time was not in a good condition, and it was only by excellent and careful management that the Dominion Textile Company is in the position it is in to-day—no other reason at all.

Mr. COOTE: I would remind my hon. friend that the Financial Post suggests that part of this prosperity may be due to the tariff. I think possibly it is only fair to Senator McSweeney in view of what the hon. member says, that I read his statement.

Mr. MARLER: I think that would hardly be fair. The hon. member has dealt with that.

Mr. LOGAN: It is the late Senator McSweeney. He is dead.

Mr. COOTE: I am glad to be corrected. I was not aware that he was dead. It seemed to me when I read this that it was of some interest. It has never been brought to the attention of the people of this country so far as I was aware, and I thought that the late Senator had made out a case of very harsh treatment by some of the officials of the Dominion Textile Company which our finance ministers past and present seem to be so anxious to protect. If we are going to protect any class of people in this country at the expense of the rest, we should know a little bit about their record and whether they are the right class of people to protect, whether they will use that protection in a proper manner. With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I will conclude this statement of the late Senator McSweeney. It is not very long and will probably clear up the point my hon. friend (Mr. Marler) has brought to the attention of the committee in regard to the position of some of these mills. This is the statement he made when he appeared before the Drayton tariff commission:

Gentlemen, I did not intend to have anything to say on the cotton question or any other, but as you have nothing to do in particular and I am anxious to give you something to listen to I shall just say a few words. What I have to say will not be very long. My first acquaintance with A. F. Gault, who was at the head of the Dominion Cotton Company, was about 1885 when he was here in Moncton. He bought up the mill here. The stockholders got 17 cents on the dollar. I was one of them. I think the Dominion Cotton Company took in about ten mills at that time, three of which were down in the Maritime provinces. They showed for ten years net earnings of $1,750,000. They had a bonded indebtedness of $1,500,000 which balanced the earnings and left a decent surplus of $250,000, or thereabouts. They then rented their property to the Dominion Textile Company. The Dominion Cotton Company owned the Hochelaga, and other, mills in Montreal and they leased their property to the Dominion Textile Company at a rental of five per cent. The minority stockholders, of whom I was one, unfortunately, objected to that and we fought them through the courts in the province of Quebec. We beat them in three courts there. They took it

to the Privy Council direct. We beat them the first time and we lost the second time. The costs amounted to about $10,000. Then they found that they had not such a good thing as they thought and they came to us or we came to them—we met any way—and they agreed to reinstate us in our stock and to pay the costs, which amounted to $10,000. A number of us accepted that offer and we got our stock back. We had lost all the dividends for five or six years. The small body that remained out did not accept that offer but they gave them two shares for one of stock and that made everything clear. They had a mill here and they could not give title to that mill unless they had everything clear. They had a mill in Windsor which is now running as an underwear factory. They had another plant in Halifax. So, you see, in so far as the Maritime provinces are concerned, they closed up the mill here and did the same thing in Windsor. They did not care two straws for us. As Charlie Gordon told me, they were anxious to concentrate their business in Montreal and they have done so.

Then follows the part I read before. He concludes:

Before I get through I will touch on my friend, Patton, another philanthropic gentleman who made a profit of 72 per cent, all told. He was not building his mill for the glory of God, but he was building it for the benefit of the stockholders. Our friends of the cotton mills, I think, enjoy a 25 per cent protection. They had 30 per cent but I think this present government reduced it 5 per cent.

I am afraid he made a mistake there unless he is referring to the preferential tariff. However, it is immaterial. He goes on:

When you gentlemen get back in Ottawa and sit down in your Council Chamber to make the tariff, if you give these gentlemen about 20 per cent of the cost of bringing their goods—buying them, freight carriage, insurance and various other things amounting to from 7½ to 10 per cent—you will give them ample—both the cotton and the woollen people. I do not think I will say very much more; there is not very much more to be said. I did not intend to say anything; I just came in accidentally and I did not bring any papers which might enable me to give you more details. I am very much obliged for your kind attention, and I will now take my seat.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to urge upon the minister the recommendation which the late Hon. Senator McSweeney made in regard to the protection which these industries might both enjoy. He suggests 10 per cent. He thinks that would be ample. I must say that it does appear to the ordinary man and woman in this country that if our cotton mills and woollen mills cannot exist with 10 per cent protection, surely we are protecting inefficiency. As a final word to the Minister of Finance, I am very sorry, and I think the people in this country generally speaking are very sorry, that he did not carry out the tariff plank in the Liberal party's platform, which said that the British preference be increased 50 per cent of the general tariff. I will admit that in many cases the British preference tariff is now very close to the 50 per cent line. I think on many lines of goods it might safely be reduced below that. I believe the late Senator McSweeney stated it very well when he said 10 per cent was ample on, I think, almost everything in the British preference. There may be some things in which they should not reduce the preference to 50 per cent of the general tariff; that is, items on which we are maintaining a revenue tariff, but on all others it seems to me the Finance Minister might have safely carried out this one plank in their platform, and I think it would have met with general approval from the people in this country, if he had carried out that part, at least, of the platform.

[Mr. Coote.]

Mr. MARLER: If the business people of Canada, those engaged in the various manufacturing industries, found they could not survive without a reduction of the British preference, and the mills had to close up as a consequence, would the hon. member approve of that? In other words, would he prefer to have the tariff reduced and the mills closed?

Mr. COOTE: I submit to this House, and to the hon. member who has asked the question, that I do not think it is a fair question at all.

An hon. MEMBER: Why?

Mr. COOTE: Because I do not think any man should admit that the cotton industry or the woollen industry could not survive with a 10 per cent tariff. Let me ask my hon. friend this question: If 75 per cent of the people engaged in the agricultural industry, or of the people engaged in the industry of growing wheat, were to come to this House and say "We cannot produce wheat at a profit at the present prices which we receive for our wheat and at the present prices which we must pay for everything we buy which goes into that wheat," would my hon. friend opposite be willing to reduce the tariff to secure a lower cost of living? Apply that principle to the woollen and cotton industry. Would the hon. member agree that those who are engaged in growing wheat should have cheaper cottons and cheaper woollens, so that the prices they are getting for their wheat would allow them to purchase these things? I think that is a fairer question than the one the hon. member propounded to me.

Mr. MALCOLM: My hon. friend from Macleod (Mr. Coote) is very much mistaken in his first observation that increasing the British preference would give us cheaper cotton goods. I did not wish to speak on cotton goods, but I would like to make an observation on that item. During last year the importation of knitted cotton goods from the

United Kingdom was very small. We imported only 20,319 pairs of cotton socks and stockings from the United Kingdom, but we imported 544,538 pairs of cotton socks and stockings from the United States; so that the British preference plays very little part in the matter of importation of cotton hosiery.

Mr. COOTE: If the present tariff charge against hosiery from Great Britain were cut in two would we bring any more hose from Great Britain, or would the Canadian manufacturer simply meet the price and go on manufacturing?

Mr. MALCOLM: I am speaking of the importation of cotton hosiery. It would not make any difference in the cost of cotton hosiery if the British preference were increased, because the cotton hosiery does not come from Great Britain, but from the United States. But I rose to point out that in the knitting mill business in the province of Ontario there are employed a very fine class of Canadian citizens, under conditions quite different from the conditions prevailing in the Old Land. The mills in the province of Ontario are conducted under regulations which are advantageous to Canadian workmen and conditions that do not apply in the Old Land, and the Canadian manufacturers of knitted goods in the small towns of Ontario and in my own constituency are paying fifty per cent more wages than the current rate of wages in Scotland and England. We are working under a minimum wage law; we are working under the Workmen's Compensation Act and the Factory Inspection Act, all of which we are strongly in favour of, in order that the work men and working women may be placed under the best working conditions. There are hon. members in this House who came from Great Britain, and who came to this country to find better conditions, and we have them here. The only protection, or the only consideration, that the knitting mills of the province are asking is a tariff which will offset the additional labour costs they are bearing in Ontario. Beyond that they ask for nothing. I will point out to my hon. friends that $100 worth of merchandise represents about $40 worth of labour, or $20 need of protection. That is the actual protection that is needed for labour. Then again there is the duty on machinery and the sales tax on wool which is being removed by the Finance Minister's budget. The knitting mills in Ontario require just that much protection for that purpose, and if hon. members are fair with regard to tariff matters, and with regard to British preference, they must take into consideration this one vital point—do you want your Ontario workmen, or your workman for that matter from any other part of the Dominion, to maintain the conditions under which he is working or do you want him to meet the competitive wages of Great Britain?

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): If the Ontario workmen are enjoying better conditions in their work than the British workmen, would they not to that extent be more efficient?

Mr. MALCOLM: I can answer the question this way, that the efficiency of the workmen in a hosiery mill is not so much a factor as my hon. friend might suggest. It is a business, largely of automatic machinery; the machinery mostly all is imported. The worker's efficiency is regulated entirely by the machinery, and the conditions are identical in Scotland and in Canada, because our knitting mills have installed during the past few years the very best type of Scottish and English equipment. The machinery is exactly the same and the speed of operators, I am told by those who have studied the question, varies but little between the British and Canadian mills. The knitted goods men in this country point out that under last year's tariff there was a large increase in the importation of knitted goods from the Old Land, but I do not think they objected seriously to that. But this year they point out that the importation of hosiery from Great Britain will not arrive in this country at any lower price than last year under the tariff existing last year. One hundred dollars' value in hosiery last year paid $25 duty and $4.69 sales tax, or a total value of $129.69. Under the new tariff it pays for $100 value, $22.50 duty and $7.35 sales tax, a total value of $129.85, or 16 cents additional on $100 value. The domestic manufacturer under the old tariff would receive $100 plus the sales tax $2.25, making a total cost of $102.25 to the retailer. Under this new tariff his value was $100, but he must take credit for the saving of 3¾ per cent on his wool value of $50, making a saving of $1.88. Then he adds a sales tax of 6 per cent, which is $5.89. His total cost is $104.01, or an increase in cost of $1.76. In other words we are not delivering the British article at as low a price as we did last year. In fact, the price is 16 cents more and we are taking out of the Canadian knit goods manufacturer $1.76 or 1¾ per cent. Hon. gentlemen might think that was a very small thing, but on behalf of the small hosiery mills, I should like to say that 10 cents a dozen pairs is considered a good profit for the mill. Ten cents a dozen pairs will give a mill a reason-

ably large earning. When there is no actual saving to the public by the new tariff condition, there is a good deal to be said in favour of these mills when a load of $1.76 per one hundred dollars is put upon them because in the total aggregate that load amounts practically to the earnings of their mills.

My hon. friend made some statements about earnings of cotton or textile mills. I am not inclined to doubt his statements but on behalf of the smaller industries in Ontario which are vital to the life of many of the small towns, industries which are financed without any watered stock, with the invested capital of men who have made all their own money and who have made it in the industries, I submit to my hon. friends this one consideration, that in applying a reduction of 50 per cent in the British preference, they would succeed in closing or making it impossible to work many of the finest and most hopeful small industries in Ontario, and that they would not give them the protection to which they are entitled owing to the different wages paid and the different standards of living asked for by provincial regulations. This is a point that my hon. friends must consider in dealing with these tariff matters and it is the only viewpoint I take with regard to the question. We talk a good deal about our living conditions in Canada and we hope to attract workmen and other men besides, by these better conditions which we offer them. That is correct. But if on the one hand we press for a certain condition and a certain rate of wages, and on the other we lower the rate of duty so that the payment of that rate of wages will not be permitted, we are leaving our workmen and our manufacturers between the upper and the nether millstones, so that they cannot survive.

Mr. COOTE: If I might use the words of the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Marler) my hon. friend, if I understood him correctly, made the bald statement that wages were 50 per cent higher in our Canadian mills than they were in Great Britain. Would he give this committee some statistics to show that that is the case?

Mr. MALCOLM: I am sorry I cannot give the hon. member for Macleod (Mr. Coote) the exact figures; but I can assure him that I will secure them for him and that the statement is quite correct that in the knitting industry in Ontario wages are 50 per cent higher than in the knitting industry in Scotland and England. I think the piece work wage for men in Scotland is about $11 or $12 a week and the day wage is slightly less. I would rather not quote, because I am speaking from memory and I am not quite sure as to the figures. I shall however be glad to procure the figures for my hon. friend this afternoon. I have the figures in my office.

Mr. COOTE: Would my hon. friend be good enough to give the committee also some idea of the difference in the cost of living in England and Canada?

Mr. MALCOLM: I have no doubt the cost of living has a direct bearing on the cost of labour. That does not enter into this argument at all.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I rise in the first instance to congratulate the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. Malcolm). He has given us a first rate exposition of what ought to be the underlying principles of the budget. He has shown us that the protective feature ought to be and must be considered, that is of course if we are going to continue to function. He has shown us that he has no use whatever for that old bugaboo of a "tariff for revenue" which really never bugabooed at all. He has shown us that we ought to have consideration on the one hand of the cost to the consumer and on the other to the returns to the workmen. He has gone further; he has shown us very clearly what the effect of a muddled view of these things is. He has shown us for example that on the one hand there is less protection to the Canadian workmen, and on the other hand there is greater cost to the Canadian consumer. I was going to say—and I would not have said it nearly as well—something along the same lines in answer to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) when he said, "This is a new doctrine and a new theory—advance tariffs and you get lower rates; cut them and you have higher rates." The whole thing runs together; there is only one issue here—the fiscal policy as a whole. At one time, for example, practically all tin plate utilized in the United States—my hon. friend knows this just as well if not better than I do—was imported, all the costs of transportation paid, all the costs of handling at the ports paid, and then a far higher rate was paid than you can buy tin-plate for to-day in the States. It is also true that by a high tariff costs were temporarily increased largely; but it is also true that it was not so very many years before those people were exporting that tin-plate, and that high tariff has very greatly reduced the cost in that country. It is also, of course, true that if

you have enough people who are engaged in active competition one with another, you are getting your prices pretty well regulated in your local market. It is also true that those prices can be proper prices only if you have something like a proper volume of business. If you have not a proper volume of business and are working only 30 per cent of your time, your overhead must go up, just as happened last year with that reduction in the duty. It is also true that the English sellers, selling as they do in this market, take precious good care that the Canadian consumer does not get all the benefit of the Canadian preference, but the benefit of the preference goes to the man who is in the position to collect it, as he is just as soon as local production is down to such a point that local costs have to go up. There is no mystery about the thing. The Minister of Finance is extremely agile in taking one or two disconnected instances and having a "hurrah" on them; he is a perfect adept at that. He is an absolute wizard at the art of misrepresenting an argument; he is a wonderful politician. But just see how the hon. member for North Bruce answers him. Why, he says, under this budget—and he gives the exact figures—while you are reducing protection and, therefore, taking away the work from your own people, you are adding to the cost. It is all very well to have a trifling reduction. and I still say that the reductions in the mass were trifling. But if there is anything in this idea about cutting and slashing tariffs, the object should be to reduce prices. A little niggling reduction here and another one there is not going to do very much except to disturb Canadian industrial conditions; it is not going to reflect itself to any extent in reduced prices to the Canadian consumer. At any rate, that is what we have found. When my hon. friend comes down here and makes a tariff reduction on the one hand and then plusses it with a sales tax much greater on the other hand, what else is to be expected? Everyone knows that every word said by the hon. member (Mr. Malcolm) is absolutely correct; the figures are there and they cannot be disputed. An hon. gentleman opposite shakes his head. If he can discover how a reduction in the cost of living is brought about by a 2½ per cent or 3 per cent, or if you like, a 4 per cent reduction of duty on the one hand, and a sales tax of 6 per cent on the other hand, I cannot see it. The minister is an adept at putting the other fellow in the wrong.

Mr. FIELDING: When he is wrong.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: He does it beautifully, and the other fellow need not be wrong at all. Now, I am going to go back to what I said before.

Mr. BUREAU: "Far away from harm."

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend from Three Rivers says, "Back to the farm."

Mr. BUREAU: "Far away from harm."

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Well, I think that if we did go there we should get more facts than we have got this afternoon. I will take the figures dealing exactly with the matters I submitted to my hon. friend. I find that my memory was somewhat below the actual truth in the matter of yardage. Speaking about the quantity of woollen yardage, I stated the increase and my hon. friend told me that it was absolutely untrue.

Mr. FIELDING: I did not say that; that is very harsh language.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am giving the effect of what the hon. gentleman said. He is never harsh, but I believe in calling a spade a spade. He said that the figure I gave proved that I was absolutely wrong; perhaps I will put it that way. I will give him the figures taken from the monthly reports of the trade of Canada. These figures are prepared from the records of the monthly reports of the trade of Canada for ten months ending January 23, 1923, and a proportional allowance is made to give the figures up to the end of March, the comparison being as at the end of March 1922 and 1923. If I remember rightly, I think I said that the woollen yardage imported into Canada had increased some 52 per cent. For the year ending March, 1922, there were 12,208,523 yards of woollen yardage imported into Canada, and for the year ending March, 1923, 18,793,613 yards, or an approximate increase of 54 per cent. The next matter I took up was hosiery and socks. Speaking from recollection I stated that the increase in quantity in this direction was 104 per cent; I will now give the exact number of dozens of pairs imported. For the year ending March, 1922, there were 257,089 dozen pairs imported into Canada; for the year ending March, 1923, there were 610,372 dozen pairs imported, or an approximate increase, not of 104 per cent, as I thought, but 138 per cent. These are the figures I have, and as I have said, the source from which they come is to be found in the monthly reports of the trade of Canada. I believe they are absolutely correct, and the very shutting down of the mills would show that they are.

Mr. BALDWIN: The hon. member (Sir Henry Drayton) has made many criticisms regarding the closing down of mills and the suspension of operations, and the bearing of these conditions on the prices of woollen goods throughout Canada. I believe that neither the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) nor the woollen industry is to blame for this serious state of affairs. The fact is that within the past few months the great woollen industries of New England have invaded Canada and have purchased every pound of wool that has been available. They bought not only what was in storage throughout the country but what was on the backs of the sheep, for which they contracted. No doubt the mills have had to suspend operations, and we can easily explain the situation by taking as an analogy the wheat industry, for instance. When wheat is high, flour and other wheat products must necessarily be high at the same time. And the same thing holds true in regard to rubber. If a great rubber enterprise is strong enough to go abroad and contract for raw rubber at very low prices, the rubber industry generally must be affected. But not all the rubber concerns can do this and our woollen mills in Canada could not have anticipated such enterprise on the part of industries that had been closed down in the United States for years; they could not have anticipated that these industries would be in a position to come into Canada and forestall them. So that I do not see that anyone can blame the Minister of Finance. My hon. friend (Sir Henry Drayton) has repeatedly asked the minister the question: "Are you not aware that the prices of woollen goods are increasing? Do you not know that several of the mills have had to close down?" Well, had these mills been able to secure their raw material and circumvent the action of the New England industries, conditions would no doubt have been different to-day. That is the situation as I see it, and I believe I have stated it correctly.

Mr. WHITE: I wish to protest against this change in the British preference; I believe that the continual reduction of the preference from year to year will have but one effect, and that will be disaster. What we are faced with now is a competition between the standards of living of the British workmen and of the Canadian factory hand. The Canadian manufacturer, under the conditions forced upon him by these reductions, is bound to reduce costs. Coming from a constituency in which there are about four factories making woollen and knitted goods, I am naturally more or less interested in this question. I received a letter from one of them this morning stating that there had been a great increase in the importation of knitted and woollen goods from Great Britain since the change in the duty last year, and also pointing out that at the present time all the woollen mills in this country are experiencing the keenest competition they have ever known. As soon as the manufacturer is faced with the necessity of reducing costs, he has, among other things, to reduce wages. If his factory is working only part-time, perhaps four or five days a week, the pay envelope of the worker is very much reduced, and he in turn is forced to decide between remaining where he is or going where he can get a better living. And it does not take long for the Canadian worker to decide when to move over to the United States, particularly under present conditions. Very many members of the House deplore the fact that a number of Canadian workers have gone to the United States in the last six months, and it seems to me that a change in the tariff such as is now proposed accelerates rather than retards this exodus. After we have accomplished that we spend large sums of money inducing immigrants to come to this country and then move through the same circle all over again.

Mr. FORKE: I have a good deal of sympathy with hon. members who have spoken along this line. I should like, however, to ask them: Have they ever taken into consideration the standard of living of the people who are engaged in an industry that has to compete against all the world, that has no protection whatever? The most poorly paid labour in the world can compete with our agriculturists in the production of the staple article which they have to sell in the world's market. That is one primary fact that we must get into our minds to start with. I listened with a good deal of interest to the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. Malcolm). He always speaks sanely and moderately, and I have no doubt he is quite sincere in his statements regarding our small woollen manufacturers. I saw an article in the Montreal Gazette the other day which no doubt contains a certain amount of truth, although I cannot vouch for it. It mentions that a box of apples packed by a Perth farmer brought him 40 cents. He placed a ticket in the box asking the purchaser to advise him what price he paid for the contents, and in due time he received a letter from a farmer in Saskatchewan stating that the apples had cost him $2.60. There you have the great spread between 40 cents and $2.60. When the hon. member for North Bruce stated that 10 cents

was a fair profit for the manufacturer on a dozen pair of stockings I should like him to have told us the retail price of a pair of such stockings. No doubt the information would be very interesting. I think a great many of our difficulties are due to this unreasonable spread between the price received by the producer and that paid by the consumer.

I should like to see our manufacturers and our farmers get a little closer together in order that they may the better understand each other's problems. I have no ill feeling towards the manufacturers. It seems to be a generally accepted idea that we are fighting the manufacturers. This is not the case. We are fighting a system that we do not think is working out to the best interests of the people. I stated quite recently that the cost of living here is as high as it is in any other part of the world, whereas this ought to be one of the cheapest countries to live in. This is one reason why we cannot compete successfully in manufacturing. A good deal has been said this afternoon about the standard of living in the Old Land. It is forty years since I left Scotland. I knew a great deal about the woollen mills of Galashiels and other centres, having come from the border counties, and I can tell you, Mr. Chairman, that at that time the condition of the workers in those mills was just as good as the condition of the farmers on the plains of Manitoba to-day. So when the cost of living is blamed on the farmers I resent it. I question if there is very much difference between the conditions in that woollen district and in our maunfacturing districts to-day except in the cost of living. If a worker in the mills here or a mechanic wants to buy a cottage it costs him a large amount of money, and the cost of his food and clothing is also very high. Consequently, his living expenses being very high, the employer must pay him correspondingly high wages, and therefore is unable to compete successfully with the manufacturers in other parts of the world. We have a vicious system working in a vicious circle, and it seems to me that we are never going to get out of it, for apparently my hon. friend from West York (Sir Henry Drayton), like Ephraim, is "wedded to his idols."

I want to remove the idea that we are hostile to the manufacturing interests merely for the sake of hostility. I am always glad to see our manufacturers prospering. I should like to see all our manufacturing industries prosper, but if this is to be at the expense of the other sections of the community which, I claim, are engaged in the basic industries of our country, then I demur. I had a gentleman this day seriously proposing to me a minimum price for wheat. He was of opinion that if the farmers of this country could be assured of a price to cover the cost of production Canada would become enormously prosperous in the very near future because such a great impulse would be given to production. This proposal is not so absurd as it may appear at first sight once you look into it. When we remember how often we are told that it is absolutely necessary for our manufacturing industries to be helped along, why should the farmers on the prairie provinces continue to produce wheat at a loss to feed the poor people on the continent of Europe?

Mr. WHITE: Does the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Forke) consider he would have done just as well had he remained working in the woollen mills of Scotland instead of coming to Canada?

Mr. FORKE: I never worked in the woollen mills of Scotland. I can tell my hon. friend the advice I got before I left the Old Land to come to Canada, and that was: Go where there is money. And being of the type that I am it is most likely that I would get it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: And you got it?

Mr. FORKE: I am glad to say, Mr. Chairman, that knowing the Old Flag waved over Canada, I decided to become a Canadian. I am here, and I want everyone to understand that I am a Canadian through and through.

Mr. MORRISON: I have been very much interested in the figures quoted by those who have preceded me. The ex-Minister of Finance, (Sir Henry Drayton), pointed out that for the year ending March 1922, we imported 12,208,523 yards of woollen goods, worth $472,000. This amounts to only 6 cents per capita of our population. For the following year ending March 1923, the importation amounted to 18,793,613 yards worth $962,000, or under 10 cents per capita. It looks to me as if the two old parties are vieing with each other and spending much time trying to assure the manufacturers that their interests will be well looked after. Relatively speaking, these importations are trifling. When the manufacturers ask for protection they do not produce their books, they do not get down to business and prove that they really need protection. We are held up as a party that believes in ruining the manufacturing industries. That is altogether wrong. We want to see industries of all kinds prospering in this country, for we realize that it is to the national benefit that industries native to the country

should be prosperous. But we want to have a little share in the prosperity. I know there are Canadian industries making big dividends to-day. The secretary-treasurer of one particular industry told me that for twenty-five years they have never earned less than 20 per cent, and in some years even 50 per cent, and the stockholders have never got less than 10 per cent cash dividend; yet that industry is highly protected.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is the name?

Mr. MORRISON: I am not going to enter into personalities. Other speakers have not given facts about their business, and I am not going to divulge personal confidences. But this discussion has been carried on this afternoon over relatively small matters, and as far as the tariff is concerned they look to me to be of no importance. The hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. Malcolm) said that 72,000 dozen pairs of cotton stockings had been imported from Great Britain in 1922 and 962,000 dozen from the United States. Well, what does that amount to when you come to consider the population? It is one dozen pairs for every seven or eight people in the country. I think we are spending a good deal of time over the woollen and cotton manufacturers that is not getting us anywhere.

Mr. FIELDING: I do not know whether we will make very much progress by quoting statistics, though they are sometimes helpful. An irreverent person, possibly, with a sense of humour, has prescribed what he calls the three stages of inveracity: the lie, the blank lie—the word originally was not "blank"—and statistics. I do not want to throw discredit upon statistics, especially those of the Customs department. But here is a very interesting point that is worth mentioning while we are on the subject, especially having regard to the warning of the hon. member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton) that we must deal with quantities, not values. In the fiscal year 1921 we imported raw wool to the amount of 9,250,000 pounds weight—not dollars. In the fiscal year 1922, we imported 12,500,000 pounds; in the fiscal year 1923, 18,250,000 pounds weight. Now, were we buying this raw wool and throwing it away? It seems to me that that raw wool must have been employed in the making of woollen goods here,—and somebody must have been busy.

Mr. GOOD: I would like to make a few observations on some of the—

[Mr. Morisson.]

Mr. FIELDING: We are dealing with the British preference clause. My hon. friend moved a resolution regarding the reciprocity clause; we will deal with that after six o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall paragraph one carry.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I gathered from the tenor of the remarks of my hon. friend that we are going to equalize the duties under the French treaty as respects the duties on goods imported by Canada from Great Britain.

Mr. FIELDING: I did not make any reference to it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I rather gathered that was what we were doing it for.

Mr. FIELDING: That is the effect of it, largely.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think my hon. friend gave us that impression during the discussion of the French treaty; of course, if he says not, I will take his word for it.

Mr. FIELDING: It was referred to, yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think that statement is correct.

Mr. FIELDING: I said that we should wait and see.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Brant (Mr. Good) has the floor. I thought the hon. member for West York was merely asking a question.

Mr. GOOD: Mr. Chairman, I wish to make some observations on a few of the remarks that have been made during the last hour and a half. It is quite true that the problems we have been discussing are complicated. One of the causes of difficulty is the problem of distribution; the tariff is another item. I think it is just as well to remember that there may be a number of causes which give rise to a particular situation. Attention has been drawn this afternoon to the present industrial conditions in the United States, and I want to suggest that it is a pertinent question for us to ask ourselves why there has been an improvement in industrial conditions in that country, while there has not been such an improvement here. I am not going to answer that question, but it is a very pertinent one. We may interpret the facts quite differently. We may say it is due to tariff conditions when it may be due to entirely different conditions.

With regard to the standards of living, the hon. member for London (Mr. White) has

made the statement that the protective tariff is necessary for us to preserve a certain standard of living in this country. Now so far as the farmers are concerned, the Canadian farmer competes freely in the open market with the producers of India, who live on an entirely different standard, and I submit to the hon. member that we have to take into consideration the efficiency of the people who work and live under different conditions. I submit in all confidence that generally speaking he will find that those who live on a higher standard are more efficient; and that equalizes the difference in the standard of living.

With regard to the point raised by the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. Malcolm) as to the wages being paid to workmen in Canadian mills, I submit to him and to the House that we must take into account, not the nominal wages, but the real wages the workmen receive; that is to say, the purchasing power of the money which they receive in this country as compared with the purchasing power of the money which the workmen receive in Great Britain, and if that is taken into consideration I think we shall find that the two sets of workmen are practically on a par. In that connection I would like to submit to the same hon. member and to the House that it is in the interest of the manufacturers that the cost of living, which is enhanced in this country by tariff duties, should be reduced. That will make the production of manufactured goods cheaper, and will not only enable our own people to get these goods cheaper but will also enable our manufacturers to compete to some extent in the foreign market.

With regard to the whole situation it seems to me that we ought to have some kind of fundamental principle to which to refer our specific acts. If we are going to adopt the principle and policy that every particular industry has got to be made to pay, and if we are going to subsidize them by state action until they do pay, then the only thing to do is to have a fair deal all round. The farmers say, and I think they could prove with absolute certainty, that under present conditions they cannot produce wheat, particularly in our western provinces, and make ends meet. If we are going to follow the policy with regard to them that we have followed in the case of some of the manufacturers, we shall have to give them a subsidy or bounty on their wheat. I think a farmer could make a nice little profit with a bounty of 50 cents a bushel on his wheat. If we are going to adopt the principle, make it fair all round. But I submit that the whole thing is unsound, and if we are going to follow that principle we shall get led into all kinds of difficulties. I would like to see this government, as I have stated on previous occasions recognize that there are a lot of industries like people walking on stilts. They have to be got down to the ground, and they should be got down as quickly as possible, and then we shall have a condition where industries that are natural to this country will be developed, and industries that cannot be made to pay in this country will not be maintained as parasites on the successful and indigenous industries. I think there has been, and is now, a good deal of fallacy in regard to a number of these questions.

Just one other point before I sit down. The hon. ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) stated that in his opinion domestic competition would regulate prices, and therefore we did not need to take account of the tariff. I submit that under the protection of the tariff it is almost inevitable in a great variety of industries that manufacturers should get together and agree on prices, and pretty soon we have no competition. If we could maintain real active competition among the manufacturers, then the protective duty would not be so serious, but the fact of the matter is the tariff is an encouragement to combines, and pretty soon we are up against the situation where there is not any competition and the consumers are exploited for the benefit of a monopoly. If we could preserve competition it would not be so very serious a matter, because all profits tend to the same level, but where you have no real competition, and I do think that in many, many lines we have had no real competition at all, it is a very serious matter to maintain the tariff.

Resolution No. 1 agreed to.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess

The committee resumed at eight o'clock, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

2. Resolved, that the Customs tariff, 1907 be further amended by adding after section 8A the following as sections 8B and 8C:—

8B. The Governor in Council may authorize any Minister of the Crown to enter into negotiations with any authorized representative of the government of the United States with a view to the making of a commercial agreement between the two countries on terms that may be deemed mutually beneficial. Any agreement so made shall be subject to the approval of the parliament of Canada.

8C. If the President of the United States, under authority of the United States Tariff Act of 1922, deter-

mines to reduce by fifty per cent the duties imposed by such act on the following articles, that is to say:—

Cattle; wheat; wheat flour; oats, barley, potatoes onions; turnips; hay; fish as enumerated in paragraphs 717, 718, 719 and 720 of the said Tariff Act of 1922, the Governor in Council may by order in council make such reductions of duties on similar articles imported into Canada from the United States as may be deemed reasonable by way of compensation for such reductions on Canadian products imported into the United States.

Mr. FIELDING: I move to strike out the words "by fifty per cent" after the word "reduce" in the second line of paragraph 8 C.

The hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Forke) offered a suggestion in regard to an amendment here. If anybody in his behalf would like to take the matter up, I have no objection. It was on the second reciprocity resolution. Perhaps we had better wait a few minutes.

Mr. MANION: I have no desire to hold up the resolution, but I would like the minister to wait a few minutes, in case the hon. leader of the Opposition might wish to say something.

Mr. FIELDING: Very well. We can go on to another item.

Resolution stands.

Customs tariff—Schedule A:

3. Resolved, that schedule A to the Customs Tariff, 1907, as amended by chapter sixteen of the statutes of 1910, by chapter twenty-six of the statutes of 1914, by chapter five of the statutes of 1914 (second session), by chapter forty-seven of the statutes of 1919, by chapter twenty-seven of the statutes of 1921, by chapter nineteen of the statutes of 1922, and by order in council, be further amended by striking thereout tariff items:—83a, 99, 134, 135, 143a, 168, 235, 242, 281, 328, 348b, 365, 374, 386, 441a, 442, 469, 586, 638a, 670, 690a, 710b, the several enumerations of goods respectively, and the several rates of duties of customs, if any, set opposite each of said items, and to repeal section 1 (i) of Order in Council, P.C. 16/1556, dated fifth day of June, 1912, designated as item 760 of The Customs Tariff, and to provide that the following items, enumerations and rates of duty be inserted in schedule A:—

Mr. FIELDING: I wish to make a slight correction in paragraph 1 of resolution No. 3. I move to amend the resolution as follows:

That item No. 242 be struck out, and that items 581 and 581a be inserted after the item 469.

Amendment agreed to.

Customs tariff—Hemp seed for agricultural purposes:—British preferential tariff free; Intermediate tariff free; General tariff free.

Mr. FIELDING: The first item in this resolution is 72, "Hemp seed for agricultural purposes," is free under all the tariffs.

Item agreed to.

[Mr. Fielding.]

Customs tariff—Potatoes when imported from a country which imposes a customs duty on potatoes grown in Canada, per 100 pounds, British preferential tariff 20 cents; Intermediate tariff, 35 cents; General tariff 35 cents.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This is slightly more than the previous rate.

Mr. FIELDING: It is a mere change from bushels to per 100 pounds, and the figures are believed to be the exact equivalent, within a fraction.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Slightly over.

Mr. FIELDING: Possibly so.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—Prunes and dried plums, unpitted, per pound: British preferential tariff ½ cent; Intermediate tariff ⅔ cents; General tariff ⅔ cents.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is the effect of this change?

Mr. FIELDING: In the first item just read there is no change, but the next item, which we might read in connection with it, needs an explanation. That is the duty on raisins and dried currants, which I mentioned as having relation to the possibility of business with Australia. It will be remembered I explained to the House that, although the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Robb) had not been fortunate enough to conclude an agreement with Australia, he had reason to believe a change of this nature would go a long way towards inducing the Australian government to make an arrangement with us, and for that reason the proposal was made that "raisins and dried currants" should be made free from Australia—free under the preference—while the duty of 3 cents, which is an increase, is to be imposed under the intermediate and general tariffs. On further consideration it occurs to us that while the object is a commendable one, we have this situation; that it may be some time before the Australian government will manifest their concurrence and offer any return. We propose by way of amendment to let that duty stand for the present, with the condition that we may bring in the new duty by proclamation by the Governor in Council; that is to say, when we get any intimation from Australia that she is willing to reciprocate this new duty will be imposed. In the meantime the old duty will remain. There has been some criticism in regard to this on the ground that it is a substantial increase of duty. The object I have already explained. As some months may elapse before we can get the Australian government to take any action, we think it is wise to make a provision that the duty for the present shall

remain unchanged, and that the other duty shall come into effect only on proclamation of the Governor in Council.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Surely after the trip of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Robb), we are not still without any results at all? If I remember rightly, the minister, by a policy of discreet silence and wise looks, rather led us to believe that he had made considerable progress in Australia. Is he not yet ready to disclose just the extent of that progress? Is the whole result of his visit to be that he is able to advise us to put a duty on raisins and currants.

Mr. ROBB: The Australian government will meet next week and we shall hear what they have to say.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Would it not be well to hear what our plenipotentiary has to disclose in the meantime?

Mr. BUREAU: It would be very undiplomatic to disclose it.

Mr. ROBB: My right hon. friend must exercise a little patience.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am led to infer that the extent of the progress made is indicated in the speech of the minister. Can we not get any further information? What does he expect to get from Australia when he goes back? Is all that he is looking for something that can be gained by giving Australia a preference on currants and raisins? Is there nothing else that would be more adequate compensation for what he expects to get by way of concessions from Australia? I have not seen very much in the way of tariff reciprocity or tariff reduction in evidence in the Australian policy of late, not on the part of the Labour party, nor of the Liberal party, nor of the Country party. The minister has been to Australia, and if he has not forgotten his impressions because of the length of the journey he took coming home, surely he can give us some idea of what the nature of this Australian treaty will probably be.

Mr. ROBB: My hon. friend will have to exercise a little further patience until our Australian friends have time to meet and to submit their proposition to their parliament.

Mr. MEIGHEN: So as yet we have not got to the extent of even a proposition. The minister, in the midst of an election in Australia, went all the way around by the Fiji islands, called on Australia, received their hospitality, made speeches at their banquets, came back through the southern tepid waters, sailed along the coast of China—

Mr. ROBB: No.

Mr. MEIGHEN: —not too far away, I hope, to be admired by the aborigines on shore. Then he bathed his intellect in the ancient lore of India, came along the Suez canal and, I suppose, explored the recesses of the Nile, possibly anticipated the march of Britain's aristocracy into the tombs of the Pharaohs. Finally he came home, and all we can get is that we are waiting for a proposition from Australia.

Mr. BUREAU: My right hon. friend knows that you cannot disclose diplomatic relations without the consent of the other party.

Mr. MEIGHEN: May we know who is likely to be the next missionary to Australia? From what I hear in this debate the chances appear to favour the Minister of Customs and Excise (Mr. Bureau).

Mr. BUREAU: I wish they would.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What itinerary would he likely take?

Mr. BUREAU: I will consult my right hon. friend. He knows his geography so well and seems to have enjoyed those various climates.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have never seen them nor felt them.

Mr. BUREAU: Then I will not consult my right hon. friend. He is drawing on his imagination.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We attended to business when we were in power. With us the matter was not one merely of globe-trotting and pastimes of that sort. I think, however, the committee can readily conclude that there was no result whatever from the visit to Australia, and judging from the preparation being made in this budget, little hope may be entertained.

Mr. LAPOINTE: That is eloquence.

Mr. GOULD: I am pleased to note that my right hon. friend is pressing this point with the minister and the government, because, while he stated that nothing was secured, the fact remains, according to the item under discussion, that we have received an extra three cents per pound duty, or an increase in price to the consuming public. Upon that basis it is not for us to suggest that other ministers should go next year, but rather we would suggest that they should all be kept at home. If that is a means of paying expenses, it is very expensive on the rest of us, particularly in the West, where not being able to grow apples and other fruits, we buy raisins and this article appears very

frequently by compulsion on our tables. Why try to induce our Australian cousins to enter into a treaty with us if a treaty of this nature is going to be more expensive to us? If that be the case, we shall do without the treaty and build up a Canada of our own, or as the old phrase goes, attend to our own business absolutely, because I do not believe it is good policy to pay a price to get a treaty such as is indicated by this item. Possibly if this item should pass without any criticism whatever, other ministers might be inclined to go next year and bring us back further concessions of this nature. We have been protesting for a long time against this principle, and I protest at the present time against this thing of going any further.

Mr. BANCROFT: I am glad the government has decided not to put into effect this increase of 250 per cent in the tariff tax on raisins and currants. This would mean, I believe, an increase of about 4 cents a pound to the consumer in Canada on this staple article of food. Based on last year's consumption, an increase of 4 cents a pound would mean $1,489,538 that the people of Canada would have to pay more for raisins and currants because of this duty if it goes into effect. Last year we purchased over 30,000,000 pounds of raisins from the United States and only 280 pounds from Australia. If we purchased all the raisins that Australia produces, this would supply only one-third of our requirements.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It would be some treaty.

Mr. BANCROFT: Yes, it is quite a treaty. This new tariff means that we would tax the people of Canada approximately one and one-half million dollars for the purpose of hauling raisins and currants seven thousand miles from Australia. I am glad the government is not going to put this new duty into effect, at least for the time being.

Mr. EVANS: I should like the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Robb) to give us some idea of the raisin business in Australia. This seems to be one of the most foolish items that has come out in the budget this year. Since we purchase so little from Australia, this thing looks to me like an excuse to raise the general tariff to three cents a pound. There is no excuse for this duty, by which we increase the price of a commodity which is so much needed by rich and poor alike. There is simply no excuse for making such a treaty on this basis with Australia, since the Australians cannot supply us with anything like the quantity we need even if we take all they raise. The minister might give us some idea in regard to that industry in Australia.

Mr. ROBB: The Australian crop of raisins is considerable and is increasing yearly; and especially in the Madura district and in other parts where returned soldiers have been engaged, they have been producing a splendid quality of raisins in large quantities. There is such a bulk of raisins there now that some difficulty is being found in marketing them, and as hon. gentlemen may have noticed, they have been urging the British government to give them a preference in this direction. While it is true that in the tariff we are proposing to increase somewhat the duty on raisins, hon. gentlemen have lost sight of the fact that we are making them free in the British preferential list; that is to say, if raisins come from Australia or any other British possession they will enter Canada free. Bearing that in mind, it might be well to consider the policies of other countries in regard to this particular commodity. If my hon. friends want to have raisins absolutely free from any customs duties, I do not know where they could go to find a tariff that would suit them. Let me put on Hansard the duties levied in certain other countries. For example, in the United States there is a tax on raisins of 2 cents per pound; in Mexico 3 cents; in the Argentine republic, 3 cents under certain conditions and 5 cents under other circumstances; in Brazil 7½ cents per pound. Free trade Great Britain has a tax on raisins of 2¼ cents per pound and gives under the British preference 5/6 of the total rate. So that after all we are only increasing our tariff by ¾ of a cent more than the rate that now obtains in Great Britain, and we are going one better by making them free on the preferential list. Belgium levies a rate of 2¾ cents per pound; Italy, 3⅓ cents a pound; and a number of other countries have rates in proportion, ranging from ½ cent up to 7 and 8 cents a pound.

Mr. BANCROFT: Does the minister argue that the price of raisins in this country will be reduced by placing this commodity on the free list under the British preference?

Mr. ROBB: I do not think the price will be increased.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Are the Australian raisins seedless?

Mr. ROBB: They are both.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I am informed by a large user of raisins in my own district that the

Australian raisins are not seedless, nor are they as good as the others. I am glad to see that the Minister of Finance has set aside this particular clause for the time being. I have a telegram from certain manufacturers of mincemeat in my own district who use large quantities of raisins, and they tell me that such a duty as this will be a great handicap to their particular business. The minister has reduced the duty on the British goods of their manufacture, while at the same time it is proposed to impose a duty on the ingredients that go into that article. That seems to be cutting on both sides of this business.

Mr. FIELDING: A case of mincemeat.

Mr. CHAPLIN: It is more than mincemeat so far as they are concerned. I do not know that a machine is necessary to put them out of business; that is being done pretty effectively now. The same company make plum puddings, and I fancy that the plum pudding business in Canada will go; and they will also be hurt, under the British preference, in the manufacture of jams. I heard the other day that the English people were putting a big tax on sugar. Now, when that sugar is exported into Canada in jams and in mincemeat the English manufacturer virtually gets a rebate of the tax on sugar. I should like to know whether there is any method of putting on an extra tax to meet the importation of sugar as embodied in these goods. Practically 65 per cent of the cost of jams consists in the price of sugar, and sugar in this particular case comes in practically free. It seems to me that these businesses are being injured to a considerable extent by this British preference, and it does strike me that it would not make much difference, if I were a manufacturer of this particular line of goods, whether I was hurt by my own relatives overseas or was put out of business by other means. If I am to be put out of business at all, I cannot see that it makes a great deal of difference whether it is done by Englishmen or by Frenchmen. No doubt there is a certain degree of sentiment in the former case; some hon. gentlemen might say perhaps, that it would be preferable to be put out of business by the English people.

Mr. BUREAU: Suppose I said that.

Mr. FIELDING: This item must be considered in relation to the object we have in view. We have been anxious to cultivate trade relations with Australia; I think we all agree to that. The late government had been in negotiation with Australia with a view to coming to some understanding if possible in this matter. They laboured in all sincerity, but I do not think they were very successful. We have now taken the matter up and are trying to come to some arrangement with the Australian authorities. If we agree that it is desirable to make some arrangement with Australia in order that we may have access to their markets for our own products, we must be prepared to meet them in some way by making some concession. We have offered them our British preference in return for the preference they give to Great Britain, but so far they have not been willing to accept this proposal. There is a hitch for the moment, but it has been intimated to us, not only by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Robb) who has personal knowledge of the matter, but also by others interested in the Australian business, that if we make this concession in regard to the duty on raisins and currants it will go a long way towards disposing the Australians to come to terms with us. If they are pleased to take that view, foolish though it may seem to some people, and small though the point may be, we think it is worth our while, in view of the consideration that such a concession as this may influence the Australian policy in our favour, to do what is now proposed if the sacirfice is not too great. That is the whole story. Unquestionably we want to do business with them, but so far we have not been able to. This is proposed as one way of bringing about an understanding that will be beneficial to us, and I ask the House to agree to it on that ground. In the meantime, for the reason I have stated, some months will elapse before we shall do business with them and the duty will not be imposed immediately. If they meet us in the proper spirit and concede something which we consider will benefit the whole of Canada, the question is, is this a price we can afford to pay? We think it is worth considering.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I commend the minister for coming to the conclusion that the next time he undertakes to trade he will see that he has something to trade with.

Mr. FIELDING: I am going to get armed this time and see what the effect will be on those people who find fault.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am not finding fault at all. When you are trying to trade on behalf of the country as a whole with another country it is a very good thing to have something to trade with, and I congratulate my hon. friend. How this particular item works out one way or the other I do not know, but I entirely agree with the principle that he should have something to

trade with, and I only regret that my hon. friend did not find that out sooner. Before adjournment at six o'clock I was saying something about what I understood my hon. friend's intention to be that, having regard to the French treaty, the relative equality between England and France was to be maintained. I would ask him to be sure that his figures are correct in respect to brandies. He will remember that he told us that cognac and armagnac are the expensive brandies and would not interfere very much in our market with Scotch and Canadian whiskies. The information I have is that having regard to the currency as well as the cost of production, the distillery cost of the cognac brandy is $3 as against $7 for Scotch whiskey and $6 for Canadian whiskey. Of course, the excise duty on the Scotch whiskey remains at $10, while the cognac brandies would take the same excise duty as our own product, namely, $9. I am further told that the cost of laying these commodities down in bulk, including distillery cost, duty, sales tax and freight, would be $19.25 for the Scotch, $16 for the Canadian, and $13.10 for the brandy. If they were bottled getting down to the usual basis of a case of twelve bottles at 1½ proof spirits, the cost would be $30.88 for the Scotch, $26 for the Canadian, and $21.65 for the brandy. Of course, after having told my friend about other figures, I hesitate to say that any are correct, but this is the best information that I have and I hope he will check the information he has with a view of seeing if his former statement is correct, for I imagine he desires to leave these commodities on a parity.

Mr. FIELDING: Although the matter has been disposed of, I am glad my hon. friend has called attention to it. I think we had better see what the competition of cognac brandy amounts to. Cognac is a common expression, but I think the cognac contemplated by the treaty is not the same article. Indeed, that was one of the points the French government attached very much importance to. They thought that a great deal of so-called cognac was not cognac brandy at all, and they did not desire a special concession for it, but they wanted to be guaranteed a fair rate for this particular cognac, which must be certified by government officials and be accompanied by their certificates. I think when that test is applied very much of the brandy my hon. friend refers to will be found not to come within the description at all. However, the information, some of which has come to me also, is rather conflicting. As the French treaty will not go into effect for some months I think we can safely let this remain for the time being and if from experience it be found that the French brandy gets any advantage over our Canadian spirits I would be prepared to give the matter consideration when this is in evidence.

Mr. LEWIS: I do not see the connection between raisins and French brandies, unless the raisins are used for home brew.

Mr. FIELDING: There is none.

Mr. LEWIS: At the same time I do feel that this is rather a weak argument to put forward in favour of a preference to Australia. Raisins have become a very essential food in the ordinary family budget, and by the time this tariff reaches the consumer it will certainly mean between four and five cents a pound extra. When we have a better product in close proximity, it seems to me a little too expensive to bring raisins all the way from Australia with a view to effecting a trade agreement which may or may not be consummated for years to come. I am glad though that the resolution is to be deferred by order in council until this agreement materializes.

Mr. LUCAS: I understood the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Robb) to give a list of tariffs imposed by other countries against the importation of raisins running all the way from 2¼ up to as high as 7 cents a pound. Is there any other country that gives Australia as good a market to-day as Canada in regard to a tariff duty on raisins?

Mr. ROBB: Not if we place ours upon the free list.

Mr. GOULD: Would the Minister of Finance inform the committee just what concessions the government is seeking in the Australian market which would be beneficial to Canada?

Mr. FIELDING: We offered to exchange our preferential tariff for their preferential tariff without qualifications. They claimed that that was not good enough for them. They would give us as good terms as they granted to any other country, but they would not give us the same treatment as they granted to Great Britain. It is on that point that the hitch has occurred. We have some reason to hope that the item suggested here will be an attraction to them and will remove some of the objections they have urged and result in a more acceptable arrangement.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—Raisins and dried currants per pound: British preferential tariff, free; Intermediate tariff, 3 cents; General tariff, 3 cents.

Mr. FIELDING: I beg to move that resolution No. 3 of the Customs Tariff Resolutions of 11th May, 1923, be amended to read as follows:—

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend tariff item 99b of the Customs tariff, 1907, to read as follows:—

Tariff item 99b—Raisins and dried currants, per pound: British preferential tariff, ½ cent; Intermediate tariff, ⅔ cent; General tariff, ⅔ cent.

The Governor in Council may by order in council direct that there be substituted for tariff item 99b in schedule A of the Customs tariff, 1907, the enumeration of goods and the rates of duties of Customs set opposite said item in schedule A the following:—

Tariff item 99c—Raisins and dried currants, per pound: British preferental tariff, free; Intermediate tariff, 3 cents; General tariff, 3 cents.

2. From and after the publication of such order in council in the Canada Gazette tariff item 99b as it appears in said schedule at the time of the passing of the act founded on this resolution shall be repealed and the provisions of tariff item 99c shall be substituted therefor.

Amendment agreed to.

Custome tariff—All sugar above number sixteen Dutch standard in colour, and all refined sugars of whatever kinds, grades or standards, not covered by tariff item No. 135, when not exceeding eighty-eight degrees of polarization, per one hundred pounds: British preferential tariff, 83 cents; intermediate tariff, $1.50; general tariff, $1.50;

when exceeding eighty-eight degrees but not exceeding eighty-nine degrees, per one hundred pounds: British preferential tariff, 85 cents; intermediate tariff, $1.53; general tariff, $1.53.

when exceeding eighty-nine degrees but not exceeding ninety degrees, per one hundred pounds: British preferential tariff, 87 cents; intermediate tariff, $1.55; general tariff, $1.55;

when exceeding ninety degrees but not exceeding ninety-one degrees, per one hundred pounds: British preferential tariff, 89 cents; intermediate tariff, $1.58; general tariff, $1.58.

when exceeding ninety-one degrees but not exceeding ninety-two degrees, per one hundred pounds: British preferential tariff, 91 cents; intermediate tariff, $1.62; general tariff, $1.62.

when exceeding ninety-two degrees but not exceeding ninety-three degrees, per one hundred pounds: British preferential tariff, 93 cents; intermediate tariff, $1.65; general tariff, $1.65.

when exceeding ninety-three degrees but not exceeding ninety-four degrees, per one hundred pounds: British preferential tariff, 95 cents; intermediate tariff, $1.68; general tariff, $1.68.

when exeeding ninety-four degrees but not exceeding ninety-five degrees, per one hundred pounds: British preferential tariff, 97 cents; intermediate tariff, $1.70; general tariff, $1.70.

when exceeding ninety-five degrees but not exceeding ninety-six degrees, per one hundred pounds: British preferential tariff, 99 cents; intermediate tariff, $1.74; general tariff, $1.74;

when exceeding ninety-six degrees but not exceeding ninety-seven degrees, per one hundred pounds; British preferential tariff, $1.01; intermediate tariff, $1,77; general tariff, $1.77;

when exceeding ninety-seven degrees, but not exceeding ninety-eight degrees, per one hundred pounds: British preferential tariff, $1.03; intermediate tariff, $1.80; general tariff, $1.80.

when exceeding ninety-eight degrees, but not exceeding ninety-nine degrees, per one hundred pounds: British preferential tariff, $1.09; intermediate tariff, $1.89; general tariff, $1.89;

Provided that refined sugar shall be entitled to entry under the British preferential tariff upon evidence satisfactory to the Minister of Customs and Excise, that such refined sugar has been manufactured wholly from raw sugar produced in the British colonies and possessions, and not otherwise.

Provided further that sugar imported under this item shall not be subject to special duty when the home consumption value at the place of shipment direct to Canada is more than eight cents per pound.

Mr. FIELDING: Hon. members will note that there are two provisos at the end of this sugar item; the second of these I desire to amend. It has been the subject of consideration with the refining interests, with parties interested in the West Indies trade, and so on, and the conclusion we have adopted is to offer a substitute in the following words, which will be found in the amended resolution of May 23:

Provided further that sugar imported under this item shall not be subject to special duty in excess of three-fourths of one cent per pound.

The full limitation in the Dumping Act is 15 per cent, which, on the present value of sugar, would be at the rate of 1½ cents per pound. We have thought that is an extreme protection to give them. The figures in this item in detail are meant to correspond exactly with the old duty less a reduction of 50 cents. It is a difficult matter to work out, I think, correctly; so that as respects the general duty there is substantially no change in the relation from the raw material to the refiner. But this special dumping duty that was being applied fully to the amount of 15 per cent, or 1½ cents, we propose to limit to ¾ of a cent per pound, which will practically give a duty of 7½ instead of 15 cents. It is not all the sugar people want, but I suppose few of us get all we want in this wicked world. I think, however, it is a fair answer to their criticisms.

Mr. LEWIS: What system is in vogue for determining the degree of polarization in sugar?

Mr. FIELDING: I could not tell my hon. friend exactly, but the customs officials have had long experience in the matter and I have no doubt their system is scientifically correct.

Mr. LEWIS: Does it have to be stamped on the container when it comes in?

Mr. FIELDING: It is frequently the case that the officials have to admit the sugar

without taking time to test it, in which case the custom is to collect the highest duty payable, and then after testing whatever is due to them is paid. I am assured that the testing is done scientifically, and that it is based on the long experience of the customs authorities.

Item as amended, agreed to.

Customs tariff—Malt flour containing less than fifty per cent in weight of malt; also extract of malt, fluid or not, including grain molasses—all articles in this item upon valuation without British or foreign excise duties, under regulations by the Minister of Customs and excise per pound: British preferential tariff, 2 cents and 35 per cent; Intermediate tariff, 2 cents and 35 per cent; General tariff, 2 cents and 35 per cent.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It is the same rate, is it not?

Mr. FIELDING: This is an article used by the bakers. There is a slight reduction in favour of the importer.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My recollection is that it was 2 cents before.

Mr. FIELDING: The present rate is 3 cents from the United States; we make it 2.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—Bisulphate of soda or nitre cake; British preferential tariff, free; Intermediate tariff, free; General tariff, free.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: This is a new item, I think; where is that taken from?

Mr. FIELDING: It is a new item. These articles are used in refining nickel, practically all for export, but the manufacturer is not allowed drawback on the goods exported. If it were a material used in the manufacture of the export, a drawback could be had, but it is simply an agent employed in the work, and the business is entirely for the purposes of export. This arrangement will, I think, meet the desire of the people.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The reason I ask the question is that under item 210 of the tariff bisulphate of soda is free. I have the item before me: "British preferential tariff, free; Intermediate tariff, free; General tariff, free."

Mr. FIELDING: Let that item stand. I have it marked down as otherwise.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It may be in connection with the nitre cake; I do not know about that.

Mr. FIELDING: We will let it stand for further consideration.

Item stands.

[Mr. Fielding.]

Customs tariff—Dehydrated sulphate of copper for agricultural or spraying purposes; British preferential tariff, free; Intermediate tariff, free; General tariff, free.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Where is that taken from?

Mr. FIELDING: There is no separate classification for it. The present rate is in dispute; there is a difference of opinion in the department as to what it should be. However, for these spraying purposes we remove the doubt by making it free.

Mr. GOULD: I believe that bluestone is manufactured from this product.

Mr. FIELDING: It is a bluestone further pulverized, I am advised.

Mr. GOOD: May I ask whether there is any provision for dehydrated copper sulphate?

Mr. FIELDING: No; this is the only item we have on the subject.

Mr. GOOD: I suggest that the word "dehydrated" is wrong; it should be "powdered". Dehydrated copper sulphate is not used.

Mr. FIELDING: The Customs department supplied this as the correct wording.

Mr. GOOD: I think it is wrong.

Mr. FIELDING: Well, we will look into it. Let it stand.

Item stands.

Customs tariff—Liquorice paste not sweeted; British preferential tariff, 10 per cent; Intermediate tariff, 15 per cent; General tariff, 17½ per cent.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is liquorice paste?

Mr. FIELDING: The item is divided; the raw material is made a little lower and the finished article remains the same.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The raw material is reduced from 15 to 10?

Mr. FIELDING: Yes.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—Liquorice in rolls and sticks, not sweetened: British preferential tariff, 15 per cent; Intermediate tariff, 20 per cent; General tariff, 22½ per cent.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is there any change there?

Mr. FIELDING: The rates remain the same.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—Dry red lead, orange mineral, zinc white and white oxide of antimony. British preferential tariff, free; Intermediate tariff 7½ per cent; General tariff, 10 per cent.

Mr. FIELDING: I move to strike out that item. That will leave the matter as it now stands.

Mr. GOULD: What will be the rate when the item is struck out?

Mr. FIELDING: Part of it is 3, 5 and 5; part of it 15, 20 and 22½, the rates remaining as at present.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is, the minister was raising it in the intermediate and general tariffs; now he is leaving it where we had it.

Mr. FIELDING: Part had been reduced and part raised, but there was some confusion on the subject and we thought the safest thing to do was to strike out the item and leave the duties as they are now.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister is wrong there, is he not? So far as I can see, he was raising the intermediate and the general tariff on the entire class, from 5 to 7½ on the one and from 5 to 10 on the other.

Mr. FIELDING: There is a decrease in the case of white oxide of antimony. However, as I say, there has been a little confusion and I think the safest thing is to let the duties stand as they are.

Amendment agreed to, and item struck out.

Customs tariff—Crude petroleum not in its natural state .7900 specific gravity or heavier at 60 degrees temperature, when imported by oil refiners to be refined in their own factories, per gallon, British preferential tariff, 3/10 cent; Intermediate tariff 4/10 cent; General tariff 6/10 cent.

Mr. KELLNER: Is this an increase?

Mr. FIELDING: There was an item there of six-tenths of a cent per gallon, but there is another item of a similar character where the rate is half a cent, and we thought it the better way to drop the rate to half a cent rather than have it at six-tenths of a cent.

Mr. KELLNER: What is the idea of changing it? Was it too cheap under the old tariff?

Mr. FIELDING: It was a matter in dispute with the Customs department as to what was the process. At one time we fixed the rate at six-tenths. We found there was another item at half a cent and we thought it better to make it the same term.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is that another item? The old item was:

Crude petroleum in its natural state .7900 specific gravity or heavier at 60 degrees temperature when imported by oil refineries to be refined in their own factories—

And the rate was: Free, free, free.

Mr. FIELDING: The item here is "Crude petroleum not in its natural state." It is an article which has made some advance in manufacture.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend is quite right. This is "not in its natural state." To be quite sure on that, which was the former item? The one I read referred to petroleum in its natural state.

Mr. FIELDING: 267a.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That was petroleum in its natural state.

Mr. FIELDING: The producers of this claim that it was produced in the natural state, and they thought they were entitled to admission at the rate of duty for that item. It was a matter of contention with the department for some time, and we concluded that this was the best way to deal with it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It really came under non-classified, I suppose.

Mr. FIELDING: I think the explanation I gave a moment ago is the correct one. The producers claim it is in its natural state, and contended it should be admitted at the rate of duty for that item. There was a discussion, in fact, there had to be an appeal to the Privy Council on this subject, and the conclusion was that it ought to be treated as an article of somewhat advanced character not equal to refined petroleum, but not to be treated as petroleum in its natural state, and the duty is arranged to meet that condition.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—Fire brick for use in the construction or repair of a furnace, kiln or other equipment of a manufacturing establishment: British preferential tariff, 5 per cent; Intermediate tariff, 7½ per cent; general tariff, 10 per cent.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I would like the minister to explain this item. I understood that this fire brick under the tariff was free. My information is that there is no such fire brick made in Canada.

Mr. FIELDING: At one stage the item in the tariff read, "Fire brick of a kind not made in Canada," but there arose much contention over that. The expression "not made in Canada" sometimes leads to great confusion. It was complained by some manufacturers that they did make these things in Canada and therefore that the article should be subject

to duty. Consumers say the manufacturers make something like that, but it does not serve the purpose. Fire brick is made at several points in Canada. The chief consumers, of course, will be the people engaged in furnace work, the metallic industries and so on. They have complained that the rate hitherto has been too high. There was a dispute over that and the Customs department gave a ruling which would have imposed a high duty. We have had quite a little difficulty in adjusting that, but we believe that we have now an adjustment which is really satisfactory. I beg to move as follows:

9 p.m.

That Resolution No. 3 of May 11, 1923, be amended by striking thereout tariff item 281, the enumeration of goods and the several rates of duties of Customs, set opposite said item, and to provide that the following items, enumerations and rates of duty be inserted: Tariff item 281—Fire brick containing not less than ninety per cent of silica; magnesite fibre brick or chrome fire brick; other fire brick valued at no less than one hundred dollars per one thousand; all fire brick in this item to be rectangular, the dimensions of each not to exceed one hundred and twenty-five cubic inches and for use exclusively in the construction or repair of a furnace, kiln or other equipment of a manufacturing establishment: British preferential tariff, free; Intermediate tariff, free; General tariff, free.

We are separating the item to make free for the purpose of these industries the thing which is not made in Canada. Then we say:

Tariff item 281a—Fire brick, n.o.p. for use exclusively, in the construction or repair of a furnace, kiln or other equipment of a manufacturing establishment: British preferential tariff, 10 per cent; Intermediate tariff, 12½ per cent; General tariff, 15 per cent.

That is to say, on the thing which is clearly and distinctly not made in Canada we impose no duty, and on the other we make a compromise duty of 10, 12½ and 15 per cent.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What item is my hon. friend reading from?

Mr. FIELDING: It is a new item.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The matter was before me more than once, and my recollection is that claims were being made, just as the minister states, that firebrick was now being made in Canada, and, therefore, the duty ought to apply. While the users of firebrick claimed it was not a brick they could use at all, or else it was so far away they could not handle it, and that no action should be taken by the Department of Customs. I do not think any action was taken by that department. At any rate, no action was taken by the department under the late government. All firebrick came in free under that item. So that the effect is just as the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Chaplin) states, to make firebrick, which formerly took a different classification in our tariffs, bear a duty of 5, 7½ and 10 per cent.

Mr. FIELDING: We had the same difficulty, just as the hon. member describes. In October last there was a decision by the Board of Customs which made it more difficult. They tried to classify it, and caused considerable discontent. I hope what we are proposing now is reasonably satisfactory to all interests.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Why is it necessary to put the duty on the odd shapes? They require rectangular shapes and other shapes in construction, and why is the duty put upon the odd shapes?

Mr. FIELDING: I am told the odd shapes are manufactured in Canada. The item has been considered, an effort has been made to meet conflicting interests and I am hoping that it is going to be satisfactory.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is it not a fact that no duty at all was collected on firebrick prior to 1922?

Mr. FIELDING: I suppose the classification "made in Canada" kept them out.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There was no duty of any kind prior to 1922.

Mr. FIELDING: I presume my hon. friend is correct, but I cannot say offhand.

Mr. WHITE: My recollection is that there was a duty collected on circular shapes, or any other shapes, other than rectangular shapes. Now the magnesite, silica and chrome bricks are free, provided they are rectangular in shape. But if that quality is not made in Canada I do not think it should make any difference whether they are rectangular or any other shape.

Mr. CHAPLIN: These odd shapes are required in the building of a furnace just as much as the rectangular shape. When you get to the top of a furnace you require the odd shapes.

Mr. MARLER: The irregular shapes are made in Canada. Previous to 1922 they had a duty of 22½ per cent. That duty, under the first amendment of the tariff, was reduced from 22½ to 10 per cent. It is now placed at 15 per cent. Firebrick may be divided into three classes: first, the magnesite brick, silica brick containing not less than 90 per cent silica and chrome brick. These are free. The second class of brick is a brick made out of ordinary fire clay of the regular sizes. Previous to the 1st November, 1922, those were free. By the ruling of the department on that date

they were made subject to a duty of 22½ per cent. I am speaking of the general tariff at the present time. That duty, under the resolution of May 1923, was reduced to 10 per cent, at which figure it remains. The third class was these irregular shapes partly made of silica clay and partly made of other clay, and these are manufactured in Canada. Those are the shapes I had reference to first. They were always subject to a duty under the general tariff of 22½ per cent. That duty under the amended resolution, is now reduced to 15 per cent. With reference to the uses to which these bricks are put; rectangular shapes are used very largely by the steel companies. The first class are also used very largely by the steel companies. and that class—that is the special brick of silica, chrome magnesite, not made in Canada—will be allowed in free. It is a distinct advantage to the steel companies. In reference to the first class, instead of the steel companies paying 22½ per cent, which they paid under the ruling 1st November, 1922, they will now pay 10 per cent. That is the resolution as regards firebrick.

Mr. FIELDING: It is 15 per cent now.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Fifteen, I think.

Mr. MARLER: No, 10 per cent under the second class brick.

Mr. FIELDING: Fifteen in this resolution.

Mr. MARLER: I understood the minister to say 15.

Mr. FIELDING: It is 10, 12½ and 15.

Mr. WHITE: I think the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Marler) missed the point. It is quality that governs. as I understand it, whether the brick is rectangular in shape, or with a curved edge. So long as it is not made in Canada, I understand the minister wishes it brought in free, and I do not see why irregular shapes should not be brought in free as well as rectangular shapes, provided they are the same quality.

Mr. FIELDING: It is represented that the irregular shapes are made in Canada, and that is why the distinction is made.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is on the principle of a revenue tariff.

Mr. FIELDING: Oh yes, quite so.

Amendment agreed to.

Customs tariff—328, Spectacle and eyeglass frames and metal parts thereof: n.o.p. British preferential tariff, 15 per cent; intermediate tariff, 17½ per cent; general tariff, 20 per cent.

Mr. LUCAS: What was the duty on those articles before?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Just the same. I think my hon. friend will agree with me there is no change at all, in so far as the general rate is concerned, except to add the letters n.o.p., and the reason the change is made is to make room for 328A. Paragraph 328A I take it, is to help the manufacture of spectacle and eyeglass frames in Canada?

Mr. FIELDING: Yes, they will all bring some revenue.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—328A, metal parts, unfinished, for the manufacture of spectacle and eyeglass frames: British preferential tariff, free; intermediate tariff, 5 per cent; general tariff, 5 per cent.

Mr. LEWIS: With regard to the metal parts unfinished; does that simply mean that it is not quite put together? That is, that it is not polished or screwed or properly done, or does it simply mean in the rough?

Mr. FIELDING: Unfinished, not polished.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—Brass and copper scrap: British preferential tariff, free; intermediate tariff, free; general tariff, free.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is there any change in that

Mr. FIELDING: It is the same with this qualification:

But nothing shall be deemed brass or copper scrap except waste or refuse brass or copper fit only to be remanufactured in furnaces.

It is a definition—not a change.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—Composition metal and plated metal, in bars, ingots, or cores, for the manufacture of watch cases jewellery, filled gold and silver seamless wire and for dental purposes: British preferential tariff, 5 per cent; Intermediate tariff, 7½ per cent; General tariff, 10 per cent.

Mr. FIELDING: The words "for dental purposes" are inserted.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is the reason for inserting the words "for dental purposes"?

Mr. FIELDING: Part of it was free, part at 22½ per cent, 30 per cent and 35 per cent. This is done at the request of the Customs department to make it clear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Really this is exactly as before except that all, no matter for what purpose, came in under this rate before.

Mr. FIELDING: For dental purposes did not come in. We put it in; it was not included before.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What did it come under before?

Mr. FIELDING: Part of it was free and part was at other rates.

Mr. KELLNER: What inspired the minister to put eye-glasses on the free list and to place a duty on dental instruments?

Mr. FIELDING: We have not put eye-glasses on the free list. My hon. friend is mistaken.

Mr. KELLNER: The raw material for the manufacture of eye-glasses?

Mr. FIELDING: To encourage the home industry.

Mr. KELLNER: I would submit that there is also a possibility of a home industry in this other item, manufactured articles used in the dental profession.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—Iron or steel scrap, wrought, being waste or refuse, including punchings, cuttings or clippings of iron or steel plates or sheets having been in actual use; crop ends of tin plate bars, or of blooms, or of rails, the same not having been in actual use, per ton. But nothing shall be deemed scrap iron or scrap steel except waste or refuse iron or steel fit only to be remanufactured in rolling mills or furnaces; provided that articles of iron or steel, damaged in transit, if broken up under customs supervision and rendered unsaleable except as scrap, may be entered for duty as scrap: British preferential tariff, 25 cents; Intermediate tariff, 45 cents; General tariff, 50 cents.

Mr. FIELDING: The rate is cut in two; it is one-half the former rate.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This is a raw material. It is on that principle that the reduction is made, is it not?

Mr. FIELDING: It is one of that class of stuff that might be described as raw material.

Mr. MEIGHEN: And this, in effect, gives a wider margin of protection to the users of the material?

Mr. FIELDING: Possibly.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—Rolled iron or steel hoop, band, scroll or strip, in the coil, number ten gauge and thinner, when imported by manufacturers for use in their own factories in the manufacture of cold rolled iron or steel: British preferential tariff, free; Intermediate tariff, free; General tariff, free.

Mr. FIELDING: I want to insert a word. This should read:

[Mr. Meighen.]

384b. Rolled iron or steel hoop, band, scroll or strip, in the coil, number twelve gauge and thinner, when imported by manufacturers for use in their own factories in the manufacture of cold rolled iron or steel.

There is a change there in the number of the gauge. This is an item which is a finished product in the case of one factory and the raw material in another.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The old item was, I think, free too?

Mr. FIELDING: Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It was gauge number fourteen, but it is now gauge number twelve.

Mr. FIELDING: The gauge is changed; that is all.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Is it good policy to use a gauge? What particular gauge is meant when you use the word "gauge?" Would it not be much better to describe this in thousandths of an inch?

Mr. FIELDING: The gauge is described in the tariff.

Mr. CHAPLIN: What is the gauge used?

Mr. FIELDING: Gauge when applied to a metal sheet, plate or wire, means the thickness as determined by the Imperial standard gauge. That is defined in the Tariff Act.

Mr. CHAPLIN: There are several gauges, and a matter of that kind should be put in decimals. Then you would know where you were. There are three different kind of gauges.

Mr. FIELDING: This has been in the tariff for ages, and it has apparently worked out very well.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—Rolled iron or steel, and cast steel in bars, bands, hoop, scroll, strip, sheet or plate of any size, thickness or width, and steel blanks for the manufacture of milling cutters, when of greater value than three and one-half cents per pound: British preferential tariff, 5 per cent; Intermediate tariff, 12½ per cent; General tariff, 12½ per cent.

Mr. FIELDING: The preferential rate was 7½ per cent. It is reduced to 5 per cent.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Are we getting any importations now under this item from Great Britain?

Mr. FIELDING: Largely from the United States, I am advised.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That is what I thought. The real movement is from the

United States. Is there any representation or hope that we may get some movement from Great Britain in connection with this item?

Mr. FIELDING: Yes, we were asked to consider it.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Is it the price of this article that controls the duty, or is it the shape or quality of the material?

Mr. FIELDING: Three and a half cents per pound.

Mr. CHAPLIN: It is the price then that controls the duty?

Mr. FIELDING: The wording is exactly the same as before.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Steel of the same size and the same gauge, but of a lower price, would not come under the same tariff item; is that the idea? In other words, the price has to be three and a half cents per pound or more?

Mr. FIELDING: Steel of a greater value than three and a half cents per pound would come under this item; of a lesser value it would not.

Mr. CHAPLIN: The price controls the duty.

Mr. FIELDING: Yes.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—Typewriters and parts thereof: British preferential tariff, 17½ per cent; Intermediate tariff, 22½ per cent; General tariff 25 per cent.

Mr. FIELDING: The words "and parts thereof" are included in this item. Otherwise it is the same as before.

Mr. GOOD: What quantity of home manufacture is there? Are any typewriters manufactured in Canada?

Mr. FIELDING: There are typewriters assembled, if not actually made in Canada.

Mr. LEWIS: Are we importing any typewriters from Great Britain at the present time?

Mr. FIELDING: Only a few from Great Britain.

Mr. KELLNER: How many are we importing from the United States now?

Mr. FIELDING: We imported 12,345 last year.

Mr. KELLNER: Would it not be cheaper for this country as a whole to eliminate this tariff entirely and pay the Canadian manufacturers of these machines a sum of money about equal to what they are making at present in this industry?

Mr. FIELDING: Would you make it generous?

Mr. KELLNER: I should think so; at the present rate we could afford to.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Revenue no object.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Marcil): Carried.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No. The item is not changed, but it did strike me as a proper one upon which the theory of my hon. friend (Mr. Kellner) might be discussed. I have heard him state it many times. Surely he will not now simply accept the bare rejection by the Minister of Finance of something he has agitated for years?

Mr. KELLNER: I was in hopes that I should be able to enlist the assistance of the right hon. gentleman.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman could not have entertained such hopes at all, for I have never given him any reason to do so; I have never encouraged any such hope. But he has had coadjutors of the theory in this House, and I should really like to see whether he cannot get co-operation on their part now.

Mr. KELLNER: I thought that the leader of the Opposition recognized the value of my argument and that he would assist me with a good argument of his own.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not see that there is any value at all in the hon. gentleman's argument, and I never did. Here is a case where the extent of a Canadian manufacturer is not yet great. While of course the typewriter is not a new machine, it is not as old as most machines, and the extent of the Canadian manufacture and the supply of the Canadian market are proportionately low. The importations are very heavy and the machines are brought in practically entirely from the United States of America. Now, if ever there was an instance where the hon. gentleman's doctrine should apply it is in the present case. Where are hon. gentlemen that they are not driving their theory home? Have they given up hope of the Minister of Finance?

Mr. KELLNER: I think I am safe in saying that the only typewriters turned out in Canada are only partly made here. On the other hand, we are importing a large number of typewriters every year, and I venture to say that the duty which the government puts upon the machines they actually use would more than cover the entire

income of those plants now in operation in this country. What, therefore, is the sense of the people of Canada paying $25 more for each typewriter they use simply in order to keep up two or three very inferior industries which, in any case, it is not likely will ever amount to anything?

Mr. LEWIS: This would be a tariff for revenue, would it not?

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—Printing presses, lithographic presses, and type making accessories therefor, also machines specially designed for ruling, folding, binding, embossing, creasing, or cutting paper or cardboard, sheet feeding machines, when for use exclusively by printers, bookbinders, and by manufacturers of articles made from paper or cardboard—including parts thereof composed wholly or in part of iron, steel, brass or wood; machinery and complete parts thereof for printing by photographic methods on plates for use on lithographic and offset presses: British preferential tariff, 5 per cent; intermediate tariff, 10 per cent; general tariff, 10 per cent.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: This is merely a change in the wording of the item?

Mr. FIELDING: No; it is rather a broad item, and is generous to the printing craft. We are including sheet feeding machines not made in Canada, and are fixing the rates at 5, 10 and 10 per cent.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—Stumping machines and complete parts thereof: British preferential tariff, 10 per cent; intermediate tariff, 15 per cent; general tariff, 15 per cent.

Mr. GARDINER: What were the previous rates on stumping machines?

Mr. FIELDING: The previous rates were 15, 25 and 27½ per cent.

Mr. GARDINER: Is the minister reducing the tariff on stumping machines in view of the possibility of a general election in the near future?

Mr. FIELDING: Stumping machines are very necessary things at election time, and perhaps the item had reference to the present campaign in Ontario.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is impossible to keep track of these items until someone says "carried." What is the number of the old item which is now described as 448c, the item we are now discussing?

Mr. FIELDING: This is a new item that did not appear before under any special classification.

Mr. MEIGHEN: How did the minister indicate the duties before?

[Mr. Kellner.]

Mr. FIELDING: The previous rates were 15, 25 and 27½ per cent.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Under what item?

Mr. FIELDING: Under item 453.

Mr. MEIGHEN: These machines previously just came under the general machinery classification,—the n.o.p. class?

Mr. FIELDING: They came under item 453. Some of these machines are made in Canada and the makers are entitled to a drawback.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Upon what do they get the drawback?

Mr. FIELDING: On the material used,—40 per cent—the same as other agricultural implements.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—Machinery, of a class or kind not made in Canada, and parts thereof, for the manufacture of fish meal, stock and poultry food and fertilizers, from fish and the waste thereof: British preferential tariff, free; Intermediate tariff, free; General tariff, free.

Mr. CALDWELL: Has the minister seriously considered the advisability of putting on the free list not only the machinery for the manufacture of fertilizers, but fertilizers themselves? The raw material comes in practically free now, with the exception of acid phosphate, and I would suggest including this material on the free list, as well as the machinery that is used in making fertilizers of various kinds. I think the minister must realize how the duty on fertilizers affects the price of this commodity to users in Canada. The raw materials come into Canada free and are manufactured into fertilizers which are sold to the farmers at from $8 to $15 more than the agriculturists in the United States pay. The finished product is often shipped back from the Canadian factory into the United States where it is sold in some cases at as much as $15 per ton less than is paid for it in Canada, notwithstanding that the raw materials, the ingredients, are imported into this country in the first place. This is due to the duty, and it works a great hardship on the people, especially on the potato growers, while it brings practically no revenue to the treasury.

Mr. FIELDING: Of course, one can put up an argument in favour of putting nearly everything on the free list. The duty on fertilizers has been substantially reduced.

Mr. CALDWELL: It has been 10 per cent since I can remember.

Mr. FIELDING: My memory goes further back than my hon. friend's.

Mr. CALDWELL: No doubt.

Mr. FIELDING: If we are to have a duty at all 10 per cent is not very high.

Mr. CALDWELL: The argument I am offering is simply the platform promulgated by the Liberal party in 1919 when fertilizers were put on the free list in that proposed schedule. I wish I had Hansard of either 1920 or 1921 in which the Prime Minister strongly advocated that fertilizers be supplied the farmers free of duty in order to increase production. This was emphasized by him on more than one occasion in this House since I have been a member of it; but of course that was when he was in opposition. I had sincerely hoped that, in view of the evidence I have been able to submit to the government of the effect which the duty on fertilizers has on the farmers of my section of the country, and in view of the fact that very little if any revenue is derived under this item, something might be done to alleviate the conditions in this respect. I put those figures before the House last year, and I do not wish to repeat them to-night, but on the imports of fertilizers a very small amount of duty has been collected, due to the fact that when the American manufacturer establishes a plant in Canada he brings in his raw materials free and simply stirs them together. This duty does not even help to make Canadian millionaires. If it did I would not feel quite so bad about it. It simply helps to swell the profits of our American friends.

Mr. GOOD: I think the hon. member for Victoria and Carleton (Mr. Caldwell) has made out a very good case and I should like to see the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) take some action on it. He might cut the duty down to 5 per cent anyway.

Mr. FIELDING: Oh!

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: In connection with the item last passed, the minister told us that a stumping machine being an agricultural implement the manufacturer would get a rebate of 40 per cent. I think my hon. friend is perfectly right, but there is no change made at all because agricultural implements not otherwise provided for come under item 448 and we do not need this section at all. The rate there is 10, 15 and 15 per cent.

Mr. FIELDING: Drawbacks come under 448c.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That is 448c. It covers hay tedders, posthole diggers, snaths and a whole lot of other things n.o.p. I should have thought that would certainly cover stumping machines. If it does not, my hon. friend is wrong when he says they are entitled to a rebate of 40 per cent.

Mr. FIELDING: We make assurance doubly sure.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not think there is any doubt about it.

Item agreed to.

469. Well-drilling machinery and apparatus, and parts thereof, of a class or kind not made in Canada, drawn or seamless iron or steel tubing over four inches in diameter, for drilling for water, natural gas and oil, and prospecting for minerals, not to include motive power: British preferential tariff, free; Intermediate tariff, free; General tariff, free.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: We had a free item to the same effect before. What is the addition?

Mr. FIELDING: The item has been broadened to include several things not included before.

502a. Staves of wood, n.o.p., not less than five-eighths of an inch in thickness, further manufactured than sawn or split but not further manufactured than listed: British preferential tariff, 10 per cent; Intermediate tariff, 12½ per cent; General tariff, 15 per cent.

Mr. FIELDING: That is semi-raw material and has been reduced.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I thought that had been increased. Did not that take old item 502? I am not complaining about the rate.

Mr. FIELDING: No, 502 did not cover this.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What item covered this commodity before?

Mr. FIELDING: This item appeared before under 506, and the rates were 17½, 22½ and 25 per cent. We reduce them to 10, 12½ and 15 per cent.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—Fabrics of cotton or other fibre including cord fabric weighing over eight ounces per square yard for use in the manufacture of pneumatic tires: British preferential tariff, 15 per cent; Intermediate tariff, 17½ per cent; General tariff, 20 per cent.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is the change here?

Mr. FIELDING: It should be 524b. The item is as before but the wording is changed in respect to the weight.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the article weighs differently from the previous stipulation what would be the tax?

Mr. FIELDING: The rate is not changed, but I am advised that this is done at the request of the Customs department to remove any doubt as to the interpretation of the act.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What the minister had in mind, I fancy, was to cover a respectable area of paper and make as little change in the tariff as possible.

Mr. FIELDING: There might be some reason in that. I hope my hon. friend will adhere to the view that the changes do not amount to anything.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They amount indeed to practically nothing. The minister made reference in that connection to the British preference, that because we contended they were trivial in themselves they therefore could have no serious effect. Well, they may be so trivial in themselves that they never reach the consumer so as ultimately to benefit or to hurt him, but at the same time they are just below the line which would make the tariff of any value to our producers, and therefore the result is serious. No one knows that better than the Minister of Finance.

Mr. FIELDING: I think we will have to assume certain things as fundamental, namely, that all taxes and all reductions ultimately reach the consumer. They may not do it today but they get there in the end.

Mr. MEIGHEN, If the minister believed that he would have a very different tariff.

Mr. FIELDING: Well, wait and see.

Item agreed to.

581. Velvets, velveteens, silk velvets, plush and silk fabrics: British preferential tariff, 17½ per cent; Intermediate tariff, 30 per cent; General tariff, 35 per cent.

Mr. FIELDING: I propose to amend this item by making the percentages 17½, 32½ and 35 per cent.

Sir. HENRY DRAYTON: What is the reason for this? Is it to carry out a promise given under the French Treaty?

Mr. FIELDING: No, there are no promises given to anybody.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Apart from any understanding with France, what is the reason for the increase there?

Mr. FIELDING: Owing to many representations made to us as to inequalities in the tariff. The British preference remains the same; in the intermediate and general tariffs there is an increase and as there is an increase on velvets, velveteens and silk fabrics, my hon. friend will receive the change with joy, because he complained that we were reducing these items.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I was very glad to see something done toward getting this item up a little bit. I was wondering what on earth had moved my hon. friend.

Mr. FIELDING: I think I had occasion to say before to my hon. friend that if we reach the right destination, I am not quarrelling with him as to the way by which we travel.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Has any progress been made toward finding out exactly what it means in dollars and cents—the difference in rate compared with the French treaty, having regard to the limitation of width of 24 inches? Has that been ascertained as yet?

Mr. FIELDING: The intermediate rate is changed, and in that way it affects the rate in the French treaty.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: But was there not a special rate given in the French treaty under that item? I think there was.

Mr. FIELDING: In part, yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What my hon. friend is now doing, Mr. Chairman, is something which, had it been done before he made the French treaty, would have enabled him to get something of real value to the country. The old rates were 17½, 27½ and 30; those were the rates my hon. friend had before him when he was negotiating in France. He now makes the British preferential rate 35 per cent, and I think he said he was going to make the intermediate—

Mr. FIELDING: 32½.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: And the general tariff 37.

Mr. FIELDING: 35 on this item.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Now there is a fixed item—and I want my hon. friend to correct me if I am wrong—in the French treaty, of 20 per cent applying on articles not over 24 inches wide. I had some discussion before as to what the importations were of goods not over 24 inches in width, and we could not at that time get any real information. We were told that a man who was unknown had informed the Minister of Marine that 90 per cent of the imports consisted of goods over 24 inches in width—a conclusion that I very much doubted. Can we now get the truth?

Mr. FIELDING: The Customs returns do not classify this item separately, and I suppose for the present it can only be a matter of conjecture what the proper percentage is I could not tell the hon. gentleman definitely.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: In the meantime the only thing wrong is that it is done too late.

Item agreed to.

Mr. FIELDING: 581a.

Mr. MEIGHEN: May I ask when 581a was born? It is neither in the budget address nor in the supplementary budget that came down a week ago.

Mr. FIELDING: We are going to witness the birth of it now.

Mr. MEIGHEN: How many budgets are we likely to have this year?

Mr. FIELDING: As many as may be necessary to get things correct.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That will be quite a number.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: We cannot be here all year.

Mr. FIELDING: I beg to move that resolution No. 3 of the Customs tariff resolutions of 11th May, 1923, be amended by adding thereto the following provision:

Resolved, that tariff item 581a, the enumeration of goods and the several rates of duties of customs set opposite said item be struck out of said schedule A and that the following item, enumeration and rates of duty be inserted in said schedule A:—

Tariff item 581a—Silk cloth woven in the gum, not boiled or bleached, measuring not less than twenty inches in width when imported for the purpose of being dyed and finished in Canada, under regulations prescribed by the Minister of Customs and Excise: British preferential tariff, 12½ per cent; Intermediate tariff, 22½ per cent; General tariff, 35 per cent.

That involves what I may call non-technically the first process of manufacture, which is advanced at the next stage. It is to meet the conditions of the dyeing industry of the country.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I have not seen the resolution but if I understand the minister aright, I agree with him; the only thing wrong about it is that it is done too late.

Mr. FIELDING: Better late than never.

Amendment agreed to.

Customs tariff—Artificial silk yarns of filaments or artificial fibre silk yarns or filaments produced from a form of cellulose obtained by chemical processes, not more advanced than singles, not coloured artificial silk tops and waste or artificial fibre silk tops and waste produced from a form of cellulose obtained by chemical processes: British preferential tariff, 10 per cent; Intermediate tariff, 12½ per cent; General tariff, 15 per cent.

Mr. FIELDING: I beg to move that this item be struck out and that the following items, emumerations and rates of duty be inserted:

583a. Artificial silk tops and waste or artificial fibre silk tops and waste produced from a form of cellulose obtained by chemical processes: British preferential tariff, 5 per cent; Intermediate tariff, 7½ per cent, General tariff, 10 per cent.

583aa. Artificial silk yarns or filaments or artificial fibre silk yarns or filaments produced from a form of cellulose obtained by chemical processes, not more advanced than singles, not coloured: British preferential tariff, 12½ per cent; Intermediate tariff, 17½ per cent; General tariff, 20 per cent.

Mr. MEIGHEN: 583aa applies, I understand, to artificial silk yarns and 583a to artificial silk tops. The latter will be to give a protection to those who convert the tops into yarn.

Mr. FIELDING: The first process of manufacture is always subject to a lower rate than the others.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I thoroughly agree. I cannot help but turn my mind back to the principle that is being adhered to, a principle that I strongly and consistently support.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Is it the intention that this duty shall become effective at once or after the yarn is made here?

Mr. FIELDING: Yes, but there will be a drawback up to the 1st of July, 1924. In the meantime there will be drawbacks, but those who are obliged to get this from other sources will be able to do so.

Mr. CHAPLIN: In other words, until the factory is here ready to make the goods?

Mr. FIELDING: Until sufficient time at which it is expected the factory will be in operation, yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I suppose that will cover everything in the whole list, will it not?

Mr. FIELDING: These two items of artificial silks.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is really being done is to divide the old item in two.

Mr. FIELDING: Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: You make your tops, which is largely your manufacturers' raw material, 5, 7½ and 10 per cent, and then you increase the more advanced and perfected article, the really manufactured article, as shown.

Mr. FIELDING: 12½, 17 and 20 per cent.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I suppose that was done because the gentlemen concerned thought there was not enough protection in what my hon. friend had provided for them before.

Mr. FIELDING: There are quite a number of people, I believe, who think they have not enough protection. Possibly he was one of them.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: But my hon. friend would know definitely. If he does not want to tell me, I am perfectly content to take his refusal.

Mr. FIELDING: They all wanted more.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I will put it this way to my hon. friend: Did he have representations made by these gentlemen who want to get this new industry in Canada, a perfectly proper thing to do, that the rate which he gave on artificial silk yarns or filament of 10, 12½ and 15 per cent was not enough to enable them to carry on.

Mr. FIELDING: I think they did.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: And as a result he made the change?

Mr. FIELDING: As a result of a consideration of the whole subject.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Quite so. Will they go on now with the further concession given?

Mr. FIELDING: We hope so. We cannot guarantee it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Of course, that is all that can be said. What I mean is that they have not the feeling that nothing can be done. They left full of hope that they may do something?

Mr. FIELDING: Yes, I think they expect to do something.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Quite so. So my hon. friend by giving a bit more protection hopes to secure this new industry. Now in connection with the manufacture of yarn, has my hon. friend considered the position of botany yarn in connection with these items and the drawbacks which apply to these items?

Mr. FIELDING: Yes, the matter has been before us.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Will the botany yarn be protected?

Mr. FIELDING: There is no change in the duty.

[Sir Henry Drayton.]

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: At present there is practically no protection of botany yarn. I want my friend to tell me if I am wrong in what I now say: The botany yarn, which is the finer and better yarn to-day has no protection because there is a rebate to the manufacturers that use botany yarn of I think 98 or 99 per cent.

Mr. FIELDING: Ninety-nine per cent.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: There is to-day a duty without the drawback on the Bradford yarn. There is no rebate there to the manufacturer. I think I am right in that. The botany yarns are, of course, yarns which are more expensive and make more finely finished hosiery than do the Bradford yarns, which make the rough stockings.

Mr. FIELDING: It was one of a number of cases in which protection was desired, but we were not able to see the wisdom of it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It has a protection now, only it is taken away in connection with the rebate which is given.

Mr. FIELDING: It has been there for some time. It is not a new item.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Oh, no, it is not a new item at all, but the manufacture of botany yarn in Canada is a comparatively new thing. I think my hon. friend will agree with me on that. In fact, I do not think botany yarns were produced in quantity in Canada since before the war. Since then we have had a large number of spindles put in, and there is to-day practically enough installed to spin all the botany yarns that we are using. Now these botany yarns are spun from imported wool tops. They are the finer yarns, and combined with that yarn is an artificial silk top. Now the wool tops come in free. The artificial silk tops did come in free, but now they will not. The artificial silk top that is used in connection with the preparation of botany yarns is really waste. It is broken up. It is not used for the purpose of binding at all. It is no good till incorporated with the good wool, and when incorporated it gives the gloss which the better kind of hosiery has. I want to point out to my hon. friend what he is doing with this legislation. I just want it to be known that we know what we are doing, that is all The value of the wool top, speaking generally—market quotations will change a little bit—is $1.30 a pound. The value of the artificial silk top is 72 cents per pound. Now my friend will follow me: As the value of the yarn is chiefly composed of wool, that is, these imported

10 p.m.

yarns, instead of artificial silk, the result is that under the drawback item the imported yarn will get a drawback of 99 per cent of the 12½ per cent duty that applies on these yarns from England, while the Canadian spinner has to pay duty on his artificial silk tops. I just want to ask my friend if he thinks it is fair to leave that 99 per cent drawback there, which as he points out is an old thing, in the face of an absolutely changed circumstance and condition, unless his protective policy is that it is only a new industry to be protected, and that the spinners of this botany yarn because they are here—because there cannot be anything inherently wrong in connection with botany yarn—because they are here and because they have a large enough investment to supply the country should receive no protection, while the new industry does. There is no escape, as I see it, from the situation. If that 99 per cent drawback is maintained, I think the other manufacturer should have to get along without the 99 per cent rebate in view of what my hon. friend is now doing.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I would like to inquire from the minister what the determining factor is in arriving at the 60 per cent drawback on artificial silk yarn. Why 60 per cent?

Mr. FIELDING: These are all matters of fair adjustment. I do not know that I can lay down any absolute principle to govern all matters of drawback. They vary.

Mr. CHAPLIN: During the process of establishment of this plant the manufacturers of this particular article will be paying 100 per cent duty and getting 60 per cent drawback. Consequently, they will be paying a duty of 40 per cent. In other words, if the duty is 10 cents they will be paying 4 cents.

Mr. FIELDING: I think we will have to take it as it is, Mr. Chairman.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I would like my friend to tell me on what ground he thinks that the spinners of botany yarn should be put in a position not nearly as favourable as the position of their foreign competitor. Previously there was no trouble. It is true they got no protection whatever, because there was the 99 per cent drawback, but my hon. friend turns round, and, putting a duty on these artificial silk tops, places them at a direct disadvantage, in so far as their competitor is concerned.

Mr. FIELDING: My hon. friend argues that that is what it means. He may be right. I cannot decide it off-hand.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: If the minister has not had an opportunity of considering the effect of it, I would like him to hold the item till he can consider it.

Mr. FIELDING: I do not think it is worth while holding the item. If, in any of these items, as we go further, we find anything that requires a correction, I shall not be afraid to ask for the correction, but I do not think anything can be gained by holding the item over.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Can the minister suggest anything against what I have said? There is the drawback of 99 per cent. There is the fact that the man who imports these yarns and uses them in manufacturing gets the drawback. Every single pound of botany yarn brought in is for the purpose of manufacture. There is the further fact that my hon. friend, under this arrangement which is being made for the purpose of helping one line of manufacture—and I am not quarrelling about that, it is perfectly right—in maintaining the drawback which is applicable to botany wool, is simply saying "To the extent of my new tariff on artificial silk, you, the Canadian producer of botany wool, shall be put at a direct disadvantage in your own country." If my hon. friend can show me any way in which that result does not follow, I will abandon the point immediately. But there is no question about it. Surely my hon. friend has not considered it.

Mr. FIELDING: If my hon. friend is exceedingly anxious for me to hold the item over, I will do so, although I am bound to tell him that at this stage the opportunity of reconsidering these things is not as good as it was a while ago. If he wants it held over, I am content.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not want to hold my hon. friend here for any length of time. If he says that he cannot change anything, very well; but we might as well know what we are doing. We are saying that Bradford's cheaper wool, which makes the stockings of the school children and the workers, gets no drawback, so that while the spinner of Bradford wool here gets protection, the spinner of these botany yarns shall have no protection, and not only shall have no protection but shall be at a disadvantage because the 99 per cent rebate shall be continued. If my hon. friend will not do anything else, in order to keep botany yarns going—and I do not suppose he has anything against botany yarns as botany yarns,—will he not say that the rebates on botany yarns

shall be no greater than the 60 per cent drawback which he is now putting on artificial wools?

Mr. FIELDING: I prefer to let it stand rather than answer questions.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It might come up on the discussion of the drawback, because it really should come up there.

Mr. GOULD: I would like to interpose a remark at this stage. We have listened to these tariff discussions between members of the two old parties, and we have a right to assume, at least, that these members are authorities upon questions of the tariff. Now I have had the honour of being in this House for four sessions, and I have never yet heard any argument advanced by either of the old parties why any tariff should exist, and I have a right to ask, and I have asked, and I ask now again, what investigation has the present government made to find a justification, or to ascertain why a tariff should be 10, 12, 15, 20 per cent or any percentage whatever? I have argued, and I have made the statement time and again, and wish to repeat it now, that the only thing that is in evidence at the present time is that certain institutions come and ask for these things, and, in so far as investigations by the powers-that-be are concerned, I think the people of Canada have not yet been furnished with any evidence to prove a justification or a warrant for the government of the day granting this tariff. If the evidence were given to the people it might clear up a lot of misapprehension providing that evidence does exist; and until the investigation takes place I am sure the people will not be satisfied. There are two sides to the question, the people who receive the duty and the people who pay it; the people who pay have a right to know what justification there is for a change of this kind being made.

Mr. MARTELL: Whom does the hon. member regard as the people of Canada—the people of Assiniboia, or the people of Canada generally?

Mr. GOULD: I think the question is not worth answering.

Mr. MARTELL: That is the opinion of my hon. friend, and the answer comes from a worthy source, because he does not know Canada. He wants Assiniboia to be Canada.

Mr. GOULD: I do not wish to enter into a controversy with the hon. member concerning my knowledge of Canada or his knowledge of Canada, or my conception of the people or his conception of the people, or my conception or his conception of what is right or wrong. I do not think the matter should be exactly judged by the hon. member. I speak absolutely from conviction, as an individual who possibly has paid quite as much in tariff taxes as the hon. member. I would not be afraid to wager that I have paid ten times as much as he has, and that is one of the reasons why I am ten times as sincere in my convictions as the hon. member.

Mr. MARTELL: The hon. member is speaking from his own peculiar narrow standpoint.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—Artificial silk fabrics or artificial fibre silk fabrics produced from a form of cellulose obtained by chemical processes or of which artificial silk or artificial fibre silk is the component part of chief value n.o.p. British preferential tariff, 17½ per cent; Intermediate tariff, 27½ per cent; General tariff, 30 per cent.

Mr. FIELDING: I propose to amend this item by making the tariffs as follows:

British preferential tariff, 17½ per cent; Intermediate tariff 32½ per cent; General tariff, 35 per cent.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister would not expect any comment here, but I have been wondering, for several items back, what had become of that noble band of "facing-in-the-right-direction" tariff people, and "a half loaf better than no bread." They seem to have fallen into somnolence.

Item as amended agreed to.

Mr. MARTELL: This item is carried, the same as other things are carried by the chairman without members having an opportunity for discussion.

Customs tariff—Manufactures of artificial silk or of artificial fibre silk produced from a form of cellulose obtained by chemical processes or of which artificial silk or artificial fibre silk is the component part of chief value, n.o.p.: British preferential tariff, 30 per cent; Intermediate tariff, 35 per cent; General tariff, 37½ per cent.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Any further amendment in that item?

Mr. FIELDING: It is made to agree with the silk item.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: There is no further amendment?

Mr. FIELDING: No.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend states that the advance of 5 per cent in both the intermediate and general tariffs was to put them in line. If that was all why has the minister to raise this one too? I fondly

suspect that the real reason was that the men in the business satisfied my hon. friend they could not get started unless they got that protection. I suspect that is the real situation, just as we found in connection with the former item. Does my hon. friend not agree with me that that is the real reason?

Mr. FIELDING: Would that not be a legitimate one?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Yes.

Mr. FIELDING: Then let us carry the item.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Does my hon. friend admit the reason?

Mr. FIELDING: No, I admit nothing.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not know in which direction the minister is facing. I think it is in four directions all at once.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—Coal, anthracite and lignite; anthracite and lignite coal dust; coke: British preferential tariff, free; Intermediate tariff, free; General tariff, free.

Mr. FIELDING: The word "lignite" is included. That is the only change.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Was lignite not previously 50 cents?

Mr. FIELDING: That has a bearing on the American tariff. The American tariff includes anthracite and other coal in one and these items are so arranged that, perhaps, there may be on this particular item, reciprocity. The American tariff is so arranged that, perhaps, they could admit anthracite and lignite reciprocally. We have no anthracite to sell; but it is the desire of the coal mining industry in the West that these things be put together with the expectation that this might lead to the Americans reciprocating, because of the terms of the American tariff.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Needless to say we do not import any lignite from the United States.

Mr. FIELDING: No.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I see the reason, but we do not import any lignite from the United States and never will to the end of time.

Mr. FIELDING: No, but if we had any reciprocity in this particular item, it would have to conform to the American tariff.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is the duty on bituminous coal?

Mr. FIELDING: Fifty-three cents.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Has the minister had importunities from the minister without portfolio, the Acting Minister of National Defence (Mr. Macdonald) and the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) for an increased duty on coal?

Mr. FIELDING: No, these hon. gentlemen with the characteristic modesty of the Bluenose have not asked for any increase.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Modesty was not so characteristic during the campaign of 1921.

Mr. FIELDING: Did they ask for an increase?

Mr. MEIGHEN: They ridiculed the duty on coal we had been maintaining as nothing at all, and they wanted something worth while for Nova Scotia.

Mr. FIELDING: I never heard of that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister apparently never heard it and he has not heard it yet.

Mr. MARTELL: Nova Scotia has never got anything from either party.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It has been said that the sin of ingratitude is worse than the sin of witchcraft. Where is the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Martell)?

Mr. MARTELL: He is from Nova Scotia.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I heard about the silence of the sixteen. Their silence is relative; they are silent largely compared with what they were. But this small duty on coal was ridiculed by those stalwarts of the faith. How is it that they now allow the minister to sleep at night and to keep the duty of 53 cents on coal.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): In the days when my right hon. friend was Prime Minister of this country and had to do with the management of the railways, they spent $12,000,000 for the purpose of purchasing coal, and $9,000,000 of that went to purchase American coal. That scene has been somewhat changed. In 1921, the coal miners of my county were going without work; their families were going without food, while my hon. friends, in their management of public affairs, were purchasing coal from the United States. Under this government, that situation has been reversed, and in our province to-day all our coal mines are working to the fullest possible extent of their capacity. We have reversed the situation. The public interests of this country, including the railways, are purchasing coal in this country, and our coal miners are enjoying better conditions than they have enjoyed for the last ten years.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This is highly interesting and edifying. In the days that the hon. member speaks of when the large purchases were made, everyone was employed in Nova Scotia. They were selling their coal the world over.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Not at all.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, selling it the world over. They could scarcely get it out fast enough. My hon. friend is referring to later on. At that time there were some out of work, but there was very little unemployment. I venture to say that there is as much coal being purchased to-day outside of Canada as there was in 1921, and by the railways too. As a member of this government to boast of never interfering with the railways, and then to come to this House and proclaim that they have altered the purchase of coal by the railways, my hon. friend is very consistent.

Mr. MARTELL: What member of the government?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. minister without portfolio, the acting Minister of National Defence.

Mr. MARTELL: He is a pretty good fellow.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In 1921 we did not interfere with the operation of railways; we allowed them to buy where they could buy the cheapest; but we said to the extent necessary to provide work in Nova Scotia, buy at the price you can buy from the United States, and we out of the treasury of Canada will make good the difference, so that the railways might be free to make the best business bargain they could. They bought at the price they could buy in the United States, and we paid large sums out of the treasury of Canada in order to keep men employed in Nova Scotia. I venture to say that to-day the railways are following just the policy they did then, and that the government is not doing anything to help keep men at work in Nova Scotia. I would be glad indeed if it is the fact that there is a greater coal production in Nova Scotia; but such is not due to any action of this government, nor is it a fulfilment of the pledge which the hon. member made to move for an increased duty on these articles in the House of Commons.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): As regards any pledges I made to my constituents, I am prepared to go to my constituents and to deal with them. My right hon. friend, with his usual method of drawing a herring across the trail, goes back to war conditions and talks about what his government did when they were working under a War Measures Act, as though that were the situation to which I was referring. I was referring to the situation of 1921.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Part of the time the hon. member was.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I was referring to the situation of 1921. In that year, while contracts were made by Mr. Hanna, a gentleman who was appointed by my right hon. friend's friends to operate that railway, with our coal mining industry in Nova Scotia, they absolutely refused to take the quantities of coal for which they made contracts. In 1921-22, out of twelve million dollars worth of coal purchased for the government railways—I am not speaking about the Canadian Northern or the Grand Trunk—my right hon. friend's friends purchased nine million dollars worth from the United States, while as I say in the county of Cumberland, and in my constituency, men were out of work and the women were without food. That was the situation then, whereas to-day under a policy which has been inaugurated by Sir Henry Thornton, all the coal that can possibly be mined in Nova Scotia is being sold to the Canadian Government railways of this country and to business enterprises at home and abroad. My right hon. friend assented to a contract which was made by Mr. Hanna in 1921, by which he undertook, for a period of three years, to purchase a million tons of coal annually from a certain coal mine in the state of Ohio. Last year, before the Public Accounts Committee, when we asked for information in regard to that, Mr. Hanna declined to produce the contract. That was the situation. As a result of the public confidence that has been renewed in our province as a result of the carrying out of a proper policy by the men who are now dealing with the affairs of this country, as a result of the general renewed improvement of business throughout Canada, the mining industry of our province is in a better condition than it has been in ten years.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I recognize the difference in the angle of discussion adopted by the minister when he rose this time. It is now Sir Henry Thornton who made the change; it was not this government.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): My right hon. friend, with his usual ingenuity is proceeding to quibble. I said that he had allowed Mr. Hanna to purchase coal in the United

States; he had never said that he should not do so whereas we asked that it should be purchased in Canada whenever possible.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The first time the hon. member said that this government had changed it all. Yes, Mr. Hanna ran the railways under our government in practice just as well as in profession. I venture to make this statement, although I have not the figures before me, not having looked into them—because we shall have a discussion later—that as large a proportion of American coal is being purchased to-day as was purchased before.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): For what purpose?

Mr. MEIGHEN: For the railways.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): The hon. member is quibbling again. I said the Canadian Government Railways; I was not speaking of the Canadian National Railways or the Grand Trunk.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Who is quibbling now? What counts to the miner is how much is bought for the railways; he does not care whether the coal goes to the Intercolonial or to the Grand Trunk. The thing that counts is what coal is bought for the railways; that is what counts to the province of Nova Scotia. I venture to hazard the statement I have just made, without going into the figures, because we can get them—

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): All right.

Mr. MEIGHEN: —that there is being bought to-day as large a proportion of coal from the United States as was ever purchased. I do not wonder that there are not as many coal miners now as there were before; as a matter of fact, there are not as many artisans now as there were previously, although these are the days of halo and glory and business prosperity as described by the member for Pictou while they are described by hon. members around him as well as in other parts of the House as the days of the greatest exodus the country has known since the time of Mackenzie.

Mr. NEILL: Unfortunately I missed the earlier part of the debate, but perhaps the minister would not mind repeating, if I apologise, the explanation if he has already given it, as to why it is necessary to ask the House to put on the free list two-thirds of the coal produced in Canada and not the other third. Roughly speaking, coal comprises anthracite, lignite and bituminous coal. Anthracite has been on the free list for some years, and lignite apparently is now being made free. What line of reasoning does the government pursue by which it finds it advisable to put these two coals on the free list and abstain from making bituminous coal free also?

Mr. FIELDING: Does the hon. member think it should be on the free list?

Mr. NEILL: Yes.

Mr. FIELDING: I am afraid I could not agree to that. We get a revenue out of the duty, not to mention other considerations.

Mr. NEILL: I do not think that is a good answer; if it is, would not the same factors apply to anthracite and lignite? The condition in regard to revenue is the same, no matter what kind of coal is involved, so that the question is not primarily one of revenue at all. What differentiates between lignite and anthracite on the one hand and bituminous coal on the other? That is the point on which I should like to have information for the people in the West.

Mr. FIELDING: The differentiation, if I may use the word in this connection, began a great many years ago when the so-called National Policy was established in 1878-79. Bituminous coal was then made dutiable while anthracite was made free, and that has been the condition ever since. Sometimes the fact that a thing has been in existence is a good reason that it should be continued. At all events, that is the history of this matter, as my hon. friend no doubt knows.

Mr. NEILL: That does not explain why we are putting lignite on the free list now.

Mr. FIELDING: I have explained that.

Mr. NEILL: Possibly I was too dense to grasp it. I still think that the same conditions that apply to two-thirds of the coal that is produced in Canada might well apply to the other third. Earlier in the resolutions we see power taken to the government to send a representative to Washington to negotiate reciprocity. That of course is a pure gesture, because we know that the government has power to do that without any legislation. It has been done before quite recently, and it was done years ago without legislative authority. But there is a species of reciprocity now offered to Canada, and only one species, which is on the statutes of the United States. I find in the budget speech a suggestion that the President of the United States might enter into any reciprocal arrangement with Canada without going to congress which I very much doubt. But

there is, under section 315, if I remember rightly, a very distinct pledge on the books of the United States to-day and which cannot be gainsaid, which provides for reciprocity in one particular. It is not at the whim of the president or of any one man; it is there as a matter of law, and provides that if Canada takes off this duty of 53 cents the United States will take off a similar duty on Canadian coal coming into that country. That is an absolute open offer to reciprocity of which there can be no doubt to-day. It is there as a matter of fact, and it would be a real earnest of our genuine desire to have a larger measure of reciprocity with the United States if we accepted and put into force this particular offer which is now available right at our hands. I may explain that like most hon. members I have a selfish motive in this matter, only I have the honesty to avow it, and that is that if this duty were removed it would materially assist the coal miners in British Columbia, because the market for our bituminous coal in British Columbia is in the United States and we are handicapped by this 53 cents per ton which largely benefits the province from which the Acting Minister of National Defence (Mr. Macdonald) comes. So that it is a question of British Columbia being penalized for the benefit of the beautiful province of Nova Scotia for which and for whose representatives I have the very highest regard. I do think, however, that they should also let British Columbia have a fighting chance.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This is a very pertinent question, which I think the minister should answer. Reciprocity with the United States is really the goal of his ambition! Here is a chance to start. The United States has offered reciprocity in bituminous coal. Why does the minister not meet that government in this resepect?

Mr. FIELDING: Do you wish it?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not at all. The minister has never heard me talk reciprocity here, but he has heard himself do so. Now, here is a chance for him to put his principles into practice, and he is urged furthermore by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill). Why does he not start? Reciprocity, according to the minister, is a virtue in itself, and a real crime was committed because we did not secure all the reciprocity on earth in 1911. Well, here is the United States knocking at our door asking for reciprocity in coal. Why does the minister not meet them?

Mr. FIELDING: I am afraid the United States in selecting one particular item and offering us reciprocity in connection with it is not taking very sound ground. At all events that is the way it impresses me. I do not think that the United States should be allowed to pick out one particular item for reciprocity, and an item that does not suit us in Canada. The majority of the Canadian people have agreed that there shall be a duty on bituminous coal, and I understand that the hon. gentleman takes that view himself. We are therefore both agreed on that point. Why should we allow the United States, then, to select one item in particular and ask for reciprocity in respect of it? It may be clear to my hon. friend that there is justification for this course on the part of the United States, but it is not clear to us. It is simply a difference in point of view, I suppose.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister's argument boiled down is this, that reciprocity is all right so long as you keep away from coal. He puts in his reciprocity proposal six or seven things and says, "Come to us on any of these and we will meet you, but for the life of you, don't mention coal, because while reciprocity is a splendid thing in other respects, it is bad so far as coal is concerned." Now, the House will get the measure of the minister's sincerity in the matter of reciprocity. I do not wish to dispute his sincerity at all; that is to say, I do not question his sincerity in regard to wheat and wheat flour in which he wants reciprocity, nor his sincerity in not wishing to have reciprocity in coal. He is equally sincere in either case, but the House will get the measure of the value of reciprocity as such in the mind of the minister. All that he has given us on the merits of reciprocity as a principle now goes up into the air; it amounts to nothing at all. It is defeated by what he says right now in respect of coal. In a word, you must take every single article on its merits, you must look to the future as well as to the present, and there is no special virtue in reciprocity with the United States merely because they are a great nation immediately opposite us.

Mr. FIELDING: My hon. friend for his purpose attributes something to me which I never said. He says that I am in favour of reciprocity in connection with everything but coal.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not say that.

An hon. MEMBER: Yes, you did.

Mr. FIELDING: I say I am in favour of reciprocity with the United States broadly and generally. I do not suppose we would have

reciprocity in everything. I am prepared to consider a fair reciprocity treaty with the United States, and possibly it may include coal. Everything would depend upon taking the treaty as a whole, not letting Uncle Sam select some particular item and say he will give us reciprocity in that. That is the situation.

Mr. MEIGHEN: As one interested in the production of Canadian coal, I shall always remain utterly unperturbed by the minister's threats that we will ever have reciprocity in coal while he is Minister of Finance. Reciprocity in cattle, wheat, wheat flour, oats, barley, potatoes, onions, turnips, hay, fish—he specifies there about eight articles and he says to the United States, "As far as those are concerned I am an advocate of reciprocity; but as far as coal is concerned I am not." I say that the minister by his position to-night clearly exposes to the House that reciprocity in general with the United States has no particular argument in its favour at all—that you may be able to pick out an article where it will be of benefit to us, you may be able to pick out others where it will not be. In a word, much that he has said in the way of declamation and general statement of his devotion to the principle of reciprocity is entirely destroyed by his attitude with respect to coal. However, we will come to this article when we return to No. 2, and I am going to have something to say about it, particularly when I compare it with the minister's proposals in 1911.

Mr. FIELDING: The hon. gentleman says he is going to come back to these resolutions, but while he is dealing with them he might as well deal fairly with them. He selects a resolution mentioning cattle and several other things, but he ignores the general resolution before that declaring the willingness of this country to enter into a fair, general treaty of reciprocity with the United States. And he says, "Oh, you are only proposing reciprocity in these few things." What are these few things? In the first place—we may possibly have to repeat the discussion—there is a broad, general declaration of the willingness of the people of Canada to enter into a reciprocity agreement, not qualified by any limitations. How broad it is to be depends upon the terms of the agreement, and that is a matter which would necessarily go to Congress. But we have said, "There is something which we could do without waiting for Congress. The United States government has authorized the President to make reductions on certain things." Perhaps we could get the United States government to make these reductions now or at an early date, and we select the things most important. I hesitate not to say that the most important item to-day to make —I will not say a reciprocity agreement, for it is not such a broad question, but if we wanted to make a temporary arrangement with the United States to-day I say there is nothing the people of the western provinces are more interested in than cattle, and that in eastern Canada there is no item we are more interested in than fish. We take a few items which we all want to send to the United States and we say, if the United States will meet us on these things we will make corresponding reductions, not waiting for Congress to act. Why these particular things, it may be asked. Well, because these are the particular things which above all others are troubling the people of Canada to-day. That is the position; not as stated by my hon. friend.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I will tell the minister why I referred to that. Just as the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill) said, the only clause in the minister's reciprocity proposal is clause 8C. The preceding clause is only a gesture. He does not need it. He would be just exactly in the same position if it was not there at all.

Mr. FIELDING: Did they need the same thing in 1879?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not at all.

Mr. FIELDING: But they used it, and for good reasons.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Very well. It is a gesture and nothing more.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Why was it put in the National Policy?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I presume for just the same purpose as the minister uses it now: it was a dead letter then and it is a dead letter now.

An hon. MEMBER: They were fakirs then.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Now, the minister says we select those things that we need—

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Will my hon. friend permit me a question?

Mr. MEIGHEN: He never permitted me one in my life.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I will be very glad to start all over again. Does my hon. friend say that the clause with regard to reciprocity which was part of the National

Policy of Macdonald and Tilley was put in without any intention on the part of those great men to carry it into effect?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not say that at all. I say if it was worded as this is—I presume it was, my hon. friend says so—it was a gesture and nothing more and did not change anything in any degree whatever.

Mr. MARTELL: What was it put there for?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Neither does this. The United States says on a long list of articles—and these in 8C are only a few of them—they give the president power under certain conditions to reduce the duties. The minister selects about eight and says, "On these that suit us we will meet you;" and he asks for power from this parliament to do so, but he takes care to exclude other commodities, thereby confessing to this House and the country that his general declamations of devotion to reciprocity with the United States really amount to nothing. If it would be a good thing in these, why would it not be in coal?

Mr. FIELDING: If that is so, why not in everything?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Because it is not. I do not believe in it at all. I do not think we get anywhere by any extensive reciprocity agreement with them. But when the minister says, "It is all right in these articles and all wrong in coal," he declares to the House that the principle he has been arguing for all these years is really nothing but air.

Mr. LOGAN: I should like to remove from the minds of hon. members a misconception with reference to the duty on coal. We in the Maritime provinces are getting rather tired having people continually throwing at us that all we desire is this wonderful duty on coal. What is the duty on coal, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. MARTELL: A bagatelle.

An hon. MEMBER: A Martell.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, Oh.

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. LOGAN: When the duty was put on coal some years ago it was made specific, and when it was fixed at 53 cents a ton, coal was worth about $2.25 a ton. To-day coal is worth over $5, and the duty instead of increasing, as it would have had it been ad valorem, remains the same. The result is that this wonderful duty we are supposed to be so anxious about in Nova Scotia is to-day a 10 per cent duty. That is the protection that our Nova Scotia coal gets. That is, if the law were enforced as was intended by those who enacted it. But what are the facts?

Mr. MARTELL: It does not protect us at all.

Mr. LOGAN: The importer buys his coal at the United States colliery as run of mine, and has it screened there so that it is divided into screened and slack coal. This is brought into Canada and he pays a duty of 53 cents a ton on the screened and 15 cents a ton on the slack coal, with the result, as I am credibly informed, that to-day this imported coal is paying an average duty of less than 35 cents a ton, or about 7½ per cent ad valorem. Now, does my hon. friend from Comox-Alberni or any other gentleman on the other side of the House consider that a 7½ per cent duty is a protective tariff? It is not even equivalent to a tariff for revenue. In fact it is not even half of a tariff for revenue, as we generally understand that phrase.

Let me call attention to one other thing. During the last three years of the right hon. gentleman's administration there was brought into this country from the United States over half a billion dollars' worth of coal, and the average loss in exchange during that time was about 8 per cent. Multiply $500,000,000 by 8 and you have a loss to this country of $40,000,000. It might as well have been thrown into the sea; yet no one seemed at that time to be very much alarmed or to be considering seriously the development of our own coal resources.

Personally I am fully convinced that there should be a duty on anthracite coal. If we are going to tax the poor man's coal, even at 7½ per cent, why should we allow the rich man's coal to come into this country free? As a revenue producer nothing could be better than a tax upon anthracite coal. I consider therefore, that it should be advocated not only to encourage the buying of our own coal but to give us a substantial revenue. Our coal has been proved to be equal to anthracite so far as domestic needs are concerned. This has been proved beyond a doubt in the committees of this House within the last few weeks. I say we should collect a revenue on imported anthracite coal; for in doing so we collect it from the people who can afford to pay, those who are well off or comfortably off. But let us have the last of this talk of protection on Nova Scotia or New Brunswick coal when we are only collecting a duty of 7½ per cent on American coal.

Mr. NEILL: It is very evident that the coal producers of Nova Scotia must be in a very prosperous condition when we find the hon. members for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) and Hants (Mr. Martell) disparaging the duty as small and saying that 53 cents a ton is a mere bagatelle. I trust they will join with me in suggesting that it be taken off for the benefit of British Columbia. I assure these hon. gentlemen that British Columbia would receive that bounty with the deepest gratitude; they would not look a gift horse in the mouth and say, "This is only 53 cents." I say we would be only too glad to have it; we would regard 53 cents as a substantial assistance and would be pleased indeed to receive what these hon. gentlemen do not seem to appreciate very highly.

Mr. MARTELL: Will my hon. friend permit me a question? We have no coal in the county of Hants; there may be coal lying dormant there, but we have not any coal mines. The hon. member for Hants is as far as possible, theoretically at least, a tariff for revenue man only. I am not advocating a tariff for the protection of any industry, but we hear too much about this question of protection for the coal industry in Nova Scotia. Nova Scotia, prior to confederation, was able to run all her affairs with about 7½ per cent duty. To-day the only thing you can point to that we have any protection on at all is coal, and it is very little protection we get on it. The hon. member for Cumberland may have coal in his constituency; if he has, he has as much right to protection as any other industry in Canada, and 50 cents on a ton of coal in Nova Scotia is not half as much protection as other industries are getting in this country which are making the people of Nova Scotia hewers of wood and drawers of water. My hon. friend (Mr. Neill) is very frank when he says he wants protection; I believe he would admit himself that he is a protectionist. Comox-Alberni has no coal, therefore he is not very much concerned about protection; if Comox-Alberni had coal he would be preaching protection. There is a small duty on coal in Nova Scotia. The people of that province are prepared to accept free trade in everything; we are prepared to take the duties off coal so long as you take them off everything else.

Mr. NEILL: Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman said he would like to ask me a question; would he mind stating it? If he does not wish to do so, I do not desire to take up the time of the committee but I really must repudiate the suggestion that there is no coal in Comox-Alberni. I think it is a slander on the representation I have given to that district in the House in the last two years when I am told at the end of my days that there is no coal in Comox-Alberni!

Mr. GOULD: I would like to add a word, not particularly about coal but in relation to the sentiments expressed on the question of reciprocity. When the Minister of Finance rose to reply to some suggestions that have been made, he stated that it was not right to single out one item. Well, so far as reciprocity is concerned one does not need to confine himself to one item, having regard to the present attitude of the American people. I would recall the minister's attention to the fact that boots and shoes, which everybody in Canada must use, are allowed to enter the United States free of duty. When the minister was compiling the list here it might have occurred to him or to the government to have included boots and shoes, because that would have materially affected the carrying out of the principle of reciprocity concerning which the minister seems to be so anxious. Likewise, agricultural implements may enter the United States free of duty, and we might mention quite a number of other things in connection with which the American Congress has gone on record as making a standing offer of reciprocity. I contend that in good faith we might accept this half loaf or quarter loaf offered us at the present time by the United States government. If we are really desirous of promoting the spirit of reciprocity we have a splendid opportunity to do so now, in a measure at least. There are undoubtedly other items which could form the basis of a reciprocal agreement with the United States when the time comes, but I repeat that we might well take advantage of the opportunity now offered by the American government in the legislation at present on their statute book.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Gould) has raised a very interesting point. He is quite right when he states that the American tariff imposes no duty on boots and shoes, and, I believe, no duty on agricultural implements. He says to the government, "Now, if you are in earnest, if you really mean what you say when you assert that because the American tariff is generally high we must therefore maintain ours, why do you not at least do what they do in boots and shoes and in implements?" His argument, based as it is on the pretensions of the government, is to my mind, irrefutable, and I would especially like to hear a reply

from the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe). Let us test his sincerity in this matter. His constituency is filled with boot and shoe factories. There is the American market open, a market of one hundred and ten million people, free to the manufacturers of boots and shoes in his constituency. If the government are only waiting for American reductions in order to have our own duties reduced, just think of the opening that is left them now in boots and shoes. I hope the hon. member for Assiniboia will press until he really exposes the actual mind of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and many other hon. members around him.

Mr. LAPOINTE: My hon. friend is very kind to the industries of Quebec. Indeed our first aim is to get reciprocity in natural products. When it comes to manufactured articles, boots and shoes will be treated like the others.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Treated exactly as the others.

Mr. BAXTER: I do not want to delay passing the item but I was hoping for some explanation from my hon. friend from Hants, but I am afraid he has gone out of the Chamber. It is not so long since there was a very disastrous election in this country, and I happened to be travelling down in my hon. friend's province. I was handed a very neatly printed little pamphlet which told what my hon. friends were going to do in the matter of boots and shoes when they came into power, and my right hon. friend to my left (Mr. Meighen) was represented as being a sort of monster of injustice because every poor woman who bought boots and shoes for the family had to pay fifty cents, all because of the wicked Mr. Meighen, and if she had the merciful Mr. King as premier it would only be thirty cents. There was going to be a very sharp reduction in the cost. Last year I noticed the tariff gave some little advantage in respect of English boots and shoes. There are some imported, but very few, and they are not of the ordinary cheaper variety. I do not fancy there has been any very great relief to the suffering housewives in Nova Scotia because of any experiments tried on the tariff last year, and I was regretting the absence of the hon. member for Hants from the House at this moment. I thought I might learn from his eloquent lips just how these women in the province of Nova Scotia are being consoled for the utter failure to implement the promise of cutting down the wickedness of Meighen at fifty cents to the mercy of King at thirty cents.

Item agreed to.

[Mr. Meighen.]

Customs tariff—Hat sweats; hatters tips and sides when cut to shape. The articles in this item when imported by hat and cap manufacturers for use exclusively in the manufacture of hats and caps in their own factories: British preferential tariff, free; Intermediate tariff, free; General tariff, free.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That is slightly extending the wording, I think.

Mr. FIELDING: The item is substantially the same except that hatters' bands are taken out.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: They are dropped?

Mr. FIELDING: Dropped from this item.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Where are they put?

Mr. FIELDING: They come under tariff item 575.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That is 25, 32½ and 35 per cent.

Mr. MEIGHEN: So the net effect of this is to put a duty on hat bands of 25, 32½ and 35 per cent.

Mr. FIELDING: It would be 27½ per cent.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is the net effect of this change. This will be good news to those who talk about the "step in the right direction."

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—Emery wheels; carborundum wheels and stones, n.o.p.; manufactures of emery or of carborundum: British preferential tariff, 17½ per cent; Intermediate tariff, 22½ per cent; General tariff, 25 per cent.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is the change here?

Mr. FIELDING: No change except that n.o.p. is inserted.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the minister tell us the effect of that?

Mr. FIELDING: The next item will show.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is item 670a.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—Carborundum wheels or stones not further manufactured than moulded and burned: British preferential tariff, 10 per cent; Intermediate tariff, 12½ per cent; General tariff, 15 per cent.

Mr. FIELDING: There is a reduction there.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What are carborundum wheels?

Mr. FIELDING: They are partly manufactured stone brought in from the United States to be finished in Canada.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is no reduction then on the finished article?

Mr. FIELDING: No.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—Sticks or canes cut into suitable lengths for umbrella, parasol or sunshade or walking sticks, further manufactured than in tariff item 672 but not further finished than bent, when imported by manufacturers of umbrellas, parasols, sunshades or walking sticks for use exclusively in the manufacture of such articles in their own factories: British preferential tariff, 10 per cent; Intermediate tariff, 12½ per cent; General tariff, 15 per cent.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Any change there? Is the effect here to put on a new duty or to change the nomenclature?

Mr. FIELDING: Part of it is a reduction, and part of it is free. This is put in at the suggestion of the Customs department. They have had difficulty in administering the former item.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The former item was free altogether.

Mr. FIELDING: No. 17½, 22½ and 25 per cent.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The old item 672 read:

Ribs of brass, iron or steel, runners, rings, caps, notches, ferrules, mounts and sticks or canes in the rough, or not further manufactured than cut into lengths suitable for umbrella, parasol or sunshade or walking sticks when imported by manufacturers of umbrellas, etc.

It seems to me that the effect is—I have no doubt my friend finds the industry requires it—to take these sticks or canes off the free list—they were free before under all three tariffs—and to put on a tariff of 10, 12½ and 15 per cent in its place.

Mr. FIELDING: No. I understand some of them were ruled free in the customs and some were dutiable. They were not all free.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I have just read the item.

Mr. FIELDING: I think you will find that the words are changed.

Mr. BAXTER: It looks as if it turned on bending, It says "not further finished than bent."

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—(b) Usual coverings containing goods not machinery, subject to any ad valorem duty, when not included in the invoice value of the goods they contain;

(bb) Usual coverings containing machinery subject to any ad valorem duty, when not included in the invoice value of the goods they contain: British preferential tariff, 22½ per cent; Intermediate tariff, 35 per cent; General tariff, 35 per cent.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is no change here at all.

Mr. FIELDING: Yes, there is a reduction in the case of coverings for machinery coming from Great Britain. The coverings there are much heavier and of a more expensive character.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is paragraph (bb).

Mr. MARLER: Is there any duty on coverings for hospital supplies? Does that come under this item?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: In nearly all cases they are included in the cost of the goods, in the invoice.

Mr. FIELDING: If the goods are free there is no duty on the packages. If the goods are dutiable there would be a duty on the packages.

Mr. MARLER: Under this item?

Mr. FIELDING: Under all items, yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not think there is a charge on any containers except when included in the purchase price. My hon. friend's own item says "when not included in the invoice value of the goods they contain."

Mr. FIELDING: The item is the same, I am advised, except that the word "machinery" was taken out.

Mr. MARLER: The reason I asked that question was this: The question came up some years ago as regards X-ray plates used in hospitals in Montreal. I understood they were dutiable, and in addition the coverings were dutiable. I do not know whether it is convenient for the minister to give an answer now. If not let it pass.

Mr. FIELDING: I will be glad if the hon. member will let it stand and I will give it later.

Item agreed to.

DRAWBACK

Customs tariff—4. Resolved, that schedule B to The Customs Tariff, 1907, as amended by chapter twenty-six of the statutes of 1914, by chapter forty-seven of the statutes of 1919, chapter nineteen of the statutes of 1922, and by order in council, be further amended by striking

thereout tariff items 1029, 1030, the enumerations of goods, and the rates of drawback of customs duties set opposite to each of the said items, and to repeal Order in Council, P.C. 17/846, dated the twenty-first day of April, 1922, and to provide that the following items, enumerations and rates of drawback of customs duties be inserted in said schedule B:—

Mr. FIELDING: May I ask the committee to return to resolution No. 4?

The CHAIRMAN: That is the one we are at.

Mr. FIELDING: As to the date at which it is to take effect. However, we will return to it and the committee can go on with the other. We will let it stand.

Customs tariff—Materials, subject to drawback when imported by manufacturers of hat sweats and hatters' tips and sides and used in the manufacture of such articles in their own factories: Portion duty—not including special duty or dumping duty—payable as drawback, 99 per cent.

Mr. LEWIS: It seems to me this drawback of 99 per cent is altogether too generous. I understand it costs the government 3 per cent to collect the tariff when only one transaction is made; the drawback as I understand it, involves two transactions, and the cost to the government would be 5 per cent. It seems to me that instead of giving an over generous drawback of 99 per cent the government should take at least four or five per cent on the transaction. I do not think any drawback should exceed 95 per cent.

Mr. FIELDING: The effect of giving a drawback of 99 per cent of course is to make it practically free. The argument is that it is easier for the customs to control it by way of a drawback than by making it free. You may have an article free for one purpose and dutiable for another, and if you make it free generally the privilege is abused. Experience has shown that, and it is better to make the article dutiable and grant your drawback for that part of the business in which you wish to make it free; that is the reason it is made 99 per cent.

Mr. LEWIS: Is not the transaction a loss to the government financially?

Mr. FIELDING: It virtually makes the article free.

Mr. LEWIS: It is a loss to the government just the same.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—Materials: subject to drawback when used in the manufacture of articles enumerated in tariff item 236: Portion of duty—not including special duty or dumping duty—payable as drawback, 50 per cent.

Item agreed to.

[Mr. Fielding.]

Customs tariff—Sugar not above number sixteen Dutch standard in colour, sugar drainings or pumpings drained in transit, melado or concentrated melado, tank bottoms, sugar concrete and molasses testing over fifty-six degrees and not exceeding ninety-six degrees of polarization, subject to drawback when used exclusively in the manufacture of syrups and molasses enumerated in tariff item 140, not to include syrup and molasses produced in the process of refining sugar. Provided, however, that such drawback shall not be paid unless the claims as presented by a manufacturer at any one time aggregate twenty-five dollars: Portion of duty—not including special duty or dumping duty—payable as drawback, 30 per cent.

Mr. FIELDING: I move that item 1031 be struck out and that the following be substituted:

Artificial silk yarn, filaments, threads or twists enumerated in tariff items 583AA and 583B when imported by manufacturers to be further manufactured in their own factories before the 1st day of July, 1924, 60 per cent.

That item will be designated 583aa.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Had it not better be numbered with the drawback numbers, instead of being put in with the tariff numbers? Usually my hon. friend will find all his drawbacks in schedule B. Really the proper place to put that in would be as No. 1011a, because then it would be in proper contradistinction to what happens in connection with this unfortunate botany yarn. It is a drawback provision, and the drawback provision as to botany yarn is No. 1011.

Mr. FIELDING: Before the resolution is finally disposed of we will consider that suggestion.

Item stands.

Customs tariff—Oil subject to drawback when used in the manufacture of manila rope, not exceeding one and one-half inches in circumference, when used exclusively in the fisheries: Portion of duty—not including special duty or dumping duty—payable as drawback, 99 per cent.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is that new?

Mr. FIELDING: Yes, it is a new item. It is in the production of an item that is free that this oil is used.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—Glass tubing, subject to drawback when used for the manufacture of glassware and other scientific apparatus for laboratory work in public hospitals. Portion of duty—not including special duty or dumping duty—payable as drawback, 99 per cent.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—Barilla or soda ash, subject to drawback, when used in the manufacture of sal soda. Portion of duty—not including special duty or dumping duty—payable as drawback, 99 per cent.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—Machinery, and parts thereof, and dies valued at more than $500 each, of a class or kind not made in Canada, subject to drawback when used in manufacturing or producing goods of a class or kind not manufactured or produced in Canada prior to the twelfth day of May, 1923: Portion of duty—not including special duty or dumping duty—payable as drawback 60 per cent.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is the underlying idea in connection with this item? We get 60 per cent there as against 99 per cent in the others.

Mr. FIELDING: It is intended in this case to encourage the introduction of machinery not made in Canada, but machinery to be used in the creation of industries not hitherto in existence in Canada. It may be argued we should make it free, but we have in mind some of the industries which are contemplating coming in now which will have the benefit of what some people think is quite a protection, and there is no reason why we should give them protection on both. For that reason we think they should be content with a partial drawback.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—Materials, including all parts not finished, subject to drawback when used in the manufacture of goods enumerated in tariff item 448c: Portion of duty—not including special duty or dumping duty—payable as drawback, 40 per cent.

Mr. FIELDING: That is giving the drawback on materials used in the stumping machines previously referred to.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—Copper in blocks, ingots, pigs or bars; subject to drawback when used in the manufacture of rods for use only in the manufacture of trolley, telegraph and telephone wires, electric wires and electric cables: Portion of duty—not including special duty or dumping duty—payable as drawback, 99 per cent.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That is new also, is it not?

Mr. FIELDING: Yes, that practically makes the item free.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What was the situation before? Had we that at all before?

Mr. FIELDING: There is one factory—I am not sure that there is more than one—making these goods, which did not get them free because they were not made in their own factory. They were not wire manufacturers, and consequently they were not able to avail themselves of the freedom. We now propose to give them an opportunity of getting a drawback no matter whether these articles are made in their own factory or not.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend's recollection will be much fresher than mine; but as regards the copper situation in Canada, at one time one of the things that came very strongly before me in the tariff inquiry was that in view of the protection we had on the raw material, it would have paid a manufacturer to take his plant to Buffalo for the purpose of selling in Ontario, because the duty on his raw material and his other expenses ran up to about 12 per cent as against a protection of 10 per cent, so that he was 2 per cent worse off than if we had free trade. Is the idea of this drawback to get away from that situation?

Mr. FIELDING: Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: If it be to get away from that situation, why is it so much confined to these particular articles?

Mr. FIELDING: The item is the same as it was before, except that the qualification about using these bars in their own factory in the making of wire is removed. Anybody can now import copper bars for that purpose. Under the new copper policy, we hope, however, they will buy them in Canada.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: This is not intended then to assist the main situation at all?

Mr. FIELDING: It will change the situation in this respect, that the man who could not formerly import copper rods and bars free unless he made the wire in his own factory, can do so now. That limitation is now removed.

Mr. WALLACE: While we are dealing with drawbacks, is there any drawback on material entering into the manufacture of oleomargarine?

Mr. FIELDING: I am told that there is a drawback under an order in council which will expire some time this year.

Mr. WALLACE: What is the amount of the drawback?

Mr. FIELDING: The actual duties paid.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister says that it will expire.

Mr. FIELDING: I am so advised. It is an order in council for a limited period.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, but the minister can have another one passed.

Mr. FIELDING: Certainly.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is the intention to keep the material free while the finished product is free?

Mr. FIELDING: That whole question is open until to-morrow?

Mr. MEIGHEN: To-morrow it may close and it may not.

Mr. SPENCER: What is the amount of the drawback for this last year—the whole thing?

Mr. FIELDING: I could not give that to my hon. friend now. If he is desirous of getting it, I will give him at a later date the amount paid.

Item agreed to.

Customs tariff—5. Resolved, that any enactment founded on the foregoing resolutions shall be deemed to have come into force on the twelfth day of May, one thousand nine hundred and twenty-three, and to have applied to all goods mentioned in the foregoing resolutions imported or taken out of warehouse for consumption on and after that day and to have applied to goods previously imported for which no entry for consumption was made before that day.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: In this connection I think my hon. friend said—at least his statement would have that effect—that notwithstanding the fact that the general resolution would come into effect, he was taking power to see that resolution in regard to artificial silk did not become effective until the company could do business.

Mr. FIELDING: Have we not effected that by the drawback?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not think so.

Mr. FIELDING: I will take a note of that and think the matter over.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It is a very serious matter.

Mr. FIELDING: Two resolutions touching reciprocity stood over earlier in the evening. If hon. members so desire, we will go on with them now.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is pretty late to start reciprocity to-night. I should like the minister, when we come to the discussion, to have the information as to what list of articles, as regards the United States, the president has power to make reductions on, upon the conditions specified in their law; that is to say, upon what articles besides those enumerated in clause 8c.

Mr. FIELDING: I shall be glad to look into that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: And under what conditions?

Mr. FIELDING: As contained in the American tariff?

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Item agreed to.

4. Resolved, that schedule B to The Customs Tariff, 1907, as amended by chapter twenty-six of the statutes of 1914, by chapter forty-seven of the statutes of 1919, chapter nineteen of the statutes of 1922, and by order in council, be further amended by striking thereout tariff items 1029, 1030, the enumerations of goods and the rates of drawback of customs duties set opposite to each of the said items, and to repeal Order in Council, P.C. 17/846, dated the twenty-first day of April, 1922, and to provide that the following items, enumerations and rates of drawback of customs duties be inserted in said schedule B:—

Mr. FIELDING: I desire to move that this resolution be amended by adding after the word "councils" in the sixth line the following words "P.C. 19-656 dated 25th May, 1920, and." That is an order in council that was omitted.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is the minister's idea in having a statute repeal an order in council? All he has to do is to repeal that himself in council. It seems to me to be cluttering up our statutes. Nobody in looking over the statutes can tell what on earth the effect is.

Mr. FIELDING: The Customs department regards this as very important. It does not lumber up our statutes much because when you are repealing a certain bill, it is not much to add a certain order in council.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I know that.

Mr. FIELDING: It is the practice, and the Customs department agree that it is necessary.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think it is the practice. It was not the practice before, although it may be now. It is true that it does not take any longer to read; but the difficulty is that afterwards when this becomes a permanent statute in our annual production, anyone who examines this statute will not know what the effect of the statute is. He will have to send down to Ottawa in order to get a copy of the order in council. It makes it very difficult to interpret.

Mr. FIELDING: If the order in council is repealed it does not matter.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, but he does not know what is accomplished by this statute. I think it would be much better that orders in council passed by council should be repealed by council and not by statute.

Mr. FIELDING: I understand that the experience of the Customs department has been otherwise, but I am willing to look into

the suggestion of the hon. gentleman. I move that the committee rise and report progress.

Item agreed to.

Progress reported.

COMBINES, MONOPOLIES, TRUSTS AND MERGERS

CONCURRENCE IN SENATE AMENDMENT

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister) moved the second reading of and concurrence in an amendment made by the Senate to Bill No. 54 to provide for the investigation of combines, monopolies, trusts and mergers.

He said: There is a slight amendment offered by the Senate to the bill. It simply adds that the statement which must be submitted when the six applicants make application for an investigation shall be in the form of a solemn or statutory declaration. The amendment is acceptable to the government.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is that the only amendment?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes.

Motion agreed to; amendment read the second time and concurred in.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the House adjourned at 11.25 p.m.

Wednesday, June 6, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

REPORT

Sixth report of the Select Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce.—Hon. Mr. Maclean (Halifax).

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST READINGS

Bill No. 196 (from the Senate), for the relief of Cecilia Maria Taylor.—Mr. Guthrie.

Bill No. 197 (from the Senate), for the relief of William August Kruger.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 198 (from the Senate), for the relief of Thomas Benjamin Brown.—Mr. Carruthers.

Bill No. 199 (from the Senate), for the relief of Elva Burnside.—Mr. McKay.

Bill No. 200 (from the Senate), for the relief of Alfred Thomas Candy.—Mr. Duff.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

ELEVATOR DOCKAGES

Mr. SHEARD:

1. Do elevators receive pay for separating dockages of 3 per cent or over from grain?
2. Do these dockages of 3 per cent or over belong to the elevator?
3. Are they binned separately from the dockages of under 3 per cent, which are the property of the elevator?
4. When terminal elevators purchase these dockages do they not receive them in their entirety?
5. Do they deliver to other purchasers of dockage the quality which they themselves receive?
6. How and where is this quality determined?
7. Is it inspected and graded?
8. Is it (in case of dispute as to quality) subject to survey by the Survey Board?
9. Is it standardized by the Standards Board? If not, why not?

Hon. Mr. ROBB:

1. Yes.
2. No.
3. No.
4. Yes.
5. Yes.
6. According to the tariff governing the operation of public terminal elevators, the holder of warehouse receipts or shut-outs covering the dockage is entitled to the same quality of screenings as taken from the car, as shown by the grain inspector's test.
7. Yes.
8. No.
9. No. No provision is made in the Canada Grain Act for the standardizing of dockage.

MEDICINE HAT CUSTOMS OFFICE

Mr. GARDINER:

1. How many employees are there in the customs office at Medicine Hat?
2. What are the individual salaries of these employees?
3. What were the total expenditures in the customs office at Medicine Hat for the years 1921 and 1922?
4. What were the total revenues from this office in the years 1921 and 1922?

Hon. Mr. BUREAU:

1. Eight, including one relieving officer.
2. 1 collector, $2,160; 2 senior customs excise clerks at $2,040 each; 1 cashier and computing clerk, $1,800; 3 customs excise clerks, $1,600, $1,440, $1,380; 1 customs excise examiner, $1,320.
3. 1921-22, $15,154.48; 1922-23, $14,890.98.
4. 1921-22, $90,592.47; 1922-23, $118,875.48.

OLEOMARGARINE—IMPORTS OF MATERIALS

Mr. EVANS:

1. What was the amount of importations last year of oils or fats used in the manufacturing of oleomargarine?

2. What was the amount of duty paid on such importations?

3. What was the amount of drawback paid on the finished article made from such importations?

4. What are the names of the companies who imported such oils or fats and who received the drawbacks?

Hon. Mr. COPP:

1 and 2. Information not available as customs entries do not show purpose for which importations are made.

3. The total amount of drawback paid last year on materials used in the manufacture of oleomargarine, $19,269.82.

4. Swift Canadian Company; Harris Abattoir.

TORONTO SOLDIERS' COMFORTS BRANCH

Mr. CHURCH:

1. Has the government decided to close, in June next, the Soldiers' Comforts branch of the Department of Civil Re-establishment at Toronto? If so, why?

2. Have any protests against this action been received from the directors of the Canadian National Exhibition, various women's organizations, or other public bodies, and urging that this important soldier employment work be continued?

3. What economy or co-ordination, if any, will such a course of action effect?

Hon. Mr. BELAND:

1. The government has decided to coalesce the work of the Soldiers' Comforts branch with that of the permanent establishment of the department.

2. Representations were received from the directors of the Canadian National Exhibition and their request has been met. Other bodies have also made representations.

3. The Purchasing and Stores division of the department which must be maintained to supply the ordinary requirements of the hospitals—without increasing the overhead costs—is in a position to undertake the administrative work involved in the supply of soldiers' comforts, thus effecting economy to the extent of the present cost of operating and providing accommodation for a separate branch to furnish such supplies.

CAMP HILL HOSPITAL, HALIFAX

Mr. CALDWELL:

1. Has there been a contract entered into for the supplying of milk, cream, and ice cream, to the Camp Hill hospital, Halifax, Nova Scotia?

2. If so, with whom?

3. What are the contract prices?

4. Were tenders called for before the contract was awarded?

5. If so, how were same called for?

6. Were any tenders received from any person, firm or corporation other than the successful tenderer?

7. If so, at what prices?

8. Is the department aware that the executive head of Camp Hill hospital is heavily interested financially in the company to which the above contract was awarded?

[Mr. Beland.]

Hon. Mr. BELAND:

1. Yes, for milk and cream.

2. Scotia Milk Company, Halifax.

3. Milk 32 cents a gallon; cream 37 cents a quart.

4. Yes.

5. Requests for quotations were issued to eight dairies.

6. Yes.

7. Milk per gallon: 33 cents, 33 cents, 34 cents; cream per quart: 37 cents, 45 cents, 40 cents.

8. No information.

SINGAPORE NAVAL BASE

Mr. MACLEAN (York):

1. With reference to the proposal of the British government to expend £10,000,000 upon the creation of a naval base at Singapore, is it a fact, as stated in the British House of Commons on first of May last by Mr. Eyres-Monsell, Financial Secretary of the Admiralty, that—"This work was approved by the Dominion Conference in 1921 and it was most strongly represented by the Dominions"?

2. Is it a fact that Mr. Eyres-Monsell, at the same time and place, said, with reference to the expenditure, that—"he had great hopes that the Dominions, which had a very direct interest in the work, would see their way to co-operate with us in this direction"?

3. Is it probable that the hopes of Mr. Eyres-Monsell will be fulfilled?

4. Is it a fact that Colonel Amery, First Lord of the Admiralty, at the same time and place, said—"He had no doubt that the Conference to be held in the autumn would endorse the conclusions arrived at by the Conference of 1921"?

5. Is it probable that the prediction of the First Lord will be fulfilled?

Mr. SPEAKER: I would inform the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean) that this question should be preceded by an asterisk so as to obtain a verbal answer.

Question stands.

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

SOLDIERS' SETTLEMENT BOARD—EDMONTON

Mr. BOYS:

1. By what method or in accordance with what principle is the insurance business, arising out of the transactions of the Soldiers' Settlement Board at Edmonton, distributed?

2. To what persons, firms or companies, acting as agents for insurance companies and resident in Edmonton, was this insurance business given in—(a) year 1921, and (b) year 1922, and what were the premiums paid to each of such persons, firms or companies?

3. To what persons, firms or companies, acting as agents for insurance companies, and resident in Edmonton, was this insurance business given from January 1st, 1923, until the present time, and what were the premimus paid to each of such persons, firms or companies?

4. Are any of the persons above mentioned persons who have had no service overseas in the late war? If so, who?

5. Is it the policy or the intention of the government to give any of the insurance business, arising out of the transactions of the Soldiers' Settlement Board at Edmonton, to persons who did not serve overseas in the late war?

6. Is it the policy or the intention of the Government to distribute the business of insurance, arising out of the transactions of the Soldiers' Settlement Board at Edmonton, to a list of selected persons? If so, what are the names of these persons?

UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR PAPERS

SOLDIERS' COMFORTS BRANCH, TORONTO

Mr. CHURCH:

For a copy of all correspondence, letters, telegrams, reports and other documents, relating to the closing of the Soldiers' Comforts branch at Toronto on June 20th next, of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment.

INCOME WAR TAX ACT

Mr. STEWART (Leeds):

For a return showing all cases where fines and costs have been in whole or part remitted after conviction for violation of the Income War Tax of 1917, since January 1st, 1922. Such return also showing at whose instance or at whose representation, verbal or otherwise, such remissions have been made, and also showing in each case when the law was or has since been complied with by the delinquent.

LAKE FREIGHT RATES

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. ROBERT FORKE (Brandon): The Prime Minister yesterday, in reply to a question, stated that, arising out of the report of the royal commission that had been investigating the subject of grain rates on the lakes, a bill would be introduced to amend the Shipping Act so as to give power to the government by order in council to suspend the coasting laws. A great deal of evidence has been taken on this subject and the commission has submitted a report making several recommendations. What the Prime Minister promises is entirely inadequate in the light of that report. Does the government intend to bring down legislation that will fully meet the suggestions that have been offered by the commission?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): My hon. friend refers to certain legislation that arises out of the report, and I think it would be well for the House to wait until that legislation is brought down to see how far-reaching it is. There are features of the report that demand very careful and thoughtful consideration. The government has not thus far had an opportunity to give to the entire report the consideration which we think it merits. However, when the legislation which is based on the recommendations of the commission is before the House it will be open to any hon. member to suggest additions or amendments.

Mr. FORKE: When is that legislation likely to be brought down? I gathered from the statement made yesterday that what the Prime Minister outlined was the whole bill of fare that the government purposed submitting to the House. And, as no mention was made of many of the items recommended by the commission, I thought it well to call attention to the matter.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I hope it will be possible to present a copy of the proposed bill early next week.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY

REPRESENTATION TO THE GOVERNMENT FROM DEBENTURE HOLDERS

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. HERBERT MARLER (St. Lawrence-St. George): Has the government any announcement to make concerning the visit to Ottawa of Sir Francis Harrison Smith and Mr. D. F. Forsdike, who represent the Grand Trunk Pacific debenture holders? Further, have these gentlemen waited upon any member of the government, and, if so, what is the nature of the representations they have made?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): The two gentlemen referred to by my hon. friend did wait this morning upon the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham), the Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin), and myself, and presented certain representations on behalf of the debenture holders of the Grand Trunk Pacific. These representations are similar to those set forth in a memorial the government received some little time ago from the shareholders' committee, and I think I could best answer my hon. friend's question by undertaking to lay upon the Table of the House a copy of the memorial itself. I shall be pleased to do that before the House rises to-day.

MONTREAL AND LONGUEUIL BRIDGE

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. JOSEPH ARCHAMBAULT (Chambly and Vercheres): On April 23rd an order of the House was passed for production of the report of the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal on the south shore bridge. On May 9th I called the attention of the Minister of Marine (Mr. Lapointe) to the fact that the report had not so far been laid on the Table.

The minister's answer was that he would submit it in a few days' time. A month has elapsed and the report is not on the Table yet. I should like to know from the minister whether it is his intention to produce that report this session.

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries): This report was sent to the department only two or three days ago, so that it could not have been laid upon the Table of the House before now. I shall be pleased to bring it down in a few days.

OLEOMARGARINE

MOTION BY MR. CARROLL TO PERMIT MANUFACTURE, IMPORTATION AND SALE

Order of the Day—Special Order.

Mr. W. F. CARROLL (Cape Breton South and Richmond) moved:

Resolved, that it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend The Oleomargarine Act, chapter twenty-four of the statutes of 1919 (second session), and the amending Acts, by providing that notwithstanding anything contained in The Dairy Industry Act, 1914, or in any other statute or law, the manufacture in, and importation of oleomargarine into Canada, and the offering for sale, the sale and the having in possession for sale, of oleomargarine, shall henceforth be permitted, subject to the provisions of the said Oleomargarine Act and to such regulations as are now or may hereafter be established by the Governor in Council.

He said: Mr. Speaker, no doubt you viewed with alarm my entrance into the Chamber this afternoon. Probably you thought that I must be armed with a very large array of papers and that the House would be subject to a long and tiresome speech from me. I want to assure you before I go any further that my speech will be brief, but I trust it will be logical and replete with facts. The question of the manufacture, importation and sale of oleomargarine has been before parliament for a number of years. In 1886, on a motion by a member of the government to place a tariff duty upon the importation of oleomargarine, a debate took place which considerably affected the standing of the commodity in this country. At that time there were no regulations in force regarding the manufacture of oleomargarine, and in the course of the debate statements were made to the effect that this commodity was manufactured out of dead horses, rats and other unwholesome ingredients. A few years later legislation was passed to ensure the purity of dairy products, culminating in the Dairy Act of 1914, which was amended in 1916 to provide for the manufacture, importation and sale of oleomargarine in this country.

Under this act various regulations were put into effect to protect our people against adulterated products, and to-day I hope we shall not have repeated the well-worn argument that oleomargarine is harmful or unwholesome, for the reason, Mr. Speaker, that the manufacture of this commodity has been under the direct control of the Department of Agriculture and it is generally acknowledged that the gentlemen in charge of that department are very careful indeed to see to it that there is nothing dangerous to the public health in the ingredients which enter into the manufacture of oleomargarine.

Without entering into details regarding these ingredients, I will content myself by saying that there is a difference of opinion both in the country and in this House as to whether or not we should allow the further manufacture, importation and sale of oleomargarine. We must approach this question in a fair and honest frame of mind and should not use arguments which, while they may have been effective up to 1916, can now be safely discounted in view of the fact that the Department of Agriculture exercises very stringent supervision over this manufacture. But while there may be a difference of opinion on the desirability of allowing oleomargarine to be still manufactured and imported, we cannot ignore appeals from various influential organizations which to-day are asking parliament to make effective an Oleomargarine Act such as I propose to introduce if this resolution passes. We must consider this question not with the eye of 1886 but with the eye of the present day. If I cite the Canadian Lumbermen's Association as being in favour of the continued manufacture and sale of oleomargarine, I shall perhaps be told that this organization is looking for cheap food for its labourers. And when I say that the Retail Merchants' Association of Canada is also asking that my proposed bill be brought into effect, I shall be told that this organization, too, is interested from a financial standpoint. But, Mr. Speaker, I have stronger authority still in the fact that 200,000 of our women have shown by the votes which they cast in their respective organizations and by their circular letters that they are in favour of the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine being continued. As I say, the motives of the Canadian Lumberman's Association and of the Retail Merchants' Association of Canada may be questioned on the ground of their being pecuniarily interested; but will any hon. gentleman dare rise in his place and tell us that the mothers and sisters and daughters

of the Canadian people are engaged in propaganda that will hurt their offspring, their kith and their kin? The stand taken by these women is one of the strongest arguments, it seems to me, that can be used in favour of the continued manufacture and sale of oleomargarine.

But to return for the moment to the Retail Merchants' Association of Canada. I presume that as business men they are not interested either in poisoning our people or in bringing about the ruin of our dairy farmers. What do they say about this matter? In 1916, when an order in council was passed under the War Measures Act to permit of the manufacture, importation and sale of oleomargarine, this association undertook to investigate this commodity. Their investigation convinced them that oleomargarine was not the menace to the health of our people which the propaganda of its enemies had sought to make out. Here is a circular which the association have sent out to the members of the Senate and of the House of Commons, and I may be permitted to read one paragraph, as follows:

> Before our members undertook to offer it for sale to the general public we made exhaustive enquiries as to the ingredients it contained and its method of manufacture. We consulted with the chief analyst for the Dominion government and he pronounced it a perfectly good food, and he stated that it contained no harmful ingredients, and, as on each package is stamped the approval of the Department of Agriculture of the Dominion of Canada, our retail grocers, butchers, produce dealers and general store merchants throughout Canada felt perfectly justified in stocking it and offering it for sale. If our customers did not want it there would be no sale for it, but our experience shows that they do want it, and, seeing that it is a non-injurious and palatable product, and contains nothing that is unhealthful, we are of the opinion that they should be allowed to buy it if they so desire, and no law should be passed to prevent them from having it.

I reiterate, Sir, that whatever may have been said regarding the harmful properties of oleomargarine should no longer be repeated, because parliament in 1917 recognized this commodity as a healthful article of food, and up to the present time millions of pounds have been sold throughout the country with the approval of the Department of Agriculture. Again I appeal to hon. members not to use the argument that oleomargarine is harmful food, because by so doing they will in effect be casting a slur not only upon the Minister of Agriculture and his predecessors but upon the departmental officials as well. Surely before the approval of the department is placed on this article which goes out in small packages, the precaution is taken to ascertain whether or not it is a healthful article of food.

Much has been said, Mr. Speaker, regarding the injury which oleomargarine may have been causing to the dairy industry of this country. Well, I do not believe the manufacture of oleomargarine has been in any way injurious to the dairy people, because every pound of butter they manufacture has a ready sale; the milk from every cow they raise is sent out in the shape of butter and cheese. But they tell you that oleomargarine is used as a substitute and that in its sale as such the persons handling it make their customers believe that they are buying butter. I do not think there is any force in that argument, for this reason: Every package of oleomargarine that is manufactured in or imported into this country has stamped on the product itself, in letters that may be seen and read by all, the word "Oleo." Every parcel is also enclosed in a wrapper which indicates in the clearest way that it is oleomargarine and not butter. Moreover, the Department of Agriculture exercise supervision over and make regulations respecting the manufacture of this product in Canada as well as its importation. Now, follow me. This product is manufactured here, or is imported. Surely the officers of the Agriculture department are sufficiently alive to the interests of the people to see to it that not an ounce of oleomargarine leaves the factories in this country or is imported without there being stamped upon it the word "Oleo." Then it goes to the wholesaler. I hope that the Agriculture department have been sufficiently alert in performing their duty to the people during the last four years to see to it, through their inspectors or other officials, that the wholesaler who gets this bulk of oleomargarine for distribution to the retailer does not attempt to impose upon the people by erasing in any way those distinctive letters which indicate that the product is oleomargarine and not butter. Then we come down to the retailer. I do not argue that the Department of Agriculture have a sufficient staff to see to it that no substitution or erasure is made at that stage. But, Sir, I have sufficient confidence in the honour and honesty of the retailers of this country to believe they are not doing that kind of thing, and it will take a very strong line of evidence to make me think otherwise.

When did the dairy industries of this country suggest, after 1917, that we should have a prohibition against the manufacture or sale of oleomargarine? It is a very peculiar thing that in 1921, in their petition to the government of the day, they did not ask for

the prohibition of this article of food. What they did ask for was a "standard colour of oleomargarine"; for the printing on each package of the word "oleo"; for a differently shaped package "from that now used for oleomargarine"; "for the prevention of deception or dishonesty in making purchasers believe they are actually getting butter or an article of the same food value as butter."

Mr. KAY: May I ask what my hon. friend is quoting from, and the date?

Mr. CARROLL: I am quoting from a copy of a petition sent to the Dominion government in 1921 by the Dairy Council of Canada. Now, if they saw in 1921 that they should not ask for the prohibition of oleomargarine, or, to put it differently, if they did not ask for it, what has changed their mind in the meantime? Is there any evidence that dealers have been deceptive in the matter—that they have attempted to make the people believe they were getting butter when they were really getting oleomargarine? I do not believe it, Mr. Speaker. Taking this matter as a whole, I think we should use the arguments that may be used as from 1917 in respect to oleomargarine and not hark back to the times when people were afraid of anything new and when they believed that oleomargarine was made up of such ingredients as I mentioned in the earlier part of my remarks.

I wish to impress upon you, Mr. Speaker, and upon the members of this House the fact that the parliament of Canada put the stamp of its approval upon oleomargarine in 1917 and has kept it there ever since. It has indicated its belief that oleomargarine is a non-harmful food, a food that is wholesome. In casting your votes in this connection I want you to remember that fact; I want you not to be led away by any other thought but that there are thousands of people in this country who want to use oleomargarine and who have the right to use it. I hope you will not think me a plagiarist if I use the words: Is this an article of commerce? And—If this is an article of commerce, why should we prohibit it? I am using the words, Sir, of the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) in a former debate in this House. He is one of the few people who have the happy faculty of placing a whole argument in a nutshell.

I ask the members of this House to give fair consideration to this whole question. I ask them to think of the millions who are asking this parliament that they be permitted to put this product on their table as an article of food. I ask them not to be led away by their own personal interests; we are not here for that purpose. I do not make any accusation—I believe that every member of this House will use his best judgment in the matter—but I do suggest that we be not led away by any selfish motives. Let us seek away down in our hearts and ask ourselves: Are we going to prevent the people from using oleomargarine if they wish to use it? If we are, then it is just as well that parliament should to-morrow say to the people that they shall not use shoes unless they are up to the standard; that they shall not use an article of clothing unless it is the very best; that they shall not purchase any horse food that is not up to or, perhaps, above the standard. It may be said that oleomargarine is a cheap article of food, but it is not deleterious; it is not unwholesome. But I say, give the people of this country who wish to use that article of food the privilege of using it. I reiterate: If this parliament takes it upon themselves to refuse the common people of this country that which I consider a benefit, they will hear from them in the very near future.

Hon. S. F. TOLMIE (Victoria City): Mr. Speaker, in rising to second this resolution I do so with the understanding that I may suggest certain changes or in my opinion improvements to it as I go along. Under those conditions I am glad to second this resolution.

This matter has been discussed, as has been pointed out by the hon. member (Mr. Carroll) who has just taken his seat, on a number of occasions in this House in the past, and I for one sincerely hope that we shall decide finally on this occasion whether we are going to have oleomargarine in this country or not. The subject has taken up a very great deal of the valuable time of this House in previous years. On this occasion I can hardly refer to the subject without saying a word as to the way in which this resolution has been put off from the early part of the session until now when we are in its closing days—a resolution of the very greatest importance not only to the dairymen of this country but also to the consumers and to a certain group of manufacturers. I feel that this matter should have been given attention earlier in the session if possible, and should not have been avoided and side-stepped in the way it has been. I rather think the question has been evaded to a certain extent, but I shall not speak any more of that phase of the question beyond referring for a moment to what the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) said yesterday when discussing oleomargarine and in uttering the word "cuckoo" we will all understand what I mean.

This measure was first introduced as a war measure on account of the great scarcity of fats overseas. It will be remembered that there was a considerable demand for fats on the other side of the Atlantic during the war, and oleomargarine was introduced at that time and found very useful indeed over there. In fact, our Canadian troops went all through the war using only oleomargarine as a spread for bread. It has been suggested that on account of its having first been introduced as a war measure it should cease now that the war is over. But let me point out that the people of Canada have expressed their wishes through their representatives in this House on several occasions and have extended the time year by year, and at the present time oleomargarine is now recognized as one of the staple articles of food in many sections of this country. I think the government should carefully consider this in bringing down any measure or in giving support to any measure for making oleomargarine permanent in this country.

What is oleomargarine? In the first place it is made from selected beef fats, neutral lard, vegetable oils, pasteurized milk, salt, pure water, and sometimes includes butter. It is all churned together and then made into blocks and offered for sale. It is manufactured only under the strictest sanitary conditions. It is first necessary for anyone desiring either to import or to manufacture oleomargarine in Canada to obtain a license from the Minister of Agriculture for that purpose, and the minister may at any time cancel that license for cause. It is made under the very closest inspection, the inspection of our Meat and Canned Foods branch of the Department of Agriculture, and their certificate and brand on any goods sent out of this country is accepted in all parts of the world. With the United States we have an exchange of certificates between our Health of Animals branch here and the Bureau of Animal Industry at Washington.

The question is often asked, is oleomargarine wholesome? We find that its digestibility is about the same as butter, about 97 per cent, and its energy value is also about the same. With regard to its palatability we find that the British or English-speaking people throughout the world have a preference for fats showing the lactic acid flavour, as a result of the fermentation of milk and cream from bacteria working upon it. Oleomaragarine will never be as popular as butter in this or any other country because it will never be as palatable, not possessing that peculiar lactic flavour I have just referred to, and anyone who understands or has an appreciation of real good butter can never be misled by any oleomargarine. He can tell the difference both by taste and odor.

One feature of this oleomargarine question that has been stressed to a very great extent in the discussions in this House in the past year is the vitamine content of oleomargarine. You will find that authorities differ a great deal on this point, some claiming that the other animal fats contain just as many vitamine soluble A as the butter fats themselves. Let me quote. William Clayton, Master of Science at Liverpool University, in a book published in 1920 says:

> The published work on "The Nutritive value of Oleomargarine and Butter Substitutes", with reference to their content of the fat-soluble accessory growth substance, is due to Halliburton and Drummond whose conclusions were: That the fat-soluble accessory growth substance is present in beef fat and also oil and is present in margarine prepared upon such a basis. Such margarines are nutritively the equivalent of butter.

We find, too, that butter varies a great deal in its vitamine content, and this is indicated very greatly by the pigmentation or colouring of the butter. For instance, in winter time we find that the butter is very light in colour, and then it has a very low vitamine content as compared with the rich, bright yellow butter of June or July during the height of the grass season. Now, the butter maker is permitted to colour his butter in the winter time so that it will look like June butter. As has been pointed out by scientists who have investigated the matter very carefully, the vitamine content is shown by the height of colouring, but the butter maker by heightening the colour of his butter gives no indication to the purchaser of the vitamine content or its value as a food in that particular respect. Let me quote in this connection from Sherman and Smith's book " The Vitamines," 1922, by H. C. Sherman, Professor of Food Chemistry, Columbia University, and S. L. Smith, Specialist in Biological and Food Chemistry, United States Department of Agriculture. They say:

> In recent years butter has occupied a unique position because it appeared to be conspicuously the richest in vitamine A among the commercial food fats. Further work in this field indicates, however, that the value of butter in this respect is subject to rather wide variation.
>
> Steenbock, as previously noted, found that paleness of butter fat indicated paucity of vitamine A, but the present system of artificially coloring butter makes it impossible for the consumer to apply this criterion. The burden of responsibility for the maintenance of the vitamine value of butter lies with the producer. By intelligent and liberal use of feeds rich in vitamine A, such as alfalfa, and care in the manufacture, transportation and storage of the product, both butter and other animal fats may in time be standardized as commercial sources of vitamine A.

Quoting again from Mr. Clayton, of Liverpool University, he says:

In conclusion it is well recalled that butter owing to the influence of food, storage conditions and temperatures used in the renovation of inferior products, and even the method of use of the produce in the home, may not exceed a good oleomargarine in nutritive qualities.

The whole question seems to depend upon the adequately varied and balanced diet of the individual. Children should preferably be fed on butter, but adults, with their stronger digestive powers, may with absolute impunity replace butter with either oleo or vegetable margarine, provided they consume sufficient amounts of the vegetative green parts of plants since these furnish an ample supply of all three vitamines.

You will see here that the diet of a man being very varied, a paucity of vitamines in any particular article of food may mean that the whole ration was short in that particular respect. May I point out, Mr. Speaker, a few of the common articles of food that contain vitamines. I will only mention a few of them so as not to take up too much time of the House.

Butter; cream; margarine prepared from animal fats other than lard; milk, condensed, evaporated or dried; nut butter; mutton and beef fat; heart; brain; sweetbread; cod liver oil and other fish livers oils—

Which, I may say, is one of the richest in this vitamine.

—herring oil, salmon and cod oil; liver; onions, kidneys; potatoes; fat fish, as herring, salmon fish roe; eggs—

And some forty-two others, including many vegetables.

This will indicate to you how very freely these vitamines are distributed among the common articles of food. We have also had rather sweeping statements made about the entire absence of vitamines in oleomargarine. You will see, however, that this is not the line of argument pursued by those men who are experts in this particular direction. In a bulletin issued by the National Dairy Council entitled "Health vs. Wealth" I find the following statement:

You may wonder when milk and butter contain vitamines why beef fat does not. Vitamines are in green, leafy substances, grass, leaves, twigs, whole grain and many things that a cow eats. The cow requires some for her own use and stores some in her liver, but all the rest is given off in the milk and are never deposited in the flesh. As oleomargarine is chiefly made from the waste products of the animal at the slaughter house it could not possibly contain vitamines.

This is a very broad statement indeed and is opposed by many. Now let me quote from a statement by H. Steenbock, of the Department of Agricultural Chemistry of the University of Wisconsin. He says:

In our work a somewhat similar product, the oleo oils from beef fats, prepared in commerce for the manufacture of oleomargarine, were in some instances found richer in fat-soluble vitamine than many butters. Subsequent to the publication of these results we became aware of the fact that vitamine content as determined in our feeding experiments with these samples seemed to vary directly with the intensity of pigmentation.

Pointing out again that you may form an opinion as to the presence of vitamines by the colouring of the fat material. Now, in this particular article on "Health vs. Wealth" it is indicated that most of the vitamines are lost except those given off through the milk, but the author does not state what becomes of the vitamines fed so liberally during the grass season to those animals which are not giving milk; and we could hardly expect that nature will be so improvident, as in the case of the steer and the dry cow, as to cause an almost entire waste of this particular and valuable ingredient of food. If we accept Steenbock's theory for a moment we will recognize, as I pointed out a moment ago, that the excess of vitamines is clearly indicated by the high colour of the butter fat. Those who are familiar with the beef aspect of the question will remember that grass beef is also very much higher in colour than beef produced in winter time, indicating that there are vitamines stored up in the beef fats particularly at that season of the year.

Now in some of the American literature which has been distributed in the propaganda against oleomargarine we find pictures of white rats indicating some rats fed on vitamines which are of a very lusty character and other rats fed on a diet wholly lacking in vitamines which appear very weakly. It must be admitted that growth is due to certain chemical changes which take place in the body, and that the very best results are obtained where you have a ration that is chemically well balanced. In many sections of the country there is a paucity of certain ingredients in the soil which causes certain diseases, for example the disease known as rickets. I know of certain sections of British Columbia where cattle, young animals particularly, pastured on certain lands soon after exhibit rickets, or a bending or softening of the bones, due to the absence of calcium and phosphates. By the feeding of certain food rich in calcium and phosphates, however, these conditions are avoided and you can produce healthy cattle on this very same land. I know certain sections of British Columbia where, during the calving season many calves live only for an hour or two after birth, a severe loss resulting from this mortality. This again is due to the absence of iodine, showing again how necessary it

4 p.m.

is, in the case of growing animals, particularly that the rations should be well balanced.

I may say that during the war our Canadian troops, as I pointed out a while ago, had nothing but oleomargarine as a spread for their bread. This was also used by the British troops. The Danish army and navy is also supplied with the same material. In many Danish institutions oleomargarine is a regular part of the diet. It has been pointed out in some literature I have seen that it is necessary to have milk in some form or other for the proper growth of the human being. I do not think that this theory has been thoroughly supported by evidence. Take the case of the North American who never used dairy products in his life. Yet you see Indians out on the prairie six feet one inch in height and weighing two hundred pounds, fine lusty fellows. If we were to look into the matter very carefully we should probably find that not more than one half of the people of the country use milk or milk products.

Mr. WARNER: I should like to know if the hon. member has proof that the mothers among the savages do not nurse their children.

Mr. TOLMIE: I think the hon. gentleman's question is very appropriate. Every human being is probably nursed in that way, but I am talking about the individual when he reaches the period when the individual can use butter spread on bread. I am quite sure the Indians in the West have never used any butter. If they have, the practice has only commenced within recent years.

We also had very strong criticism of the vegetable oils used in the preparation of oleomargarine. I know that, either last year or the year before, we had some vivid word pictures drawn here of perspiring natives toiling in the jungles of Africa gathering the various seeds and plants from which these oils are obtained. I thought at the time the picture was rather overdrawn. I may say that the principal ingredient in the vegetable oil line used in the manufacture of oleomargarine in Canada is simply cotton seed oil. While we hear many complaints about the use of cotton seed oil in the preparation of oleomargarine we find it is used in many other articles of food such as shortening, and in salad oils, without the least bit of trouble. Evidently the oil is regarded as quite suitable in those cases but apparently is objectionable when used in the manufacture of oleomargarine. In addition to that we find that even annatto used for the purpose of colouring butter is mixed with cotton seed oil and by the use of this particular colouring, as I pointed out a while ago, January butter is made to look like June butter and as though it were rich in vitamine contents.

Now, we find that the consumption of oleomargarine increases as butter goes up in price, and it lessens as butter goes down in price, because no person with a decent palate or a good taste would for a moment think of eating oleomargarine if he could secure butter at a reasonable price. Oleomargarine, though, furnishes a greal deal of relief to people in families where economy is an absolute necessity under certain conditions that are liable to occur from time to time. To indicate that oleomargarine is in demand, let me quote a telegram received from the chamber of commerce in my constituency, the city of Victoria:

> We strongly urge you support resolution introduced by Mr. W. F. Carroll, M.P., Cape Breton, to make permanent legislation permitting manufacture and sale oleomargarine in Canada. Public opinion in Canada overwhelmingly favours such permanent legislation. Will you please forward copy this wire to Prime Minister and Mr. Carroll mover of the resolution.

May I say that Mr. Spencer, in addition to being chairman of the chamber of commerce, is the owner of a very large departmental store where they handle all lines of food products. I have had similar wires from women's organizations, including the Local Council of Women, but I will not take up the time of the House in reading them.

We usually find that oleomargarine is lower in price than butter, and I have in my hand these quotations of last week in Ottawa:

	Wholesale price	Retail price
Creamery butter	33 cents	40 cents
Dairy butter..	26 cents	33 cents
Oleomargarine..	20 cents	25 cents

This shows a difference between creamery butter and oleomargarine of 13 cents wholesale and 15 cents retail, and a difference between dairy butter and oleomargarine of 6 cents wholesale and 8 cents retail.

I was informed only yesterday that it paid the grocer in many cases to sell oleomargarine, because he made a greater profit from the sale of oleomargarine than from the sale of butter. This would hardly be borne out by the figures I have cited. The profit shown in dairy butter is about 7 cents between wholesale and retail; on creamery butter, 7 cents between wholesale and retail; and on oleomargarine only 5 cents between wholesale and retail.

Mr. STANSELL: Is the hon. member prepared to state the source of the figures he has cited?

Mr. TOLMIE: These figures were obtained from the city market in Ottawa last week, on the day it was expected that this ques-

tion would come up. I did not think it necessary to get new figures to-day.

The argument has been used that we should wipe out oleomargarine in this country, because some of our logging camps give it to their loggers to spread on their bread in place of butter. I do not think we should be inconvenienced simply because of that. That is something that should be arranged between the logging camp men and their employers. In British Columbia, as I am sure the Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock) will agree, you cannot put on the table of the logging man anything except just what he demands and he sees that he gets it.

Many families throughout the country are from time to time using oleomargarine in order to keep down family expenses. We have the man who gets out of work; we have the man who has sickness in his family and who has to incur an extra expense; we have those families where economy is an absolute necessity, and this occurs from time to time in the everyday life of the people of this country. The people have every right to decide for themselves in their own intelligence whether oleomargarine is to be purchased by them or not, and this House is taking upon itself a very great responsibility when it tells the people that they should not have the same privileges as are enjoyed by the people of every other country in the world.

We have three groups that are chiefly interested in this oleomargarine question. We have the great consuming group which is the first consideration; then we have the dairy man; and, third, we have the manufacturer of oleomargarine. Therefore, this is not entirely a question pertaining to the dairyman. If the poor man or the man who desires to lower his cost of living, cannot obtain the cheap oleomargarine and cannot afford the price of butter, it will be necessary for him to use ordinary beef or pork dripping, and I am sure oleomargarine would be more palatable for his use under such conditions. We should leave this matter entirely to the judgment of the people. It is not the place of the government of this country to prohibit the manufacture of oleomargarine; rather it is the duty of the government to protect the people, to see that oleomargarine is made in a very wholesome way; that there is no possible criticism along that line, and then that it is not sold for something which it is not. As I pointed out a moment ago, oleomargarine, on account of its inferiority in flavour, will never interfere with good butter.

We have also had the argument put forward that if the manufacture of oleomargarine is once made permanent in this country, oleomargarine will greatly increase in quantity. I think that argument is not borne out by our experience since 1918 when it was first introduced. We find that we have had free access to the American market, and not only the ingredients which are made up into oleomargarine in this country, but the manufactured article can be imported from the United States absolutely free of duty. So, if there had been a greater demand in this country for oleomargarine, we would have had it entering Canada in very much greater quantities. The truth is that since 1918, when oleomargarine was first introduced into Canada, there has been a steady falling off in the quantity consumed in this country; but it has been very clearly shown that when butter gets cheaper in price, the consumption of oleomargarine lessens to a very considerable extent. Let me cite these figures:

	Oleomargarine	
	Quantity manufactured in Canada	Quantity imported
Year	Pounds	Pounds
1918..	10,483,179	3,494,622
1919..	8,450,902	5,231,211
1920..	6,224,422	5,547,345
1921..	3,780,392	2,057,035
1922..	1,902,629	1,345,784

Mr. JACOBS: The hon. member will notice that under the Liberal administration we have been using more butter than oleomargarine.

Mr. TOLMIE: I am sure the Liberal government can take credit for some things, but that is rather a long step.

In the meantime creamery butter has shown a steady increase, and only last year it increased something over 15,000,000 pounds. At the present time the consumption of oleomargarine amounts to only about 2 per cent for the spreads used for bread in this country. That is, 98 per cent of the spreads consists of dairy products as compared with 2 per cent of oleomargarine. This shows that the situation is not at all a dangerous one. The dairyman of this country, therefore, might very well look at this question in a broad, liberal way.

Mr. LUCAS: Would that condition continue if oleomargarine became permanent in this country?

Mr. TOLMIE: That is just the point that I referred to a moment ago. I have just given the figures that show that, with the duty entirely off oleomargarine and its ingredients coming into this country since 1918, there has been a steady falling off from about 14,000,000 pounds to less than 4,000,000 pounds last year,

when they had the broadest access to the American markets and could have imported a much larger quantity had they desired to do so, or had the consumption called for that. Therefore, with the placing of oleomargarine on a permanent basis in this country, I do not think we could reasonably expect that there would be a greater consumption of oleomargarine than there has been in the past. It has been stated in some of the literature circulated on this subject, and particularaly in that of a gentleman named Love, of Edmonton, who quotes a western packer in his booklet to the effect, that the sale of the portions of the carcass used for oleomargarine do not in any way affect the price of the beef animal. I have figures from the Packers' Association which clearly prove that the price obtained for these portions of the carcass does affect the sale of the animals to the extent of about 59 cents per head; and calculating on the sales of last year through the packing houses this would make a difference to the beef producers of about $400,000.

Let us glance for a moment at the question as to how oleomargarine has affected other countries where dairying has been carried on to any great extent. These figures are exceedingly interesting. In 1880, Denmark, one of the greatest dairy countries in the world, exported 27,057,726 pounds of butter. In 1882, the first co-operative creamery was introduced into Denmark, and in the same year oleomargarine factories were established in that country; and the increase in the manufacture of oleomargarine has steadily continued at a rapid rate. Now, judging by the argument advanced by those people in Canada who are opposed to the manufacture and consumption of oleomargarine in this country, we ought naturally to expect that Denmark's dairy industry would be absolutely ruined by this time through the influence of the manufacture of oleomargarine in that country. Well, let us look into that question just for one moment. Denmark in 1921 had increased her exports of butter to 199,584,863 pounds, or nearly 800 per cent. That is an indication of the way in which oleomargarine has "ruined" that country. On the other hand, Canada in 1880, exported 18,535,362 pounds of butter, while in 1921 the same country, carefully protected against oleomargarine up to 1918, not a pound of that substitute having been sold here up to that time, had suffered a reduction in its exports of butter which then amounted to just 9,739,414 pounds, or a reduction of nearly 47 per cent. Denmark today is consuming annually about 48 pounds of oleomargarine per capita, about 19 pounds of butter and about 62 gallons of whole milk. Did oleomargarine interfere with prices in Denmark? We shall see. In 1880, the average price for Danish butter was 24.12 cents per pound and in 1921 it had risen to 57.25 cents. Denmark imports most of her concentrates, her grains and her oil cake from the United States and the Argentine republic for the purpose of feeding her cows for the production of dairy products. Denmark has a population of only three millions as against Canada's nine millions. Canada can grow the finest foods for dairy cattle of any country in the world, and our people should be able to produce, on that account, cheaper dairy products than any other country. But the figures I have quoted show that while Denmark increased her dairy exports nearly 800 per cent, ours declined 47 per cent. If Denmark has been ruined by oleomargarine, then for goodness' sake let us be ruined in the same way.

Mr. PUTNAM: I presume the hon. member will admit that his figures give no intimation as to whether the coeval existence of oleomargarine would not have still further reduced the Canadian export of butter in the term of years he has referred to?

Mr. TOLMIE: I contend that the decline in our exports of butter was not due to the presence or the absence of oleomargarine at all; I say that if oleomargarine can ruin our butter business in Canada, then Denmark should have been ruined by now, for the reasons I have stated.

Mr. PUTNAM: The hon. gentleman, I suppose, would concede that the decline in our exports of butter would have been more disastrous than it was if the industry had had to compete with oleomargarine throughout the period he mentioned? It is mere conjecture as to whether or not the absence of oleomargarine helped to keep the industry.

Mr. TOLMIE: I am not claiming that the absence of oleomargarine kept it up at all. What I claim is simply that we are not making progress, and instead of fiddling around discussing a question of this kind in connection with a great industry such as the dairy industry, we should be busily engaged this afternoon trying to discover some means of improving the condition of that industry in Canada to-day.

Mr. PUTNAM: I contend that there is absolutely nothing in the hon. gentleman's figures to show that the absence of oleomargarine had any effect on butter one way or the other in Canada.

Mr. TOLMIE: I pointed out that from 1880 to 1921, the period covered by the fig-

ures I submitted, throughout almost the whole of that time except for the last three or four years, we had no oleomargarine at all in Canada, and our butter exports were on the decline all the time. These figures, I think, indicate quite conclusively that we have nothing very much to fear from the manufacture and consumption of oleomargarine in this country. What we need immediately is a well-considered, a carefully worked out, and a broad and comprehensive plan for the development of our great dairy industry; and we should be discussing the more important phases of that business rather than wasting our time on this question.

The dairy industry of Canada has a hundred times more to fear from the manufacture of poor butter than from the manufacture of oleomargarine. The reports brought back by the officials of the Department of Agriculture who recently visited Great Britain go to show that the fact that we do not obtain as much for our butter as the Danes do is due to the poor quality of our product, its poor colouring, its poor keeping qualities and its flavour. I was asked only yesterday whether I expected the people of this country to adopt the standard of living of the Danes. Now, I do not know anything about the standard of living of the Danes, because I do not know Denmark; I have never been there. I do know, however, a number of Danes who have come to this country and settled both west and east of the mountains, and I can say that they are among our very best settlers. At any rate, they are men who are willing to work; and they work with results. I can recall one man whom I met in the city of Calgary, who came here with nothing at all—he had 25 cents in his pocket when he landed. To-day he turns out butter every week at the rate of tens of thousands of pounds. Another man of this type told me last year at the Calgary exhibition: 'Tolmie, you can break me if you like and I shall be independently rich in this country in five years." And, Mr. Speaker, he said this in a section of the country we hear decried so much in this House.

Let me quote some figures to show what we have to fear from the manufacture of bad butter, as compared with the production of oleomargarine, in Canada. I would ask hon. gentlemen to pay particular attention to the figures with reference to oleomargarine, because we hear it stated so frequently that this article is being sold for butter in a wholesale way in Canada. In 1919, the convictions for infractions of the Dairy Act, that is, for the sale of bad butter, were 111, while the convictions under the Oleomargarine Act were eight; in 1920, the convictions for butter were 126 and for oleomargarine 12; in 1921, the convictions for butter were 126 and for oleomargarine 14; and in 1922, for butter they were 126 and for oleomargarine 14.

Mr. NEILL: Is not that due to two facts —first, the far greater quantity of butter sold; and secondly, the fact that there is a very strict standard of butter making while there is none whatever for oleomargarine in this country?

Mr. TOLMIE: I do not think the hon. member will find any very strict standard of butter making extensively applied to dairy butter throughout this country. I have been a dairy inspector myself and a good many times I have seen butter that was anything but desirable. Quite apparently there was no standard at all except to get the butter into solid condition and sell it to someone.

Mr. MARTELL: Would not my hon. friend say that probably the reason why more oleomargarine people escaped than butter makers was due to the fact that the former were represented by more able attorneys?

Mr. TOLMIE: I do not think so. I am not trying to argue in favour of oleomargarine as against dairy products. I am trying to quote exact figures, and it is a very poor showing indeed if our dairymen, or whoever are responsible for the administration of the Oleomargarine Act, can find only fourteen convictions from Halifax to Victoria in one year if infractions of the law are nearly so general as they are stated to be.

Mr. WARNER: Can the hon. gentleman tell me how many firms in Canada are making oleomargarine compared with the number of our dairymen?

Mr. TOLMIE: I cannot tell my hon. friend the number of our dairymen, they are here by the thousands, but I think the oleomargarine manufacturers are confined to two firms. If I am not mistaken, we have two factories in Toronto and one in Edmonton.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): What are the names of those two firms?

Mr. TOLMIE: The Swift Canadian Company and the Harris Abattoir Company.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): They are American firms?

Mr. TOLMIE: One has the same name and is I presume a branch of the Chicago firm, although I have no evidence of that, but the other is a strictly Canadian firm as far

as I know. I am acquainted with both proprietors and they look like Canadians anyway.

To indicate how carefully the dairyman is protected in this country with regard to the manufacture of oleomargarine, I will quote the regulations. I do not say that this protection is ample, and I have already intimated that there may be further restrictions we can apply so as to prevent the sale of oleomargarine for anything other than what it actually is. Before oleomargarine can either be manufactured or imported the dealer or manufacturer must have a license from the Minister of Agriculture. The minister may cancel this license at any time for cause. All packages must be clearly marked "Oleomargarine." I have a package here on which will be noticed the word "Oleomargarine" is cleary marked. We also have the word "Oleo" stamped directly into the material itself in letters one and a half inches high. Oleomargarine must be manufactured in an inspected establishment and, as I pointed out, the inspectors are highly qualified men who in addition to being skilled veterinarians have also passed a further examination before being taken into the employ of the Department of Agriculture. The sanitary arrangements must be first-class in every respect. The manufacture of oleomargarine in butter establishments is strictly prohibited. All materials must be inspected and analyzed if thought necessary. Oleo oil and neutral lards used for this purpose must be from inspected establishments. Importations of any of these materials must be accompanied by certificates from recognized authorities in the country from which they come. Milk from non-reacting cows or pasteurized so as to be free from tuberculosis must be used. Butter free from rancidity and bad odour must be used. I may say that some of the manufacturers are using no butter at all at the present time. No preservatives other than salt are allowed. No unlicensed person is permitted to mix oleo with butter. No colour is to be used or given away with oleomargarine. Manufacturers of oleomargarine must not use the words "butter," "creamery," "dairy," or the name of any breed of cattle in advertising or describing oleo or on any package containing oleo. Pure vegetable oleo must be so designated. It must be sold only in its original package. In all restaurants where oleomargarine is sold there is to be a placard displayed, "Oleomargarine sold here." Now, we have heard a great deal about how oleomargarine is sold in some places for butter. I have made careful inquiry among the butter distributors in this city, who say that that is not the case, that our restaurants here buy and use butter of the best quality. I have also asked a prominent gentleman connected with the Dairy branch who also agrees that not much oleomargarine is disposed of, at any rate under these conditions.

Mr. LUCAS: Has the hon. gentleman ever seen one of those placards in any restaurant in Canada?

Mr. TOLMIE: Not where I eat. There are very severe penalties imposed for any infractions of these regulations. I am quite sure that frequently oleomargarine gets a reputation for certain things that it is not guilty of at all. For instance, a gentleman, connected with the Department of Agriculture at that time, travelling from Montreal to Ottawa received on the train some very bad butter. He was very much disgusted with it and very angry, and after "calling down" the waiter he placed the butter in a paper package and had it analyzed, claiming very confidently that it was not butter at all but oleomargarine. The analyst found that it was just bad butter—some of that butter I was describing a few minutes ago.

There are certain propositions being put forward for the further control of oleomargarine even more stringently than at the present time, so as to make it impossible for it to be sold for butter. It has been proposed to give it an artificial colour. You will note, Mr. Speaker, here is a sample of oleo oil used in the manufacture of oleomargarine which is of a distinct yellow colour. Here again is some cottonseed oil, which is a vegetable product and which also is a rich golden colour, indicating that the natural colour of any product made from these two articles would be yellow. It is proposed now, however, to change this colour. Whether a proper standard can be arrived at or not I do not know, but if the manufacturers are agreeable I see no reason why this proposal should not be carried out. I feel we should place this matter on the soundest possible basis, I think we should encourage our dairymen in every possible way, and if I for one moment thought that this oleomargarine manufactured in Canada would interfere with the dairy industry—last year there was the miserably small quantity of less than 4,000,000 pounds of oleomargarine manufactured compared with 240,000,000 pounds of butter—if I thought it was going to seriously interfere with our dairymen I would certainly oppose its continued manufacture. But after a very careful study during the past three or four

years I have been unable to find any reasonable argument along these lines.

Mr. CARROLL: Is the hon. gentleman himself engaged in dairying?

Mr. TOLMIE: Oh yes, I am engaged in the dairy business, and I also have two pure bred herds of very valuable dairy cattle. My principal customers are dairymen. However, I feel that when I come down here as the representative of Victoria City I would not be justified in allowing my private interests to interfere with my public duty.

Mr. WARNER: Of course—

Mr. SPEAKER: I would remind hon. members that these interruptions are only allowed with the consent of the hon. gentleman who is addressing the House. They must not be too profuse.

Mr. WARNER: I want to ask the hon. gentleman two questions. If a greater number of people were engaged in the manufacture of oleo might not conditions be different? Also, if permanent arrangements are made does he not think there will be a great increase in the amount of oleo manufactured?

Mr. TOLMIE: No, I do not think there would be any difference at all, because ever since 1918 our people have had an opportunity to eat all the oleomargarine they want. Our figures show that instead of an increase in consumption there has been a steady falling off with the decrease in the price of butter, that is, the consumption of oleomargarine has fallen from 14,000,000 pounds to less than 4,000,000 pounds last year, which I think is a pretty fair indication that the people are getting tired of it. Had there been a duty on oleomargarine it might have affected the figures, but this commodity can be got just as cheap from the United States as in this country, and the people have shown that they have no great desire for it.

The butter maker is asking the oleo maker to colour this product, made from two yellow articles, either pink, green or black. I think it would be unreasonable to ask for that change in colour; it would be entirely foreign to the natural colour of the products from which the finished article is made. Remember this: The dairyman to-day—and the oleomargarine man does not object to it—is allowed to colour his butter so that he can make January look like June; he can make it look as if it were rich in vitimines when perhaps it is not. In Great Britain they permit ten per cent of butter to be added to their oleomargarine product; in Denmark fifteen per cent is allowed. In this country some of our packers are using as much, I think, as eight per cent. This can hardly be called adulteration—the mixing of a small quantity of higher priced material with a lower priced material Adulteration, as I understand it, is quite in the opposite direction.

As have pointed out, on every package of this product "Oleomargarine" is clearly marked. I am strongly in favour of improving that in any way possible so as to prevent the article from being sold as butter, or so as to obviate any misrepresentation in connection with it. I am a firm believer in putting a duty on oleomargarine imported into this country and on such of its ingredients as are already manufactured here. I see no objection whatever to the standardization of oleomargarine and the placing of a statement on each package indicating exactly what is contained in it. Holland has built up a great oleomargarine industry, the product being largely exported to Great Britain. Here is a chance in our country for development along similar lines. I feel that we should take up any line of work that will increase our industry, add to the wealth of the country and enable us to overcome the difficult conditions that exist as a result of the war. I believe in the firmest and closest policing of the sale of oleomargarine and dairy products in general. Unless we put our goods on the British market in the best possible condition we are not going to get our share of the market over there.

The suggestion has been made that oleomargarine affects dairy prices in this country. I do not think that its sale affects the price of butter here at all, for the reason that we get rid of our surplus in an export market: If the dairy industry of Canada is to increase we must continue to develop our export market. Naturally the price of butter in Canada is set by the price of butter in the market in which we dispose of our surplus product; and do not forget that that butter is sold in a market where oleomargarine also is sold in huge quantities. If we cannot compete with the little bit of oleo sold here, how on earth can we ever hope to compete in the British market, where oleomargarine is sold in such large quantities? One thing is sure, if we are going to compete over there we shall have to reduce our cost of production to such a level as will enable us to meet the Danes and our other competitors on that market; otherwise we cannot hope for good results.

It has been stated that the farmers all over this country are firm believers in the wiping out of the manufacture and consumption of oleomargarine. I have had talks with several farmers in the West, and when the whole con-

dition is explained to them, as I have attempted to state it to-day, they have felt that there was no unreasonable ground for fear of the competition through the manufacture of oleo. But here is a very interesting thing: At the last session of the Alberta legislature a resolution was brought up to wipe out oleomargarine, that is, to recommend that the manufacture, sale and importation of oleomargarine in this country be made to cease. This resolution was put to a vote and that farmers' legislature voted it down by a majority of 30 to 12. I want to congratulate those farmers on the broad-minded view they took of the situation. If the dairymen throughout Canada were fully informed concerning this matter we would not have all this row about oleomargarine at the present time.

Mr. WARNER: May I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. TOLMIE: Certainly.

Mr. WARNER: Does he know that that vote was not so much on the question whether or not we should have oleo in Canada as on the question whether the provincial legislature should undertake to advise the Dominion parliament what to do in the matter? That is what the vote was.

Mr. TOLMIE: Yes, but the hon. member knows what the resolution was aimed at. The question was whether they should recommend that legislation against oleomargarine should be adopted by this parliament, and they turned it down by a majority of 30 to 12. They are broadminded farmers, men who understand their business.

There should be a campaign in this country to increase the consumption of dairy products, to advertise their value, and so on. I think also that in connection with our export it would be well to adopt the words "Canada, approved" on our Canadian products wherever possible. These are the words that appear on our pork, bacon, ham, and so on that are sent out of this country. By having these words attached to all our products we should set up and maintain a nigh standard; we would keep up our volume of exports and maintain the quality of our goods, thus being able to get our share of the British market in a comparatively short time. I have tried to present the figures to the House in a fair way. I hope this matter gets settled one way or the other on this occasion. I know it would do me more good to take the other side of the question, as I said before in reply to an inquiry by an hon. member—to take the side of the dairyman. But I do not feel justified in doing so; I feel that this House has no right to tell the people of Canada that they have not the same intelligence as the people of other countries and that they cannot be allowed to buy oleomargarine if they wish to do so. The whole thing hinges on that one point, in my opinion we have to leave a little to the people. We told them a while ago what they should do with their money when they went to a certain place of entertainment; now we are going to tell them what to put in their mouths, and in doing so I think we are going a little too far. Last year the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) expressed great astonishment at my stand in this connection. I studied this question very thoroughly, both when Minister of Agriculture—when I was able to get information more easily than now—and subsequently; I have examined it carefully from all points of view, and I have come to the conclusion that the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine in this country is not hurtful to our dairy industry at the present time and will not hurt it in the future. Instead, therefore, of wasting our time on a question of this kind we should be busy trying to develop the dairy industry along proper lines.

Mr. W. F. KAY (Missisquoi): Mr. Speaker, as my hon. friend from Cape Breton South (Mr. Carroll), has been less belligerent to-day than he was on a former occasion, I trust that I shall have no difficulty in keeping within the rules of parliamentary debate. I am not going to follow his argument very far, but he made one statement that I think is hardly fair. He said that oleomargarine had the approval of the staff of the Department of Agriculture. I think he has no warrant for that statement. The law was passed by this House and these gentlemen, however much they may be against oleomargarine, are in duty bound to enforce the provisions of the law.

The hon. member for Victoria City (Mr. Tolmie) in the beginning of his speech found fault with the government for what he termed the long delay in giving an opportunity for the discussion of this resolution. It struck me as rather curious that he should criticise the government in that respect, because if my memory serves me correctly, in 1921 when he was Minister of Agriculture a bill providing for the extension of the oleo legislation stood on the order paper from the early days of the session and was not discussed until within the last two weeks of the session.

This question has been discussed in this country for a great many years. The first

legislation enacted on the subject was I think in 1886, when oleomargarine was first prohibited. In 1903 the provisions of that restriction were re-enacted, and this occurred again in 1914 under the Dairy Industry Act. During all that period from 1886 to 1917, a period of thirty-one years, oleomargarine was prohibited in this country, and we have not heard that there was any public demand or any demand whatever for its introduction. In 1917 the members of the House will remember that we as well as all the allied countries were beginning to feel the pinch and the stress of the Great War, and all the peoples of the allied countries were then willing to submit to any sacrifice which would help towards winning the war. Many things were done, Sir, not only in this country but in all the allied countries at that time which no one would have dreamt of as possible under normal conditions, and one of these extraordinary things was the enactment in 1917 of the order in council permitting the temporary importation, manufacture and sale of oleomargarine in Canada. Before that order in council was passed the matter was fully discussed by the Canada Food Board, an organization of the government, and by a special committee of that Food Board known as the Special Milk Committee. Upon that committee were representatives of the dairy interests, and when the great need of the boys at the front and of the allies for more butter and fats was pointed out to the dairymen they consented gladly, as patriotic citizens should, to allowing oleomargarine to be manufactured, imported and sold in Canada provided that it was as a war measure only and a temporary one. In order to show that that was the view of the government I will read the provisions of that order in council, dated October 23, 1917:

Whereas attention is drawn to the abnormal demand for butter due to war conditions and to the very great probability that such abnormal demand and consequent high prices will prevail for this product for some time to come;

And whereas it is in the public interest, under the special conditions above named, that other fats should be available in Canada under strict and reasonable conditions as a substitute for butter,—

Therefore, His Excellency the Governor General in Council, under and in virtue of the provisions of the War Measures Act, 1914, is pleased to make and enact and doth hereby make and enact the following regulations providing for the importation to Canada and the permitting of the manufacture, sale and possession within Canada of oleomargarine and establishing the conditions of such importation, manufacture, sale and possession, such regulation to be in force and to have effect for the period during which the present abnormal conditions continue, the conclusion of such period to be determined by His Excellency the Governor General in Council, as provided in the said regulations, and as a war measure only.

[Mr. Kay.]

That, Sir, as I have said before, was agreed to by the dairymen of this country, but it was agreed to on the distinct pledge of the government of the day that the measure should not be made permanent. On the expiration of the War Measures Act in 1919 the government of that day did not consider that the special conditions mentioned in the order in council, a return to normal conditions, had arrived, and therefore in the second session of 1919 a bill was introduced intituled "An act to permit the temporary importation, manufacture and sale of oleomargarine in Canada." Since then, Sir, as you well know, year by year, a temporary bill has been introduced, and I claim that the fact that the bill has been a temporary measure, for twelve months only at a time, is an indication that the government still considered that a pledge had been made to the dairymen of the country.

Let me remind the hon. members of the House of a pledge made during the war by the British government with reference to the removal of the embargo on Canadian cattle. I need not remind this House and the people of the country that without exception we made a demand that that pledge made during the war should be carried out. The people of England, notwithstanding their great objection to the admission of Canadian cattle, felt that they were bound by the pledge which their government had given to ours, and so last year a government in Great Britain which was not the same government which had made the pledge, but the government of Bonar Law, removed the embargo on Canadian cattle, and to-day our cattle are admitted to England. I ask you then, Sir, is it not equally the duty of this government to fulfil and carry out the pledge which was given by the government of that day to the people of this country that when conditions became normal the temporary importation, manufacture and sale of oleomargarine in this country would again be prohibited? Feeling that this is so, feeling that the pledge of the government of that day is the important point to discuss, I have refrained from taking up the pros and cons of the question of oleomargarine, and therefore, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Martell):

That all the words after the word "that" in the first line thereof be struck out and the following substituted therefor,—

In view of the distinct assurances given at the time that the prohibition of the importation, manufacture and sale of oleomargarine was suspended by order in council in 1917 under the War Measures Act of 1914, such suspension being but temporary and a war measure only, should now be removed and the question

left, without prejudice as to its merits, in the same position as before the enactment of the said temporary suspension.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is on the amendment.

Mr. MEIGHEN: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, I submit to your consideration that the amendment is a direct negative, it is not an amendment at all.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have examined this point. The expanded negative theory of an amendment is discussed by well known authorities on parliamentary rules of procedure. In some instances an expanded negative has been accepted as an amendment. For example I find a ruling in May, which is the standard authority, page 258:

> The object of an amendment may be to effect such an alteration in a question as will obtain the support of those who, without such alteration, must either vote against it or abstain from voting thereon, or to present to the house an alternative proposition either wholly or partially opposed to the original question. This may be effected by moving to omit all the words of the question after the first word, "that," and to substitute in their place other words of a different import.

The main motion has for its object the making it lawful to manufacture and sell oleomargarine. The chief object of the amendment is, that when the delay under which importation, manufacture and sale is permitted expires, I think it is on the first of August, there shall be a reversion to the status quo ante, that is to say to the time when this right was prohibited. Now, there is, if I may use the expression, a classical case in May where an amendment of this nature is justified. It is to be found at page 253, and the case is a very interesting one. May says:

> The general practice in regard to amendments is explained on page 258—

Which I have just read.

> —but here such amendments only will be mentioned as are intended to evade an expression of opinion upon the main question by entirely altering its meaning and object.
>
> This is effected by moving the omission of all the words of the question after the word "that" at the beginning and by the substitution of other words of a different import. If this amendment be agreed to by the house, it is clear that no opinion is expressed directly upon the main question, because it is determined that the original words shall not stand as part of the question; and the sense of the house is afterwards taken directly upon the substituted words, or practically upon a new question. There are many precedents of this mode of dealing with a question: but the best known in parliamentary history are those relating to Mr. Pitt's administration and the Peace of Amiens, in 1802. On the 7th May, 1802, a motion was made in the Commons for an address, "expressing the thanks of this house to his Majesty for having been pleased to remove the Right Hon. W. Pitt from his councils;" upon which an amendment was proposed and carried, which left out all the words after the first, and substituted others in direct opposition to them, by which the whole policy of Mr. Pitt was commended. Immediately afterwards an address was moved in both houses of parliament condemning the Treaty of Amiens in a long statement of facts and arguments; and in each house an amendment was substituted, whereby an address was resolved upon which justified the treaty. This practice has often been objected to as unfair; but the objection is unfounded, as the weaker party must always anticipate defeat, in one form or another.

I need not quote any further from May. Here is the doctrine expounded by, I should say, the standard authority on parliamentary procedure which would justify me in ruling that the present amendment is in order. The weaker party, as in the Pitt case just cited, will have to anticipate defeat. I do not know which is the weaker party, but I rule that the amendment is in order.

Mr. W. D. EULER (North Waterloo): At the outset of the brief observations I propose to make I should like to say immediately that I am heartily in favour of the resolution submitted by the hon. member for Cape Breton South and Richmond (Mr. Carroll). This subject has been discussed session after session, and the same old straw has been threshed and re-threshed again and again, almost every session since I have been a member of this House. I deem it unfortunate that time has been unnecessarily spent from year to year in attempting to solve a simple problem which should properly be solved only in one way, it seems to me, if the members of the House choose to approach it in a fair and unprejudiced manner. Last year the hon. member for Missisquoi (Mr. Kay) introduced a resolution into this House which called for the prohibition of the importation, manufacture and sale of oleomargarine. That resolution was very exhaustively discussed, and finally was lost by a substantial majority. I contend that that vote itself was a declaration on the part of this House that it did not believe in the principle of the prohibition of oleomargarine; and I contend further that it was a direct mandate to the government to wipe off the statute book the law which provided for the prohibition of the sale and manufacture of oleomargarine. I regretted at the time that the Minister of Agriculture did not accept the vote in that way, and that he did not take steps to put himself in line with the expression of the opinion of the House as contained in that vote. As it was, the principle of the prohibition of oleomargarine was still recognized as the will of this parliament when exactly the reverse was the case, as expressed in the vote on
5 p.m. the resolution proposed by the hon. member for Missisquoi. Therefore,

in September, unless something further is done in regard to this matter the old law becomes operative and oleomargarine is prohibited. Now, we are under the necessity of discussing the whole matter again.

I accept as true the assumption that oleo is a wholesome food. I am quite content to take the word of the hon. member for Victoria City (Mr. Tolmie), who knows a good deal about the subject that it is. I have read a little about it myself, and I have personally come to the conclusion, and have the conviction, that oleomargarine is a wholesome food and contains nothing deleterious to health. That being true, my position is as it has always been in previous discussions on the question. If oleomargarine is wholesome and if it is sold for what it is, then I say this parliament has no moral right to declare that another person may not purchase, as he or she pleases, an article of commerce according to the price which they care to pay. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the issue here is a matter of personal liberty. I do not think that it should be possible for parliament to dictate to anyone as to what he or she may purchase provided the commodity to be purchased is a sound article of commerce. Here is a palatable, wholesome food, a substitute for a more costly article. When butter is selling at 70 or 80 cents a pound in the winter, who dares say that the mother, we will say, of some eight or ten little children—

An hon. MEMBER: Make it twenty children.

Mr. EULER: I will make it twenty if you like; in the province of Quebec it may be twenty-five or more—who shall say that the mother of these children, with a small income, shall be prohibited from buying the only substitute for butter which she can afford? I think the suggestion is entirely indefensible from every point of view. It is an outrage in principle, and it is unworthy of a people that calls itself advanced and progressive, and having respect for ordinary human rights and freedom.

It should not be necessary at all to make an extended argument in regard to the matter. One would almost judge from some of the statements that have been made by opponents of oleomargarine and the indignation with which it is regarded, that those of us who favour oleomargarine are trying to force people to eat it. That is not the case at all. Those who do not like oleomargarine can buy butter. All we are contending for is freedom of choice and liberty in the matter.

[Mr. Euler.]

The point has also been raised by some friends outside of the House in conversation, that because butter is more nourishing, therefore oleomargarine ought to be prohibited. If that principle is to govern, we might as well say that a good porterhouse beef steak is more nourishing than a bit of veal or a piece of the shank of the animal. That argument could be carried to absurd lengths. Cream is better than milk; milk is better than skimmed milk, I suppose. Are we, therefore, to say that the inferior article cannot be used at all? Will an interfering parliament say that one must buy steak instead of sausage or the cheaper meat which is, perhaps, the only thing a family can afford? Some people like to wear real silk, not the artificial silk that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) is trying to promote. Some people cannot buy real silk for their dresses or hosiery. they are forced to buy cotton. Are we justified, for the sake of the manufacturer of silk goods, in prohibiting people from buying cotton or any other class of goods which they may choose to buy?

We have talked almost with horror of substitutes for butter. It seems to me that the fact that the people of this country or any other country have been able to devise substitutes that serve their purpose at lower cost, is simply an indication of their ingenuity in adapting themselves to the needs of the moment or general conditions. So long as there is no deception, there should be no objection to substitutes. Cotton is a substitute for wool. Would you, therefore, abolish cotton, especially because it is imported? There seems to be antagonism to some of the ingredients of oleomargarine because they are imported from other countries. Concrete building blocks are a substitute for cut stone and are made to look like it as much as possible, and why should they not? I am even told that carrots and other vegetables sometimes appear, after they have gone through certain processes of manufacture, as the finest of strawberry jam or something of that kind. In my town they used to make, and I think they still make leatherette, a very good substitute for leather, and they make it to look as much like leather as they possibly can. Why should they not as long as this leatherette is not sold as something it is not? In my town they make a great deal of furniture, and sometimes possibly a member of this House will purchase what appears like a very fine article of mahogany furniture, when after all he has purchased only birch which is finished like mahogany and it is perfectly good furniture. Let me take even such a matter as linen collars. Possibly members of the House think

they are to-day wearing linen collars. As a matter of fact, I think they are all wearing cotton collars, and these wear longer than linen collars anyway. Therefore, the argument of substitution, in my opinion, constitutes no argument at all. If there is butter in oleomargarine and that improves oleomargarine, why should the butter not be used? It is said that oleomargarine is made to look like butter and that is objectionable. One might almost as well say that butter looks like oleomargarine. Butter is made for man and not man for butter, and I cannot quite understand the veneration with which some of our hon. friends speak of butter and the sacred cow from time to time.

It surely must be significant that every other civilized country in the world permits the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine. The hon. member for Victoria City (Mr Tolmie) has already made reference to the butter industry in the country of Denmark. To-day at luncheon I had the honour of sitting at the same table with a gentleman who came originally from Denmark and who has been living in this country for some time. He told us there, when the conversation turned to the matter of oleomargarine, that he could not understand for one moment, why anybody could possibly object to the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine. He said: "Denmark is the greatest butter country in the world"—and perhaps he is right—and he added: "No one there thinks of objecting to the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine." I think he even said that they make more oleomargarine than butter, and I believe he said further that many of those who make butter eat the oleomargarine and sell the butter.

We talk of protection, and there has been a good deal of criticism in this House with regard to the matter of high tariffs, or, as it is often called, "high protection." Sometimes I have been a recipient of some of those criticisms although I am entirely guiltless. Those who would prohibit the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine go far beyond the limits of high protection. They apparently believe in monopolies. Tariffs are usually directed against the outsider, the foreigner, the foreign product; but this is actually an attempt to put out of business a legitimate industry within our own country in order that another industry may benefit.

When one examines the arguments of opponents of oleomargarine—and I say this with all goodwill—there is really only one motive in the movement, and it is this: That all competition in connection with the commodity of butter may be removed by act of parliament, so that certain producers may make more money at the expense of the consumers. Broadly stated, I believe that and nothing else to be the fact. All this solicitude for the poor children who will not be allowed to eat butter and who will be forced to eat oleomargarine is, as one gentleman said to me to-day, just so much eye-wash. This is a purely commercial proposition. I do not blame those who are makers of butter throughout Canada for desiring to make as much money out of butter as they can. That is business; but I do not think it is right for the members of this House who are representing all the consumers of Canada, to take an attitude of that kind, advancing the interests of one class at the expense of another.

Mr. McMASTER: Sound free trade argument.

Mr. EULER: I am afraid the hon. member for Brome is putting on my remarks an interpretation that was not intended. Therefore I say that the sole purpose of the prohibitory law as regards oleomargarine is to destroy by law competition in connection with butter and nothing else. Can this parliament afford to recognize a principle of that kind? I say that it cannot. If it can, if we can do that for butter, we can do it properly for any other commodity that is manufactured in Canada. I would even go so far as to say that the man who raises cattle ought to object to anybody breeding hogs for fear that pork might come into competition with beef. And one could suggest numerous comparisons of the same kind.

Mr. ELLIOTT (Dundas): The hon. member for Victoria City (Mr. Tolmie) stated in his speech that the price of butter was fixed in the markets of the world. How will the hon. member (Mr. Euler) make that statement conform to what he has just said, that we are looking for protection for the dairy industry in this matter?

Mr. EULER: For the simple reason that if people buy oleomargarine they will not buy so much butter.

Mr. ELLIOTT (Dundas): But the hon. member for Victoria City stated that the price of our butter was fixed in the markets of the world. What has that to do with oleomargarine?

Mr. EULER: I will leave the hon. member for Victoria City to stand behind his own statement; I did not make it. Another argument has been advanced and it is the only one which to my mind carries any weight; and, at that, I do not think it goes very far.

It is that the prohibitory law was suspended on the strength of a pledge given by a former government that it was only for the duration of the war, and that the old conditions should be restored at the conclusion of hostilities. A pledge is a pledge, and I do not think that it should be violated or viewed in any light that would be regarded as a reflection on national honour, on parliamentary honour, or on the honour of any government. But surely a former government cannot perpetually bind succeeding administrations. This is a parliament elected by the people of Canada since the war, and it undoubtedly has a perfect right to legislate as it sees fit in the interests of the whole people. If that principle were not admitted, then any law that we now have on the statute books, enacted by the last government or any other before that, would necessarily have to be maintained by this parliament. That is absolutely unthinkable. This House has a right, moral, legal and in every other way, to legislate with regard to oleomargarine precisely as it deems fit in the interests of the people of all Canada.

Finally, I do not think that the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine is going to injure the dairy industry. The hon. member for Victoria City dealt with that aspect of the subject better than I possibly could because he is much more familiar with it. When butter is low in price or comparatively low—because it is never very low now to those who live in the towns—I do not believe that people will buy anything else to any great extent. When, however, it is extremely high, going up to 75 and 80 cents, as it does in the winter time, and is readily and profitably sold, there should be no objection on the part of those who sell it to the use of oleomargarine by people who cannot afford butter. Surely when butter is selling at these high prices, the men who are out of employment or who have scant employment, with a small income, should be allowed to purchase this substitute. I do not think that any hon. member of this House would say to any man or woman with a large family who cannot afford butter that the purchase of this wholesome substitute for butter shall be prohibited, so that their children may be deprived of something to eat with their bread.

I would add, before concluding, that no one can deny successfully that oleomargarine when properly made is thoroughly wholesome. And it is cheaper than butter. It is sold as oleomargarine and nothing else; and I would say that if the government or the Minister of Agriculture feels that oleomargarine is still being sold as butter, or feels that it should be surrounded by further restrictions, provided it is not actually prohibited, I am ready to support any measure that will ensure fair protection for the dairy industry. Let the manufacture of oleomargarine be surrounded with all sorts of safeguards in the public interest. But if oleomargarine is wholesome—as undoubtedly it is—and if it is properly safeguarded, then we have no right to forbid its manufacture and the use of it by the people. Such prohibition is an interference with the right of citizens and cannot be justified on any grounds. In my opinion the government should bring in a bill to repeal the old prohibitory act and then if necessary, introduce another providing for the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine under proper conditions and with adequate safeguards.

Mr. ROBERT FORKE (Brandon): I had not intended making any speech on the motion and the amendment thereto, but after listening to the remarks of the hon. member who has just sat down (Mr. Euler) I feel that I should offer some explanation of the way in which I propose to vote. The closing sentences of his speech practically state all that I intend to say at the present time. The amendment declares that at the time the prohibition of the importation, manufacture and sale of oleomargarine was suspended by order in council in 1917, under the War Measures Act of 1914, the assurance was given that as such suspension was but temporary and a war measure only—

—it should now be removed and the question left, without prejudice as to its merits, in the same position as before the enactment of the said temporary suspension.

An order in council is not merely a scrap of paper that carries no consequences whatever, and it seems to me that the proper step to take now is to remove that order in council, "without prejudice," so that the matter might stand where it stood before. Then, if the government will bring down a bill dealing with the subject of oleomargarine I shall be prepared to discuss it. In the meantime I shall vote for the amendment, because I believe it proposes the proper step.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I wish to associate myself with my hon. friend (Mr. Forke) in what he has said and in the attitude he is taking. I should not like at this time to go into the respective merits of the prohibition or the importation of oleomargarine, but I do think that an undertaking was given a large interest in this country, under circumstances to which this House and parliament should pay attention. As has been mentioned by

the hon. member who introduced the amendment (Mr. Kay), during the period of the war, there appeared before the Milk Committee of the Food Board members of the dairy industry, to whom it was represented that the interests of the country rendered it advisable on patriotic grounds that the government should be given a free hand in the matter of permitting temporarily the importation of oleomargarine. The dairy interests acquiesced at the time, freely and willingly, in the belief and on the understanding, backed up by the government of the day, that when the circumstances had passed which had given rise to the necessity for this temporary arrangement, the measure permitting the importation of oleomargarine would be repealed. I think it would be a great misfortune if any large interest in this country, any large body of our citizens, had reason to feel that the government had not to the fullest measure lived up to any obligation assumed under circumstances such as then existed. Reading the order in council which was passed at the time, I think there is no room for any difference of view whatever as to the exact ground on which the importation of oleomargarine was then permitted. It has been read by the hon. member for Missisquoi (Mr. Kay) but I may requote the first few paragraphs. It is dated October 23, 1917:

> Whereas attention is drawn to the abnormal demand for butter due to war conditions and to the very great probability that such abnormal demand and consequent high prices will prevail for this product for some time to come:
>
> And whereas it is in the public interest, under the special conditions above named, that other fats should be available in Canada under strict and reasonble conditions as a substitute for butter.—
>
> Therefore His Excellency the Governor General in Council under and in virtue of the provisions of the War Measures Act 1914 is pleased to make and enact, and doth, hereby make and enact the following regulations providing for the importation into Canada and the permitting of the manufacture, sale and possession within Canada of oleomargarine and establishing the conditions of such importation, manufacture, sale and possession, such regulations to be in force and to have effect for the period during which the present abnormal conditions continue, the conclusion of such period to be determined by His Excellency the Governor General in Council as provided in the said regulations and as a war measure only.

I think this clause in the order in council makes it abundantly clear that the action taken by the government at that time was in the light of war conditions, and with the distinct understanding that when the war was over and, to use the words of the order in council, "the present abnormal conditions cease to continue," the order in council would be repealed and the dairying industry would be put, as respects the importation of oleomargarine, exactly where it had been prior to the time it acquiesced in this particular order being passed.

Now, there is further evidence it seems to me which is conclusive in large part, and that is the legislation which extended the period of permission for importation. The act assented to on 10th November, 1919, 10 George V, Chapter 24, is entitled, "An Act to permit the temporary importation, manufacture and sale of oleomargarine in Canada." Why was that word "temporary" inserted in the title unless it was to emphasize the fact that the conditions which were set forth in the order in council had not, in the view of the ministry of the day, yet fully ceased to exist, and that this period of extension was to go on for another year.

All subsequent legislation on this subject has been in the nature of an extension year by year. I agree with what the hon. member for North Waterloo (Mr. Euler) says about a government not necessarily being bound by all the acts of preceding administrations. I think every case has to be considered in the light of all the circumstances surrounding it, and I confess that had I seen or known of the existence of this pledge last year, I should have been inclined to attach very great importance to and place strong emphasis upon it, and to have seen that it was referred to in the course of the debate. As nearly as I can gather, no reference whatever was made to this particular pledge in the debate last session. When a deputation representative of the dairy interests waited upon members of the government some little time ago, they stressed very strongly what they had conceived to be the representations of the government of the day and what they had represented to other members of the dairy industry as a consequence, and I felt at that time doubly convinced—I had previously learned of this pledge, and having learned of it decided to see that some recognition was taken of it—I felt strongly convinced at that time that the dairymen would not in all probability have acquiesced as they did in the importation and manufacture of oleomargarine during the period of the war if the pledge had not been given; and inasmuch as their action was taken for patriotic reasons, I feel it is the duty of this parliament to see that that pledge is carried out. Once it is carried out, I think parliament should be perfectly free to take whatever subsequent action it may deem fit with respect to the continued importation and manufacture of oleomargarine.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I cannot say that I am surprised at the stand taken by the Prime Minister in this matter. If I describe it as a stand I do it compliment overmuch. It really is not a stand at all. It is merely an evasion recommended to this House, and a very clumsy evasion, of a direct and definite question.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Might I ask my right hon. friend where he stands in the matter of the pledge given by his government?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I will stand by any pledge given by the late government. But I must say that I find the Prime Minister a lot more anxious and solicitous about a pledge given, as he says, by the late government, than he is about any pledge given by his own. Pledge! Really this talk about a pledge appeals to my mind as so insufferable that I can hardly command patience or find language to address myself to it. We are told by the Prime Minister that the late government gave a pledge that oleomargarine would be swept away when the war was over, and that we would return to a policy of no oleomargarine as we had before. He reads that pledge into an order in council, which was passed in the year 1918 and by which he states this parliament is bound. Well, I will have to try to address myself to that question before coming to a discussion of the merits of what really is before this House. What is before this House is whether we are going to have oleomargarine or whether we are not. Does any hon. member think that if we accept this amendment in that way and slip the question outside the door this government is going to come forward with a bill to restore oleomargarine or indeed with any bill on the subject at all? Let us all remember that oleomargarine dies if this parliament does nothing this session. The legislation passes out of existence. Now let us be assured first of all, that once we vote for this amendment and thus get rid of this resolution we are in effect shoving the subject out of doors because, take my word for it, this government is not going to come in with any bill once they have the excuse of the passing of the amendment.

But I said I would address myself to the question as to whether or not there was a pledge that binds us to support this amendment. In 1918 the government of the day, having behind it a War Measures Act passed in 1914, which virtually gave them power to legislate instead of parliament in respect of all matters that concerned the war, even indirectly, passed an order in council under the authority of that act whereby oleomargarine was admitted whereby the statute was suspended which had forbidden the manufacture and importation of oleomargarine. Naturally the government did this as a temporary measure, and plainly stated in the legislation that it was a temporary measure. As a matter of fact the government had no power to enact other than a temporary measure under the War Measures Act. We had no power in the world permanently to alter an act of parliament; we only had power to do so temporarily in so far as we felt it justified and called for by the emergencies of the war by which we were then surrounded. Consequently, we made it plain in the order that this was to be considered by the people of Canada as no permanent commitment on the subject but merely as a temporary measure resorted to by the government under the authority of a temporary act. We made this clear in our order in council. Not satisfied with that, next session we advised parliament what was done and recommended that the temporary measure which we had put into effect by order in council be made a temporary measure by legislation. Thereupon, by an act of the parliament of this country, the order in council was merged in a statute, and we no longer rested on the order in council. We rested from 1919 onwards on the statute of this House. Consequently—although I do not impugn for a moment the sincerity of the hon. leader of the Progressive party (Mr. Forke)—there is now no order in council to wipe away. Does anybody honestly imagine that there is to-day an order in council in effect? It has no more existence or effect than a piece of blotting paper?

Mr. FORKE: The question was voted upon last year and the decision was in favour of the manufacture and importation of oleomargarine. That was a decision of the House last year. Will the passing of this resolution have any more effect than that resolution had?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I doubt it very much. I doubt, even if we pass this resolution, whether the government can then make up its mind. It could not last year, and I have not seen any evidence of additional virility this year. I doubt if it would; but we must do our duty when a resolution is before us—whether the government is able to do its duty or not.

Mr. FORKE: We want to clear the way, anyway.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is no order in council to get out of the way, nor is there anything else to get out of the way. The order is as dead as Julius Caesar; it was dead a year afterwards. It was merged in a statute which provided that oleomargarine should not be forbidden to enter, nor forbidden to be manufactured for a period of time thereafter, parliament thereby taking the ground that under the conditions then prevailing, which were undoubtedly abnormal, we should not legislate in a permanent way; we should legislate in a temporary way only and leave parliament absolutely free when the temporary period was over to legislate just as it desired. What I am seeking to impress on the House is that at the expiration of the period fixed by parliament in the legislation of 1919, parliament was left free to act either one way or the other, as it might see fit. Parliament was free from all pledges of any kind. There had been indeed no pledge of any kind, affecting anyone, the moment the legislation expired.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Can my right hon. friend tell me when that period was?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think it was last year. No; the first period expired in 1921.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): Was it a fixed period?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, it was a period fixed; it expired in 1921. The government of the day came in with a bill to extend it permanently and recommended that bill to parliament. There was a very great difference of opinion in the House—a difference of opinion as to its merits, confined not at all to the opposition alone but manifested by some on the government side. We finally, in view of the opinion of parliament, modified the bill to have it last only for a year and recommended to parliament that a measure to this end be adopted. The operation of the act was to expire one year from then, leaving parliament at the expiration of that period quite free to act as parliament might in its wisdom see fit. That law expired last session and this government being without any policy of its own at all placed the subject in the hands of parliament to be decided on a motion of the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill). Parliament on that motion declared emphatically against a policy of forbidding the admission to and manufacture in Canada of oleomargarine. One would have thought that the government then would have introduced a bill pursuant to such vote of parliament, but it did not; it introduced a bill providing for prohibition for one year and one only.

I have recited these events in order that parliament may understand its position now, in order that no hon. member of this House may feel that his vote or his decision is in any way restrained or his rights as a member of parliament abbreviated by any action of any previous government or by any action of any previous parliament. There is no excuse for any hon. member shelving this question to-day because of anything that has heretofore taken place. No hon. member I know is bound to vote for the admission of oleomargarine because of anything that was done before; every hon. member is just as free to vote against the admission of oleomargarine as if nothing at all had been done by the late government or by the late parliament. Surely it is not necessary to emphasize again that an order in council which is dead and which made no pledge at all save that its own life would be temporary, as necessarily it was, forms no hindrance to the free action of this House. Surely it is equally unnecessary to say that a statute which was declared to be temporary, to exist for a limited period only, forms, when that period is over, no obstacle to the free exercise of the rights of hon. members of this House. As I said at the beginning, the whole thing is so absurd, it is so beyond the pale of reason, that one can scarcely have the patience to hover round such a subject now.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I ask another question? I think when I asked my right hon. friend before about the period expiring he had in mind the expiration of the particular act. He has just said the order in council contained no pledge. I would like to read these particular lines:

> Such regulations to be in force and to have effect for the period during which the present abnormal conditions continue,—

That was a pledge.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING (reading):

> —the conclusion of such period to be determined by His Excellency the Governor General in Council.

That was another pledge. I will ask my right hon. friend if that period was ever determined by His Excellency the Governor General in Council?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes. undoubtedly.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Where is the record?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I will have to go over a little of the ground again, I see. Undoubtedly a pledge was given that the order in council would be temporary. Well, was the order in council not temporary? Is not the order in council dead long ago?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It was the prohibition that was temporary, not the order in council.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly the prohibition was temporary and the order in council too. There were hundreds of prohibitions passed under the War Measures Act that were just as temporary. Was parliament by those acts tieing anybody's hands after the temporary period was over? Were its hands tied, can anyone seriously argue, against freedom of legislation at the expiration of that period? Why, the Prime Minister can go through the records of the orders in council and I will guarantee that he can find two thousand of a like temporary character. Parliament was just as free at the expiration of these orders to legislate in regard to the subjects covered by them as in regard to any subjects within the purview of this House. The only pledge if you call it a "pledge" was that it would be temporary; that does not mean that parliament is not free later to make it permanent. The Governor in Council determined the period of the existence of the order in council the moment the subject was brought before parliament and a statute passed. We brought it before parliament and parliament passed a statute for a temporary exclusion, and at the end of the expiration of that period parliament is free either to make it permanent or to do away with it for good. I do not doubt that every hon. member of this House, as an intelligent man, knows that parliament is to-day as free as if there had never been previous legislation, either orders in council or a statute of any kind. So I banish from my mind the suggestion that in any way we are tied by a pledge; we are not. We have to act; we are wholly free; what should we do as free men and a free parliament?

I have no hesitation in saying what I think should be done. I do not find, however, that any member of the government, upon whom now is the responsibility and who ought to take the initiative in this House on public questions, seems equal to the task of declaring what he thinks should be done. I think oleomargarine should be admitted. I do not for the life of me see any argument why an article which is a food and which unquestionably—at least it is unquestioned—if properly made is a wholesome food, should be forbidden entrance to or manufacture within this country. The only argument attempted against it is that it so resembles another article of production—butter—that there is danger of its being mistaken for that article, confused therewith, to the damage of and injustice to the producers of that article. I am ready to agree that it is no more than right and justice that the producers of butter should have ample protection against such confusion and against substitution. If I were convinced that it was impossible to give ample protection, to provide those safeguards that would make the conditions of production fair for dairy butter, then I think the lesser evil would be to vote against the admission of oleomargarine. But I have never heard anything so to convince me. I am not convinced that even under present conditions, the regulations are such as do not sufficiently protect dairy butter. I am not convinced, on the contrary, that they are sufficient—I do not know enough about it—but I am thoroughly convinced they can be made sufficient. And if it were necessary to go to the extent of providing a colour standard up to which the producers of oleomargarine might go and beyond which they might not go, I would support the establishment of such a colour standard and I guarantee this, that if you compel the oleomargarine maker to keep the colour of his article below a certain standard, you will never have it mistaken for butter and never do any injustice to the dairy industry. I am not saying it is essential to have that done. I do say it is practical to have it done, and I do say, if the Minister of Agriculture or the government feel that it is essential in order that the distinction may be defined and clear and unmistakable, then they ought to go ahead and do it. It can be done; it has been done.

Consequently with the burden on the administration to so frame and enforce regulations as will prevent confusion, as will prevent unfair substitution, I say there should be no objection to its admittance. Now I am going further.

Mr. VIEN: Was the right hon. gentleman of the same opinion in 1917?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I was of the same opinion.

Mr. VIEN: Then might I ask further, instead of passing a temporary measure under the War Measures Act why did he not pass a law to admit oleomargarine permanently?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I thought I had told the hon. gentleman. I had told the House. Under the conditions of those times, which were abnormal, we did not feel that in

matters of general policy affected by those passing forces we should legislate permanently. We came to parliament and committed ourselves to permanent legislation in 1921. We were quite prepared as a government, indeed we actually did recommend to this House the permanent admission of oleomargarine under proper regulations. That is where I stand to-day.

Now I would go further. I believe as regards oleomargarine the same as regards other articles produced in this country or substitutes for which are produced in this country, that we ought to have a fair protective tariff against importation, and I say so more with regard to the needs of the dairy industry of this country, because it is not asked for so far as I know by the makers of oleomargarine—I say so more in justice to the dairy industry of this country than I do with regard to any producers of oleomargarine. We ought to have a duty against the admission of oleomargarine. I want to know why the farmer of this country should in this market which he helps to build up, to which he contributes every time he pays a dollar of taxes or buys a dollar of goods, be subjected without any restraint to competition of others from other countries who do not do anything to build up the market of Canada. We ought to provide a duty against the admission of oleomargarine and against the admission of the ingredients that go to make up the element of oleomargarine. If anyone can provide me with a reason why there should be a preference given in the tariff of Canada to the admission of oleomargarine I should like to hear it; it should be treated the same as other products against which duties are placed on their admission into this country—

Mr. EULER: Would the hon. member place a duty against the ingredients of oleomargarine?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes. I do not see how we could be fair to the butter makers if we did not.

Mr. EULER: On cottonseed oil, for instance?

Mr. MEIGHEN: There may be some ingredients you should not tax, but there are others you should. You cannot be fair unless you impose a duty against some of the ingredients anyway.

Mr. GOULD: Would not that duty take away the cheapness of the argument that has been presented in favour of oleomargarine?

Mr. MEIGHEN: You mean the cheapness of the article. It would not affect the cheapness of the argument. I do not think it would affect the cheapness of the article, or I should say, would not substantially or permanently affect it. It would in some measure for a time, but permanently I doubt very much if it would. But why should we in this country subject the farmer who produces his butter to the free admission of a competitor when the man who produces butter across the line has an eight-cent-a-pound duty against butter and an eight-cent-a-pound duty against oleomargarine? That is the condition to-day? The United States farmer has his market. He has a preference there because he helped to build it. He has his own country as a basis to rely on, on which to build his industry. He has a duty of eight cents a pound against butter and a duty of eight cents a pound against oleomargarine. We here have a four-cent duty against butter, and nothing against oleomargarine. That is an unfair position for the producer of butter in Canada. That is a position that should last no longer, and I venture to say that if you place the Canadian butter producer in a position comparable with his American competitor, you are not going to find him unreasonable on the question of oleomargarine. Do those two things—provide by more stringent regulations, because certainly more stringent regulations can be provided, against the possibility of substitution, that is to say, of the palming off of one article for the other; provide against that, put oleomargarine in the same position as other importations into this country that compete with productions in our own country and in our own market, do those two things, and, of course, make sure that only wholesome food ingredients enter into its production, which I understand is provided for already—and then if these three conditions prevail I know of no argument against the importation and manufacture of oleomargarine.

Mr. ROBB. How long has oleomargarine been allowed to enter Canada free under the Customs Act?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oleomargarine was entirely forbidden up to 1918, and since 1918 the ingredients have been free.

Mr. ROBB: And oleomargarine.

Mr. MEIGHEN: And oleomargarine too, as I understand its history. We should have placed a duty on oleomargarine before. We should place a duty on it now and place a duty on such ingredients as compete with

Canadian products. We should place these articles in the same category as other products of our country. Then see that the oleomargarine is manufactured only from wholesome substances, see that the restrictions are such that it cannot be unfairly substituted for butter, and these things done I do not know how we can argue against the manufacture and importation of oleomargarine. There may be difference of opinion on this subject; there is room for difference of opinion. But that is my view and I deem it my duty to state it to the House and state it clearly.

On the other question as to our being under some compulsion to vote for this amendment because of the 1918 order in council, there is no room for any difference of opinion at all. There is no room for sensible argument. It is a mere sham or screen erected in order to enable those who desire to do so to evade a fair and square issue that is before parliament.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING: (Minister of Finance): I did not desire to speak at this moment but if no other member wishes to address the House—

An hon. MEMBER: Call it six o'clock.

Mr. FIELDING: —I would like to be permitted to finish, if I may, before six o'clock. May I first direct myself briefly to the constant complaint of the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) that the government as a government does not deal with this question. He has repeatedly emphasized that, indicating that he attaches great importance to it. Let us have a little common sense on this question.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Hear, hear.

Mr. FIELDING: There is a difference of opinion among members of the government on this question. My hon friend, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) has one view, I have another view. Does my hon. friend contend that on a matter of this kind one or the other of us should resign? Is it a matter of such vital importance as to justify a member in leaving the cabinet because he differs from some of the others? Surely he would not take such an absurd position. We take the position that inasmuch as there is a difference of opinion in the cabinet, the commonsense view is to ascertain the opinion of the House of Commons and be content to accept its judgment.

Mr. MEIGHEN: You got that last session.

Mr. FIELDING: But only for a short time.

Mr. MEIGHEN: You got the view of the House of Commons last session. I would take it that it would be for all time.

Mr. FIELDING: We are taking the position to-day that inasmuch as there is a difference of opinion among ourselves, the commonsense view is not to make it a matter of vital importance and break up the cabinet, but simply to invite the judgment of the House of Commons and accept it whatever it may be. What has my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition done about it? In 1921 he took the noble stand that we were going to make this permanent, no longer any question about it, and he introduced a bill. Noble soul! But immediately he abandoned the bill. He made a change. He agreed to a bill that was not permanent. He agreed to temporize. He agreed to play safe for another year. If that be the case, if my right hon. friend felt perfectly free to do that at that time, cannot he give us the gracious privilege now of having a difference of opinion in the government and being content to accept the judgment of the House of Commons.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The difference is this: The former government, as a government, took a stand without any previous direction from parliament. This government had before them a previous direction from parliament last session, but they refused to take a stand, and they still refuse to take a stand.

Mr. FIELDING: My right hon. friend says his government took a stand. They did not do so very strongly and they did not stick to it very long. My right hon. friend practically abandoned one bill and took another bill.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh, no.

Mr. FIELDING: That is practically what my right hon. friend did. A good many years ago when oleomargarine was an unsought product, it was prohibited in Canada. For many years I had the pleasure and duty of introducing the budgets of the country, and I want to say this: To the best of my knowledge and belief the question never arose as to what was to be done with oleomargarine. So long as butter could be got at a reasonable price nobody wanted oleomargarine, and nobody cared about it. And to-day if you can get butter at a reasonable price nobody wants oleomargarine. With the progress of time oleomargarine seems to have improved in character. It seems to be a product now which eminent physicians and health authorities certify is all right; there is no objection to it, it is a wholesome and useful product. I believe that if anybody had drawn attention to it

in earlier years the prohibition would have been removed. I state again that oleomargarine remained on the prohibited list, not because anybody agitated for prohibition, not because anybody demanded it, but because the subject was not at all considered. Nobody wanted oleomargarine so long as he could get good butter.

I think I am correct in saying that Canada is the only civilized country in the world which refuses to allow the use of oleomargarine. I know of no civilized government in the world which prohibits oleomargarine except Canada. Hon. members know the old story as to the man who differed with his brethren on the jury and who said "that he never met such stupid men in all his life as those eleven fellows." Are we the only intelligent people in the world? Is the whole world, outside of Canada, wrong in its policy on this question? I think myself that the real question before parliament to-day is simply this: Are the Canadian people as intelligent as other people? If we admit that the Canadian people are as intelligent as others. why cannot you give to these intelligent people the right to buy an article which is wholesome when they want it? It is not a question between butter and oleomargarine. Nobody wants oleomargraine to-day if he can buy butter at a moderate and reasonable price. I submit, as the hon. member for North Waterloo (Mr. Euler) put it, that the issue upon this question is: Are we an intelligent people? Are we to be trusted with the duty of looking after ourselves? Is there a doubt lest we shall not always take care of ourselves wisely in a matter of this kind? Now, there are some things as to which we have prohibition—I will not say prohibition but restriction. To-day, for example, there are explosives which are dangerous. We do not prohibit them, we put restrictions upon them; we say they shall only be sold in a certain way. Then there are narcotics and drugs. We do not prohibit them but we say they shall be sold subject to restriction and to restraint. Oleomargarine is the only thing in the commercial world which the people of Canada cannot be trusted to buy if they want it. It is an awful accusation to make against the people of Canada that they cannot be trusted to buy oleomargarine.

To-day nobody condemns oleomargarine on its merits. We have this extraordinary position—I say that with great deference to my respected leader—that it is claimed we are under an obligation. I cannot admit that for a single moment. If that is so when is this pledge to end which was given in 1917? We have had a new election, a new parliament. What a preposterous thing it is to claim that the members of this new parliament are bound by something that was done by a previous government and a previous parliament. We are free to vote as we like, and let us vote as we like on the merits of this question. We are bound by nothing that happened in a previous parliament. "Ah!" it is said "in the cattle embargo a pledge was given; a change of government took place but nevertheless the pledge was carried out." Yes, the Right Hon. Bonar Law was a member of the government that gave the pledge, and he was called upon to fulfil the pledge given by the government of which he was a member. I have never joined in the argument that because of that pledge Canada's case was very strong. When you want to make a case before a rival or competitor you bring every argument you can. I think that in England there were some excellent men who did not want to admit Canadian cattle who used that pledge as a convenient excuse. I do not quarrel with them for doing so, but I decline to admit that the members of one House of Commons are bound by the act of any previous House, and I am bound to say that I see no foundation whatever for the statement that in this matter there exists a pledge that binds us. If there is a binding pledge I have a right to ask when does it end? If it binds us now it binds our successors, we are no longer a free parliament. No, the real question is not as between oleomargarine and butter. The people who want oleomargarine only want it when they cannot get butter at a reasonable price. If they cannot afford to use butter they will use oleomargarine; they want a substitute which is wholesome. Do not let anybody be deluded by the cry that oleomargarine is not wholesome. The highest medical authorities tell us that it is wholesome. I cannot for the life of me see why the intelligent Canadian people cannot be trusted to decide for themselves what they want. If we are as intelligent as any other people in the world give us the right to exercise our intelligence.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. T. H. McCONICA (Battleford): Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of detaining the House with any lengthy discussion of the proposition before us. There are, however, some features that I think have not been

touched on and that we might well consider. We are asked to allow the permanent manufacture and sale of oleomargarine in Canada. What is oleomargarine? Nobody knows. You may search the statute books of Canada from end to end, and you will find no definition, no formula, no restriction, no anything that indicates what oleomargarine is. The hon. member for Victoria City (Mr. Tolmie) gave us a formula, but does anybody follow his formula? We have no evidence that people do. There are a dozen or twenty different kinds of grease that they say may go into oleomargarine, but in what proportion and with what other constituents we have no means of knowing.

My objection to oleomargarine is that it is not presented upon its merits; that it does not stand on its own legs. We are told that men should have a right to buy as they see fit, and it is quite possible that most of us who buy oleomargarine know what we are buying. That is not the point. The question is: Does the fellow who eats it know what he is eating? That is the thing we want to be instructed on. Your Chinaman may go to the wholesale establishment to buy oleomargarine, and it has a government wrapper on it, with a label with oleomargarine in large letters printed on the side. He slips it in through the back door of the kitchen; the wrapper goes into the stove; the case knife wipes off the big letters; he mixes up about five pounds of it with one pound of butter; then he sells that to you and to me and to his other patrons as butter, and we pay for it as butter. I venture to say that 90 per cent or more of the oleomargarine that is consumed in Canada today is consumed as butter. The ex-Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Tolmie) was asked: Did he ever see a sign up in a restaurant or a hotel that they sold oleomargarine? He said that he did not eat in such places. How does he know? Do any of us eat there? We do not know. I would not be surprised if he had eaten a ton of oleomargarine.

Mr. TOLMIE: I do not think I look like that.

Mr. McCONICA: It may have that effect on some people; I do not know. I have an idea that if he knew how much of that stuff he had eaten when he went home after prorogation, he would be ashamed to look his own cows in the face. When he eats oleomargarine, what is he eating? He does not know. He knows he is not eating butter. He knows that oleomargarine, in its natural state, does not look like butter; that it does not taste like butter; that is does not smell like butter. He knows that certain greases, what kind he does not know, are taken and treated chemically, then deodorized, decolourized, and mixed up into some sort of a conglomeration which is called oleomargarine. We have had a statement from scientists that they have analyzed it. Does any man state what the food value is? Does any man put down a table stating that butter is so-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so, and that oleomargarine is exactly or very nearly the same? Certainly not. When a man eats that stuff, thinking it is butter, he is taking into his system something that is entirely foreign, something that his system does not require. Experience shows that milk is the natural food of the human being; that milk products are naturally adapted to building up the human system. What about this oleomargarine? We do not know. For that reason I do not think this is a question whether a man shall have the right to sell it or not. The question is: Shall a man have the right to feed it to some other man under false pretences? That is the point, and that is the one thing that, I imagine, is the vital point in this discussion.

An hon. member suggested that to prohibit oleomargarine from coming into or being sold in Canada is protection, similar to tariff protection, and he argued that we on this side should never support the prohibition of oleomargarine for that reason. I am not a protectionist, and I hope the time may soon come when nations will conclude that protection is a mistake. I very much doubt the right of a nation to tax one private individual for the benefit of another, and that is what protection is, in essence. When one man is protected someone else protects him, because there is no magic by which the passing of a protective law will create wealth for the fellow who is protected without imposing a burden on some other person. I repeat, if one man is protected some other man has to protect him. For fifteen years I have been selling my farm products in western Canada, and I do not think I ever sold a dollar's worth that brought me one single cent more because of a protective tariff; while I have not bought anything for which I did not pay more by reason of such a tariff. That is something I do not believe in. But if protection means to protect the people of Canada against fraud, against paying for something they do not get, against buying one thing and having to accept in lieu of it a rank imitation and counterfeit, then I am a protectionist.

I am not here urging this as a matter of protection to the dairy industry or to the

farming industry generally. I urge that we prohibit the importation and manufacture of oleomargarine from the standpoint of the people of Canada, who are the consumers. We have the statement of the lumber boss that he is in favour of it; have we anything from the lumber jack? That is the point. Where is the man who eats it that is asking that this stuff be allowed to come into Canada or be manufactured and sold here? There is not one word from any such person. Did anyone ever hear of any hotel keeper who advertised: "Nothing but high grade oleomargarine used in this hotel?" Why, the effect of such a pronouncement would be to empty the dining-room in a day. No; the trouble with this thing is that it is not sold on its merits; it does not stand on its own feet. It is an imposition on the people who use it, and for that reason I shall certainly support the amendment offered to the House.

Mr. TOLMIE: Can the hon. member cite a single instance that he knows of where oleomargarine was sold as butter?

Mr. McCONICA: I do not say it is sold as butter; I say it is served as butter on the table.

Mr. TOLMIE: Can you name one single instance of that

Mr. McCONICA: Yes, I can.

Mr. TOLMIE: Tell us.

Mr. ANDREW McMASTER (Brome): The question now before the House has occupied our attention on several previous occasions and it is to be hoped that on this occasion, after a full discussion, we may make up our minds and act accordingly. So far as I am concerned, I am not in favour of the prohibition of any wholesome article of food. I cannot take any other stand, holding the principles I hold; and therefore I am in favour, not necessarily of oleomargarine, not necessarily of butter, but of liberty and freedom of choice for the people of Canada. I do not think that anything has been proved before the House to show that oleomargarine is not a wholesome article of diet; and once the fact of its wholesomeness is established, the whole burden of proof is thrown upon the shoulders of the restrictionists and those people who believe that liberty of choice should be interfered with.

I take it for granted that there should always be a presumption in favour of liberty. What is the object of eliminating oleomargarine? The eloquent member who has just taken his seat (Mr. McConica) has placed his opposition to oleomargarine on the highest ground. Far be it from me, he says, to advocate anything for any special interest; it is the welfare of the people that I am considering; it is to protect the people against this deleterious substance that I wish to see legislation passed. May I observe that, if oleomargarine were an unwholesome article of diet, we have a distinguished doctor in charge of the Department of Health of this country who would see to it that such an article was prohibited. No, Mr. Speaker, the object of the propaganda is, as I trust I shall be able to show, the mistaken idea that by prohibiting oleomargarine you are going to enhance the price of butter, or at least to stabilize it. That is the real object lying at the basis of this propaganda against oleomargarine. But we are not here to represent merely what we may imagine are the views of our constituents. We are here to look at matters from the point of view of the national interest.

Let me just examine for a moment the real, though unavowed object of those who are in favour of the elimination of oleomargarine, that is to say, the raising of the price of butter. Will it raise the price of butter to eliminate this substitute? I do not think it will. The price of butter, of which we have a large exportable surplus, is determined not in Canada but on the markets of the world. There the butter enters into competition—if there is such competition—with oleomargarine, and the price of our butter will not be affected by oleomargarine in this country. This was most conclusively argued by the member for Glengarry (Mr. Kennedy) two years ago when the matter came before the House. I do not believe that oleomargarine is a competitor of good butter; I believe it comes into competition only with butter of an inferior grade. If that is the case, as I believe it is, what is the result of the prohibition of the manufacture in or importation into this country of oleomargarine? Well, the first result will be to give an example of class legislation which will redound very little to the credit of those who support such a move. I say class legislation; it is not even class legislation, because it cannot be imagined, for instance, that to prohibit oleomargarine will help the farmer who raises beef cattle, and for whom the market for oleomargarine helps to maintain the price of what he produces. If this prohibition is to help any one it will tend to help—I do not believe it will succeed in doing so, but that is what is aimed at—only a section of a class, that is, the dairy farmer. Nor do I believe that it could help this section.

Furthermore, it would deprive the people who cannot afford to buy good butter of a wholesome spread for their bread. Now, I know that in appealing to the members of this House I am appealing to gentlemen who are humane and reasonable. Can they place themselves in the position of an unorganized workingman in a city? Organized workingmen, through combination, are generally able to raise their wages to a reasonable height; but the vast majority of people working in cities are unorganized, they have to sell their labour for what they can get. There have been those who have justified the manufacture of oleo as a war measure. Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, that there are those who under the present organization of our society are always at war with poverty and with debt, and they have a right to be supported and to have liberty to exchange their labour for what they want as long as they are not buying what is poisonous or positively deleterious. I ask those who support the idea of the elimination of oleo to put themselves in the place of some poor working man with a large family. He comes home at night after this legislation is passed, after oleo has been driven off the market, and not being able to afford good butter—in the winter time good butter goes beyond the price which the poor can afford to pay—he finds his children with dripping on their bread, perhaps lard, and if they say to him, "Father, why cannot we have that nice stuff that we had on our bread last year?" "Oh well," he answers, "the representatives of the dairy farmers have said you cannot have it." Is there a supporter of the prohibition of oleo who would like to overhear that conversation? I do not think so.

Now, there are others too, there are the clerical classes, there are the school teachers, there are the ministers of the Gospel who find the cost of living pressing heavily upon them. Are you to tell them that they shall not have oleo if they want it to spread upon their bread? And let me say this—and I make the plea very strongly to those who agree with me on tariff matters—if you vote to eliminate oleo you are placing in the hands of the protectionists a rod for your own backs. For if you vote for the elimination of oleo, how in the world can you expect anyone to listen to you when you protest against the imposition of duties which raise the price of what you must buy? I would implore hon. members who agree with me on tariff matters to think very deeply before they commit themselves to an attitude which will be in direct contradiction and repudiation of the principles they have advocated in this House. They will be regarded as inconsistent people—and we are told that consistency is a jewel.

And let me with all frankness and with all courtesy expose to those who think differently from me what posture they will appear in before the people of Canada, before the vast numbers who live in our towns and cities and who are not interested in having oleo eliminated. First of all, those who vote for the elimination of oleo will place themselves before the nation as the representatives of a class who are thinking of their selfish interests and not of the public weal. No one is obliged to eat oleo unless he wants to, we are not forcing oleo down anyone's throat, but we who believe in the principle of liberty do feel that there should be liberty of choice.

Then may I make this argument also? I think it is a sound one. Those who in Great Britain fought for fiscal freedom made their appeal first to the workman in the town, then to the manufacturer, subsequently to the farmer on the land, and finally to the landlord, and they got the vast majority of the British people to agree with them. They could not carry on the battle successfully themselves, they had to get the co-operation of other people. Now, in the fight which many of us wish to make for lower tariffs, for greater freedom of trade and commerce, we need the help of the consumer in the town, we need the help of the workingman in the factory, and if by our vote we restrict the liberty of those classes in the towns who wish to purchase something which they think they need, we will be in a poor position to ask for their help. The matter is not of tremendous importance in one way; it is of tremendous importance in another. People have got to be guided either by expediency or by principle, and it is hard for me to understand how anyone who desires to have his conduct guided by principle rather than by expediency can one day vote for lower tariffs, for greater freedom of exchange—because in the long run that is what it is, allowing a man to exchange the product of his own toil, his own capital, for what he lacks—and then next day say that so far as a certain exchange is concerned the possibility of making that exchange shall be cut off.

You are a student of history, Mr. Speaker, and no doubt you will be interested to note the similarity of the idea underlying this proposed legislation to eliminate oleomargarine with the ideas on trade and commerce which obtained in the time of the Stuarts. I have before me the Encyclopaedia Britannica,

and I read with interest that by an act passed in the reign of Charles II it was decreed that all dead bodies should be buried in woollen shrouds. They must not be buried in linen shrouds, nor in cotton shrouds, they must be buried in woollen shrouds. Why? Because the lawmakers of those days wished to favour the interests of the woollen manufacturers. And I say with all courtesy that legislation which would prohibit the manufacture and sale of wholesome articles of food in this country is legislation on the lines of that which prevailed in the time of Charles II. I think perhaps with that historical allusion I had better leave the question to be decided, I trust, by the enlightened intelligence of the members of this House.

Hon. CHARLES MARCIL (Bonaventure): Mr. Speaker, as the representative of an agricultural constituency I do not wish to give a silent vote on this question. Oleomargarine is unknown to the people I represent; they eat good Canadian butter. The only requests I have received from my constituency to vote for the continued manufacture, importation and sale of oleo were from a couple of lumbermen so they might be able to supply it to their shantymen in the winter time. Therefore I am free in the matter. My electors are consumers of good butter, and I hope will continue to be for a long time to come, and I should like to see the majority of Canadians following their excellent example.

We are dealing with an aftermath of the war. Nobody ever dreamt of allowing the importation, manufacture and sale of oleo in Canada previous to the war. Our parliaments before that time—and they were made up of reasonable men—never thought of allowing this product to be sold to the Canadian people. But during the war it was allowed in under the abnormal conditions which then prevailed. Those conditions are now at an end, and I think we are free to act in the matter. I am going to cast my vote to re-establish the embargo on oleomargarine, and thereby I am satisfied that I shall have done my duty towards my constituents and the people of Canada generally.

There is one great problem in Canada which must be solved and solved soon if Canada is to remain the country that it is or is to have the future that we hope for it; the people must go back to the land. That is the main salvation of Canada. In the first ten years that I had the honour of representing my constituency in this House its population increased by five thousand people; in the second ten years the increase was only five hundred people. Their explanation is that the young people are leaving the farms and going to the cities because farming no longer pays. I have heard the agricultural question discussed from the point of view of the West; the condition that exists there exists in the province of Quebec just as acutely, but little is heard here of the grievances which our farmers have. But the people of my province are a patient and long suffering people. The progenitors of some of them were there some ten generations ago, and they have passed through many of the crises experienced by Canada during that time. They have stood the burden and heat of the day and are willing to stand it yet, but I say frankly to this House that unless we do something immediately to induce the people to return to the land we are facing a great crisis in this country.

I know of no industry in the province of Quebec that is of more importance in every respect than the dairy industry. Quebec occupies an enviable position in that respect. We have a land which is eminently suited to the purpose of dairying and a climate which is exceptionally favourable to the raising of cows and the making of butter. I would therefore, dislike to see this House give a vote which would jeopardize what I consider to be the leading industry of eastern Canada—the dairy industry. I was pained and surprised to see that a large number of agricultural representatives from western Canada last year forgot the agricultural interests of eastern Canada to the extent of voting against the dairy products of eastern Canada in favour of oleomargarine. After all, oleomargarine is a mere fancy; it never existed in this country before the war. Nobody thought of it then, and it was allowed in under certain well-defined rules, with a positive engagement that as soon as the abnormal days disappeared the privilege then granted would be repealed. There were too many substitutes of various kinds during the war; it is difficult now to go into a store in any part of Canada and buy an article which is not a substitute of one kind or another. Manufacturers and others during the war lent themselves too readily to the making of substitutes of this kind or that, and I am not in favour of encouraging any more of them.

I do not see why the farmers of Canada, the dairy farmers especially, those who have the courage, and, I may say, the patriotism, to stick to the land when so many others are deserting it, should be given a slap in the face by this House of Commons in favour of an article which, after all, is consumed by very small numbers of people. We are told the consumption is only 4,000,000 pounds annually, its use being confined mostly to the

cities; in the agricultural districts it does not exist. I should be surprised to see the representative of an agricultural constituency vote in favour of the main motion now before the House. I will say nothing further, Mr. Speaker, than this: I will vote for the amendment, and in casting that vote I think I am acting in the genuine interests of the farming community of Canada.

Mr. A. J. LEWIS (Swift Current): Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words in regard to the situation by which we are confronted. I do not feel that the amendment is necessary; the defeat of the resolution offered by the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Carroll) would have accomplished the same purposes that the amendment has in view. However, now that the matter is before the House I wish to make my position clear.

During the by-election in Moose Jaw—and I want to speak as kindly as I can in regard to the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell)—he stated that when the vote was about to be taken last year on the subject of oleomargarine I, with about five or six others in this corner of the House, immediately slipped under the barn and the only part of me that could be seen was my feet. Well, I hope the whole of me will be seen when the vote is taken on this occasion. But what the minister said was not quite correct, and as the charge was repeated in a paper in my own constituency, I wish to answer it. It is true that the Minister of Agriculture spoke to me in the afternoon—not a short time before the vote was taken, but in the afternoon —in respect to oleo, and also about the conditions in southern Saskatchewan and the need of entering largely into dairy farming. With all of that I quite agreed. But about eleven o'clock in the evening I asked the whip, when the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) was speaking, how many more members were going to speak, and he said, "Oh, possibly ten or eleven." I wanted to speak on the subject, but he did not think the vote would be taken that night and I left the House about eleven o'clock. I understand, however, that the vote was taken some two hours afterward. So that I did not slip under the barn just a few moments before the vote was taken. As I said, I understood that the vote was not going to be taken that night.

Now, I wish to speak only about three or four things. The second thought that came to me when the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) was speaking was this: Since when did he become solicitous about the keeping of pledges? It is only a few weeks since the party of which I am a member presented an amendment because they felt, either rightly or wrongly, that the Liberal party were not implementing their pledges of 1919. It seems to me that a government should think about keeping its own pledges before concerning itself about keeping the pledges of the government that preceded it. At all events, so far as the pledge was concerned, it may have been a pledge, as the hon. member for north Waterloo (Mr. Euler) said this afternoon, to the dairy interests. So far as it was a pledge to them, it should be kept; but I think there is a greater pledge to the Canadian people, and they have spoken since that time in no uncertain voice.

The third point I wish to make in regard to the amendment is this: To me it appears to be somewhat of a camouflage. I went upstairs immediately after I had heard the amendment read and I looked over the resolution that was proposed last year by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill). It did seem to me that that resolution superseded any pledge that had been given to the Canadian people in 1917 or any time afterwards, because it asserted that it was in the interests of the Canadian people that oleomargarine should not be imported into or manufactured in Canada, and the House voted against it. The majority was not large, it is true, but at the same time it was a majority, affirming the view that the manufacture and importation of oleomargarine should be permitted. So it is that we have heard the expression of the representatives of the Canadian people in this parliament; they have spoken definitely; they have expressed the opinion that the manufacture and importation of oleomargarine should be permitted.

Mr. CANNON: Will my hon. friend allow me a question? Am I to understand that he contends that a vote of parliament may supersede a pledge?

Mr. LEWIS: I understand that the pledge was given at that time. Well then, automatically when the vote is taken which gains a majority, showing that the Canadian people wish oleomargarine to be manufactured, imported and sold in Canada, that to me seems to be the supreme will of the people.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member also refers to a pledge. I do not know what he means by that. To whom was the pledge supposed to have been given?

Mr. LEWIS: I understand from what I have heard that such a pledge was given to the dairy interests, and that the measure was simply passed as a war measure.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Was the pledge given in the terms of the order in council or at some meeting?

Mr. LEWIS: In the order in council.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The order in council simply states that it is temporary for the war period. Does the hon. gentleman think that is a pledge to the dairy interests?

Mr. LEWIS: I am not arguing in support of this pledge.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I know that, but I do not want a misunderstanding on the part of the House that something was said to the dairy representatives. If it was, I have no recollection of it.

Mr. LEWIS: I would say in answer to the question that indirectly, whether it was meant or not, the dairy people of Canada took it as a real pledge from this parliament, but even if they did, the expression of the will of this parliament, who are really the representatives of the people, should govern, and if it is the opinion of parliament that it is for the well-being of the people that that pledge should be abrogated and another law put in its place, I do not say that we have not the right to do so.

Mr. WARNER: I would ask the hon. member if he knows how many members of parliament were not present when that vote was taken?

Mr. LEWIS: I shall answer that in a few moments, because I was charged by the Minister of Agriculture with shirking the vote. If I shirked the vote I shirked it in good company, because the right hon. the Prime Minister himself was absent and about eighty other members, probably not expecting the vote to be taken that night, and that is the reason why I feel justified myself in regard to that matter.

As far as the resolution is concerned, it does seem to me that parliament, although eighty members were absent when the vote was taken, wanted the sale of oleomargarine. But let us go one step further. The laws we pass here are not the laws of the Medes and Persians, and if this year it is necessary to change that vote, and if we think it is in the interest of the primary industries, but not in regard to a matter of principle, that that vote should be changed, I think parliament is competent to change it without being inconsistent at all. What I do feel is this: It seems to me that there is a certain lack of courage on the part of the government after the resolution passed last year by the vote it obtained, in not bringing down a measure and shouldering the responsibility. I think it was the duty of the government to have done that, to have shown that it had backbone enough to bring in a measure of that character. I hate to cast my vote in regard to a camouflaged motion, and after hearing the speech of the hon. member to my left (Mr. McMaster) it is very hard for me to reconcile any position I may take to-night, because we are not really fighting or voting on the merits of the question.

There is one thing I do want to urge upon the government earnestly, and it is this: If this amendment carries and the importation and sale of oleomargarine is defeated, I feel that the government should insert a clause whereby people in Canada can at least manufacture oleomargarine for export, and thereby use up the by-products in some of these large concerns. If it is the will of the Canadian people that we shall not eat oleomargarine, well and good; I am willing to abide by that, but it does seem to me that these manufacturers should have the privilege of competing with Belgium and other countries in the British market. That is all I have to say on this resolution, but I hope that a measure will come before this House where there will be no side-stepping at all, and where we shall be able to vote on the merits of the question.

Just before I came up to the House I spoke to a washerwoman with a large family and said, "Possibly to-night we shall vote for the elimination of oleomargarine." She said, "If you do what are we going to do in winter with butter at sixty-five cents a pound? I shall not be able to put anything on the bread for my children." That is the situation as it seems to me at the present time. We are not forced to eat oleomargarine, and as far as the West is concerned, when I was out there I went into many and many a store to find out if they ever sold oleomargarine, and I never came across one village store in my constituency that sold it, so that I cannot see that it enters into competition with butter. Furthermore, I want to say as a member of parliament with the family I have that I have bought oleomargarine as a test for my children, and as far as some of them were concerned they could hardly tell the difference between oleomargarine and butter, especially in regard to that cottage roll the minister speaks of. I am not saying it is a good thing for the children, but it does seem to me that the people of this country have a right to say what they are going to eat, and if it can be proved that this is a wholesome food I do not see why we should restrain

this trade in any way. As far as I am concerned, I would like to see this question fought on its merits, and not on a camouflage or an amendment such as is before the House at the present time, on which we really cannot get a consensus of opinion in regard to oleomargarine.

Mr. DECHENE (Montmagny) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, I have listened with much pleasure to the greater part of this debate on oleomargarine. I was already well acquainted with the views of most of the members and nothing new has transpired in the present discussion, unless it is the word "camouflage" which was freely made use of. The last speaker (Mr. Lewis) clearly proved to us that there existed camouflage among a great number of members sitting around him. In fact, last year, when this debate took place, the interests of the large packing houses were strongly emphasized and we were told: "These packers allow us, we from the West, a better price for our beef when the manufacture of oleomargarine is permitted, because they can make use of a large portion of the beef fat, which gives them some return." Now, we know, through the circulars of these gentlemen which have been distributed to all the members, that there is about twenty-five to thirty pounds of beef fat or such per head used in the manufacture of oleomargarine, the price of the former being four or five cents per pound, this would mean that the manufacturers would pay for beef about $1 or $1.25 more per head. This would amount to very little for the cattle-breeders of the West, and even this slight advantage would not exist in the eastern provinces. For over twenty years, the governments of the eastern provinces have exerted all their energies to promote the dairy industry. Large sums of money have been paid to agricultural and co-operative associations, and also to farmers, in a word, to all those who took an interest in the growth and improvement of the dairy industry in our provinces.

Every year, parliament is called upon to vote large sums for the improvement of the dairy stocks of the different provinces. Every year, the provincial legislative assemblies vote large amounts for the same object, always, with the idea of fostering lively competition among the farmers, and, bearing in mind the improving of the dairy herds and at the same time benefiting the farms and the commonwealth. What would be the object of having spent such enormous sums, if by a majority vote of this House, we allowed the manufacture of oleomargarine on a large scale.

[Mr. Lewis.]

We are told: There are but three or four million pounds of oleomargarine sold yearly, it is very little compared with the 270,000,000 pounds of butter produced and sold yearly, in Canada, or by Canada. This may be true to some extent, but one must not lose sight that last year parliament passed an act extending for one more year the right to manufacture, to have in one's possession and sell oleomargarine. Evidently the large manufacturers of this article did all they could to keep down this trade, so as to show how small it was and not to frighten the other industries. However, I think that the majority of members will not be deceived by this camouflage of the manufacturers who, to-morrow, should the law permit them and the markets be thrown open, would spread over the country a product of an entirely inferior quality.

The hon. member (Mr. Lewis) who has just taken his seat, told us that he made, last year, the experiment of oleomargarine on his children. I do not think that he is much to be congratulated on this matter. If he had had some experience with this product, he would not have tried it a second time and I am certain that his wife would not have wanted him to bring oleomargarine home again. Most of the experiments made consist in placing oleomargarine or butterine on bread. If these gentlemen would only go to the kitchen and place this oleomargarine on hot toasts, or else, do some frying with it, I think they would much prefer not to be the cook when this is happening; it is healthier to be in the open air or pace up and down in front of the house while the wife is leaning over the pan. I do not think that all those who have a delicate sense of smell and like to eat well, bear a love for oleomargarine to the extent of putting up with the smell of tallow on their toasts or again in cooking. There is nothing so unpleasant as the odour of suet or oleomargarine in the frying pan and I have heard this as a fact from more than one person who has given it a trial. It is a substance which disintegrates with the heat and that is why when it is used on toast or in cooking it is abominable. When you are told, Sir, let the workman give it to his children to butter their bread, I think, that is a very poor argument. Here is another weak reason given in behalf of the labourer: How do you expect the working class in winter to purchase butter at 65 cents a pound? They forget to tell us, however, when these prices prevail, oleomargarine has increased in price and is sold from fifty to fifty-five cents a pound,

and even much dearer, with profits ranging from 100 per cent to 125 per cent. The price of manufacturing oleomargarine is 12 to 15 cents per pound and it is sold at 24 and 25 cents per pound; it is sold just sufficiently low enough to compete with butter, but not in keeping with the workman's purse. Very few working men, if not influenced, buy oleomargarine. It is forced upon them. It is forced upon them when the large companies feed their men with it. It is forced upon them in all restaurants of cities, where meals are served at cheap prices, without mentioning if butter or oleomargarine is supplied. This article is coloured and given the appearance of butter, it is served to those who come and eat in such places at a rate of 5, 10, 20 or 30 cents per meal, but great care is taken not to mention that as the hon. member who preceded me in this debate stated, we serve only oleomargarine of the best make. This is simply camouflage. Another reason that certain speakers invoked this evening and which I feel certain cannot but have astonished you, is the freedom of choice. Here is an article which is not worth much, everybody admits—perhaps it is worth nothing—however we are free to purchase it, we are told. Is this the only instance, in our country, where a citizen is not allowed to purchase what he finds good to his taste? Have we not in Canada a temperance act which applies to the whole country, and have we not in this province where we live, at present, a law which decrees: You shall not have the right to drink beer and you shall neither have the right to drink wine? Do we not know, Mr. Speaker, that beer plays a very important part in the English workman's diet?

There was almost a revolution in England, during the war, when they tried to stop the workman's beer. Do we not refuse in certain parts of the country, not only to our workmen but everybody the right of drinking beer, even though it may be a pleasure to them? Is beer a deleterious product? Evidently not. It is a product made from malt which is recommended by the medical profession but one must not make use of it to excess. Neither would it be wise to eat too much oleomargarine.

In France—as you are better aware than I am, Mr. Speaker, wine is part of the diet, not only for the well to do classes but also for the working classes, and cider is also part of the diet of the farming class. Even here, in certain parts of the country, is not the use of wine prohibited? In this province we are allowed to make wine, to sell it by the dozen bottles, but you are not permitted to purchase it by the bottle. What becomes of individual liberty? When it becomes of not suit the purpose, we abolish it. This is not a serious argument. I therefore state, Mr. Speaker, that we should brush aside that part of the reasoning in favour of oleomargarine and treat it laughingly.

One last word before closing my remarks. We were told a short while ago that this was part of our political platform, that we even made promises that the greater number of the members of the government would be bound by these promises of the Liberal party and should vote against oleomargarine. It is not the first time that the Liberal party places on its programme this question regarding oleomargarine. I remember—when I was still at the university or college—when the Liberal party under Sir Wilfrid Laurier prohibited the importation of oleomargarine. What was the result? Oleomargarine was prohibited shortly after 1900 and immediately the dairy industry improved and expanded, and a few years later our country had become known abroad as an exporter of butter and cheese. The prohibition which Sir Wilfrid Laurier had then imposed on this article had been favourable to the trade development of our country. We have the experience of the past, why not follow in the same footsteps? This plank in the programme of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, in 1900, is still part of our programme; and I am, to-day, happy to adhere to it as well as to many other measures by asking that imports of oleomargarine be banned and by strongly supporting the amendment moved by the hon. member for Missisquoi (Mr. Kay).

Mr. D. W. WARNER (Strathcona): Mr. Speaker, as short speeches have been the order of the day in this debate I hope I shall not speak at undue length. Although there is quite a lot I should like to say I will try and make my speech as brief as possible. I wish to say that I want to discuss this matter from, perhaps, two viewpoints. First, as to the effect of the use of oleomargarine on the young folks that we expect from this time on to grow up and become citizens of Canada; second, as to whether the government should or should not carry out their pledges; and, perhaps, I shall have something to say as to the possible financial effect on Canada, of a question of this kind if we do not act wisely.

One thing that is always present in our minds is what is best for the children of our country. The state, it will be admitted, has the right to say something with respect to the conduct of parents or people who are taking care of children. If parents, through

carelessness, negligence or other cause, do not send their children to school the law steps in and declares that those children must be given a certain amount of schooling in order that they may develop into proper citizens. Some people may regard that as unfair towards the parents. Nevertheless such is the law. Is it any more unfair or unreasonable to go one step further and provide

9. p.m. that the parents or guardians of children shall give them nourishing food in order that their physical development may be of the right character. It has been stated many times in this discussion that it has not been proven that oleomargarine is not a healthful food. I challenge that statement especially for children. Let me tell hon. members who have been quoting authorities, that some of the authorities that have been quoted have been quoted on both sides of this subject. I have under my hand several quotations. One is from Dr. McGill, until recently Dominion Government Analyst, who says that one pound of butter is equal in producing value to four and one-half pounds of beefsteak. He gives a long list of comparisons, but the important thing is in the next paragraph of his remarks:

> In addition to providing heat and energy for the body butter promotes growth and health to a remarkable degree because it is rich in that vital element called vitamines (fat soluble A) which is absolutely indispensable to health and growth and as a factor in the building of bone and teeth. There is no problem before the country of greater importance than the one of properly feeding and nourishing its people.
>
> Statistics in the United States show that one out of every four in that country is suffering from under nourishment, and that 350,000 of them die every year from no other cause than poor or deficient food. It is not a case of poverty, so much as a case of ignorance. The food now given those children costs even more than proper food would cost. Similar figures are not available for Canada. While the condition of our children is doubtless not as shocking as the United States because a greater proportion of our people live on the land, where the children are fed on milk and butter in greater abundance, still children suffering from mal-nutrition are far too numerous in our centres of population.
>
> It is the sacred right of children to be given wholesome nourishing food, that they may grow up to be strong and healthy men and women.

The next is Mr. Herbert Hoover, a member of the United States government, who won so much honour for himself and his country as United States Food Administrator during the war. He puts the case clearly when he says:

> The basis of child welfare is health and physical development, the foundation of child health lies in proper feeding. In its broad aspects the proper feeding of children revolves around a public recognition of the interdependence of humans upon dairy cattle. The white race cannot survive without dairy products.

[Mr. Warner.]

That is Herbert Hoover's idea. Professor E. V. McCollum of Johns Hopkins University, who is one of the greatest authorities on the use of foods, for the preservation of vitality and health, in his book, "The Newer Knowledge of Nutrition," at page 16, after alluding to certain experiments in diet, says:

> With this diet the interesting observation was made that growth could be secured when the fat in the food mixture was butter fat, whereas no growth could be secured when the butter fat was replaced by lard, olive oil, or other vegetable oils. Under these conditions, why should ignorant parents be permitted to give oleo instead of butter to helpless little children merely because it may be a few cents cheaper when butter is an essential to the health of the child and the welfare of the nation?

I might say that is proof—and I have more—that it has not been proven that oleomargarine is a proper food for children. It has been proven that it is not.

Mr. STEWART (Hamilton): What is that from?

Mr. WARNER: I got this statement from the secretary of the Dairy Council, who obtained the information from the parties who have been quoted. I wish to quote from Dr. Wiley who has been quoted on both sides as I think these other authorities have. I wish to quote a statement by Dr. Wiley copied from a letter that Mr. Love, secretary of the Alberta Dairymen's Association, got from Dr. Wiley himself. This is what Dr. Wiley says:

> Originally my objection to oleomargarine, and this is quoted by the dairy interests, was based on the fact that it imitated butter. Not only did the makers of this product seek to resemble butter in colour, but also in flavour, and for this reason in the making of oleomargarine it is, I believe, universally churned with cream or milk. I have always been opposed to this process in the manufacture of oleomargarine. I believe that the churning of oleomargarine with milk or cream is solely for the purpose of simulating butter in the taste or flavour. For that reason it masquerades, or seeks to masquerade, under assumed properties which are possessed by butter itself.
>
> Since the oleomargarine problem first presented itself in this country—

He is speaking of the United States.

> —there has come a new discovery of supreme importance to the health of our people, namely, the vital factors, commonly called vitamines, in foods. Investigation shows that butter fat of all known fats has the most abundant supply of vitamines. Next to butter fat comes the fat of eggs and the fat which attaches itself to the vital organs of the animal body. For this reason animal fats which are used in the manufacture of oleomargarine are far inferior to butter fat, and to this extent oleomargarine is inferior in wholesomeness to butter. There are some animal fats used in the manufacture of margarines which contain no vitamines at all; for instance, lard. The same objection holds in regard to vegetable fats used in the manufacture of margarines.

It has been stated, further, that the feeding of oleomargarine to children or young animals

is distinctly injurious because a lack of development ensues in many ways. Here is what Dr. Margaret Patterson has to say on this point:

In Denmark (one of the best dairying countries in the world) the high price obtainable for butter induced the people to ship all the butter out of the country. The butter-fat was extracted from practically all the milk used in the country. The children were given plenty of separated milk, (a very valuable food for it contains all the lime salts, in fact, the only lack is the butter fat). This lack of fat was supposed to have been made up in fats of other kinds. The proper number of calories were given, but after a time the children developed a very troublesome type of sore eyes. The eyes showed no signs of improving under the most skilled physicians and had it not been for the research work carried out by Dr. McCarrison in Britain, and Prof. McCollum and others in America, the cause and cure of the disease might have remained unknown, and hundreds of children would have lost their eyesight.

This doctor goes on to say that as soon as butter fat was given to the children, and without any further treatment, a noticeable recovery followed. An hon. member has informed the House that we do not know what oleomargarine consists of. I do not believe we do. I have here a statement from the Dominion Cold Storage Commissioner in which he quotes Mr. Love, the secretary of the Alberta Dairymen's Association, in reference to the question as to the formula for oleomargarine. I read the following:

We asked J. A. Rudick, Dairy and Cold Storage Commissioner of our country, for the formulae to make oleomargarine and he was forced to reply as follows:

"We have these on our files as well as the formulae used by most of the American manufacturers, who are exporting oleomargarine into Canada. These were supplied to us by the manufacturers on the undertaking that the information should be considered as confidential, and we are, therefore, not able to pass this on to you."

We can see how the thing is covered up so that no one can tell what oleomargarine contains. No one knows anything about it apart from the cold storage authorities who take charge of it. To continue:

Compare Mr. Ruddick's statement with the law of Canada on butter, as found in section 21, page 27, of the Food and Drugs Act, Department of Health of Canada, 1920, which read as follows:

"Butter is the clean, non-rancid product made by gathering in any manner the fat of fresh or ripened milk or cream into a mass, which also contains a small portion of the other milk constituents, with or without salt, and contains not less than eighty (80) per cent of milk fat, and not more than sixteen (16) per cent of water. Butter may also contain added colouring matter of harmless character."

The oleomargarine manufacturer does not even have to make his formulae public, so that the public may know what to look for in his product and help the government of our country to prosecute violators of the law, the same as is done in the butter business.

Everybody in Canada knows exactly what the contents of butter are, but no one can possibly tell you of what oleomargarine is made.

However, we have the printed portions of two parchment wrappers off oleomargarine and margarine prints sold in California, U.S.A., which read as follows:

"Milcoa Brand Oleomargarine.—Ingredients: 77.50 per cent cocoanut oil, 5.50 per cent peanut oil, 12.00 per cent moisture, 2.50 per cent salt, and 2.50 per cent milk solids.—Morris & Co., Los Angeles, California, U.S.A." and

"Nuco:—Ingredients: 76.00 per cent cocoanut oil, 5.00 per cent peanut oil, 2.50 per cent milk solids, 2.50 per cent salt, and 14.00 per cent moisture."

Now then, the people who are talking about oleomargarine being made from animal fats are under a delusion as well. The practice is becoming more and more general all the time to make oleomargarine out of vegetable fats, and these are imported. I do not wish to weary the House by reading it, but I have under my hand a statement by John Burns, manager of one of the biggest packing plants in Alberta, and perhaps in Canada, in which he says that they do not pay any more for an animal on account of the oleo oil they expect to get out of it.

The hon. member for Victoria City (Mr. Tolmie) stated this afternoon that only about 2 per cent of the spread for our bread was oleomargarine, the other 98 per cent being butter. He also quoted the convictions of men for wrongful handling of these two commodities. He said that for one year there were 126 convictions in the case of butter as against 14 convictions in the case of oleo; the following year the figures were 106 and 11 respectively. Now then, when we analyze these figures we find that the convictions relating to the handling of oleo constitute 9½ times more than those relating to the handling of butter. I do not believe it will be possible to control the manufacture, importation and sale of oleo once we remove all restrictions.

Now I shall take up another feature, that is, as to whether our dairymen were misled by the government at the time they acquiesced in what was considered to be purely a temporary war measure. I am told that it is not a good argument to say that the dairymen are holding the government to their pledge, but I claim, Mr. Speaker, that such a pledge was made and still stands. If for no other reason, it is plain to me that the temporary nature of the legislation demonstrates that such a pledge was given by the government of the day. I have in my hand a letter from the worthy Minister of Agriculture at the time this temporary legislation was intro-

duced, the Hon. Mr. Crerar, in which he says in part:

> You have doubtless noticed that an order in council has been passed providing for the admission of oleomargarine into Canada under certain provisions during the period of the war.

That is, during the period of the war alone. Further, he says:

> I think you can rest assured that it will not be the policy of the new administration to do anything that would in any sense permanently injure the dairy industry.

That is what Mr. Crerar wrote me when he was Minister of Agriculture in 1917. I wired him at that time on the request of the Alberta Dairyman's Association, and that is the answer he gave me. I have before me the first act which is entitled:

> An act to permit the temporary importation, manufacture and sale of oleomargarine in Canada.

Now, that is all temporary and the government have never denied that the legislation was intended to be of a temporary character to meet the abnormal conditions arising out of the war. The dairymen understood, and I understood, when I got that letter from Mr. Crerar, that that is what the government meant, and I believe the people of Canada still entertain that view. Therefore I am going to support the amendment to restore the old condition of affairs before there was any order in council or any other action to permit the temporary importation, manufacture and sale of oleomargarine. I believe that is where this commodity ought to be, and I should like to see the government take the responsibility of dealing with the matter in accordance with the pledge given by the former administration.

Regarding the value of dairying and its national importance, I have been in the dairy business all my life, since I was old enough to milk a cow, and I think I understand it from one end to the other. I know from experience how hard it is to keep people in this business. I also know how important it is to Canada to have our farmers continue as dairymen. It is worth something to Canada to encourage our farmers and help them to make a success of the dairy business, and thereby help to bring about national prosperity. For this is what it means. I have heard some people view this problem merely from the standpoint of the profit that is made out of butter. I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that that is only a detail. The pork which will be produced by increasing our dairy business will be equal to the amount of money derived from our dairy products. Denmark is one of the greatest dairying countries in the world, and she is also one of the greatest bacon producers in the world, as everyone knows. Now then, are we by allowing this substitute for butter to cut off two valuable lines of production? You can call it protection or what you like, but I say that it is not a proper thing to put oleomargarine in competition with butter when we have spent so many millions of dollars to develop the dairy business of Canada. I do not think it is good policy to do so. I think I know enough about business to understand that Canada needs every dollar she can get from every honourable and legitimate source, and our farmers need the elimination of oleomargarine to place them in a position where by increased dairying operations there may be a corresponding increase in bacon production, which will enable them to do their share in bringing back this country to a prosperous condition.

I have been studying this problem ever since Mr. Crerar wrote me the letter from which I have quoted. I come from the United States where they have always been unable to control the oleomargarine business. I do not wish to use harsh words or harsh illustrations, but I want to tell you that these corporations that are putting oleomargarine on the market are just as hard to control as the bootleggers in the liquor business. I do not believe we can control it.

I appeal to hon. members for support to this amendment; I believe that such an attitude on our part will give renewed confidence to the farmers. The government are thinking of an immigration policy; are they going to permit the sale of a substitute for butter that will make it harder for the people who come to our country to go into the best business we have? I do not believe the government can afford to do it; speaking for myself I hope they will not do it.

Now, just a word in regard to whether the prohibition of oleo would or would not be protection. We are not asking for protection on an article that enters into fair competition with another article. I think I have shown that oleomargarine is not a proper food for children. It is a substitute for butter, the best you can make. If it were a question of butter coming into this country and we were asking that a tariff be put upon it to shut it out, that is what I would understand as protection. I am looking at this matter, not from the monetary point of view, but from the point of view of the welfare of our children, I have references here which show that children attending school who had been fed with butter on the one hand and oleo on the other ad-

vanced in knowledge and in physical weight where they had used the butter and lost where they had used the oleomargarine. That was demonstrated by actual test; I could read the quotation, but I do not need to. Let me point out also that we compel the parent who might otherwise be negligent to send his child to a school to get an education. Are we going to say that he may, without perhaps knowing the actual effects, feed to his children something that will prevent them from absorbing the instruction that is given in our schools? Are we going to be as inconsistent as that? There is enough butter in Canada to enable everyone who wants a proper spread for his bread to get it; there is no question about that. Science tells us that the parent who buys oleomargarine to give to his children would do his family more good and would make a better investment of his money by buying butter with it, thus getting a natural food and a perfectly wholesome product. I think, Mr. Speaker, I have said enough on the subject; I shall not take up any more of the time of the House.

Mr. FORTIER (Labelle) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, I shall vote against the motion of the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Carroll) and I shall endorse with pleasure the amendment to the resolution brought down by the hon. member for Missisquoi (Mr. Kay).

I disapprove of oleomargarine and I favour butter, good butter; I wish to see our farmers succeed, to help in promoting both the development of our farms and this always increasing industry known as the dairy industry.

This question of oleomargarine has been discussed in every possible way and examined under different aspects by the hon. members of this House ever since the beginning of this debate. For my part, I shall briefly touch upon it. One of the phases to which my attention has been drawn the most, is the economic aspect of the question. It was said with a great deal of truth that every pound of oleomargarine which is imported, manufactured or sold in this country, has for object the replacing of one pound of butter. Those who supported the resolution of the hon. member for Cape Breton South also stated that, for the last few years, the sale of oleomargarine had considerably diminished in this country; that three or four years ago, if I am not mistaken, the sale amounted to about 14,000,000 pounds and that last year it only amounted to 4,000,000 pounds, and they seemed to infer from this fact, that we had nothing to fear from the sale of oleomargarine, we, the advocates of the dairy industry, because, as we are aware, the sale of this article decreases from year to year and tends to disappear. If such is the case why legislate with the object of continuing the sale of this product? If it tends to disappear, if the public has taken an aversion to oleomargarine, in my opinion, there is no use passing a law allowing to place once more on the market this famous substitute for our Canadian butter.

It was the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil), I think, who so ably discussed the economic aspect of the question. He represents one of the most beautiful counties of the province of Quebec, a flourishing region of Gaspé. May I be permitted to tell him that the electors of another district of the province of Quebec, the district of Labelle, who have devoted themselves to farming and have opened up, in the heart of the Laurentian hills, a beautiful and large domain, are fully in accord with him this evening, because they share the lofty views he so well expressed. As the hon. member for Gaspé so ably stated, it is more than time that the people give their thoughts to the land, and develop their agricultural industries, for agriculture will certainly be the salvation of the country, and, among these agricultural industries, the dairy industry has not its equal. Indeed, we are passing through, at present, a period which is perhaps more critical than the one we went through a few years ago; however, those who are in touch with history, will remember that about the year 1882, our rural districts were being depopulated; a constant emigration from our country was taking place and many of our farmers disheartened, abandoned their farms to cross over to the United States. We are facing at the present moment a situation somewhat approaching the one our fathers experienced. At that time the public men of the province of Quebec were moved by the sad state of things, even the clergy came to the rescue and all proclaimed: We must save our farmers. It was then that we witnessed the development of our dairy industry in that province, the organization of numerous dairy associations. Eminent men took up the good work in the province and from that date we rejoiced in seeing the farmer take an interest in the land and produce in greater quantities butter and cheese. He paid his debts, cleared his mortgages and made the land productive. In my opinion, it is the dairy industry that saved Canada. We should be attached to this industry. If the people were so much attached to it in the old centre of the St.

Lawrence valley or in the old provinces of Canada, should we not be so, we the representatives of those colonization districts. I should like to see in my region of Mount Laurier industrial dairy associations; lecturers to teach the people, the settlers, how to make a success of these farms and keep them to some extent, away from the bush, the home of shanties, so as to enhance the agricultural industries in all those valleys. I should like to see subsidies granted to the county that I have the honour to represent, for the establishment of butter and cheese factories, and to obtain better herds of milch cows. I think that this would be one of the most important acts that the government could accomplish. This work of the dairy industry, I may say is the first, the one that dominates to-day.

I therefore take pleasure in stating that I am absolutely opposed to the sale of oleomargarine which is placed on the market to replace butter. It was advanced in support of the motion of the hon. member for Cape Breton South, that oleomargarine is a product which is sold cheaper than butter and that consequently it might have a certain attraction for the poor and labouring classes. We must not lose sight of the fact that oleomargarine is a product which unfortunately tends to replace butter.

What we especially require, is pure food; and between the two, there is no hesitation of choice. I think we should even protect the poor or the workman against this substitute which certainly has not the value, nor the taste of good butter. We are told: Canada is the only country in the world that prohibits the sale of oleomargarine and all the other countries, even those that produce butter in large quantities, have permitted for a great number of years the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine. I think we should be thankful that our country has never adopted legislation to that effect. After all, we are perhaps in the infancy of the development of this great dairy industry, we therefore need to encourage it the more. That is the reason why we should not cast aside any means that are apt to help in its development. We cannot compare ourselves to the European countries, to Denmark for instance, who for a number of years past, has not ceased to work for the development of its dairy industry, the source of its wealth. Here, we are in the earliest stages; we live in an agricultural country where we find natural resources in abundance, where we can produce more than any other country, butter and cheese, for exportation. We cannot compare with Denmark or Switzerland so far as this is concerned, but let us wait. We are the owners of vast territories, numerous rivers, magnificent and large lakes and the richest soil. For that reason, I state that we should be more drawn towards the development of this great dairy industry and that we should oppose energetically the thought of allowing the manufacture of oleomargarine.

Mr. GEORGE BLACK (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, this amendment is based on the premises that the suspension of the legislation preventing the importation, manufacture and sale of oleomargarine in Canada was a war measure, and therefore being a war measure was by inference of a temporary nature, and that the suspension should now come to an end. It is true that the war is over, but with the end of the war we did not settle the question of the importation, manufacture and sale of oleomargarine. We must now deal with it as an economic question The conditions, let us admit, permitted of temporary action during the war, but conditions at the present time demand something more. They demand that this House and this parliament face the question of whether or not oleomargarine should be manufactured in and imported into this country as a permanent measure.

Mr. MARTELL: Might I ask how many dairy herds there are up in the Yukon? Is there a dairy industry up there

Mr. BLACK: I am happy to say that we have a dairy industry up in the Yukon.

Mr. LOGAN: Reindeer?

Mr. BLACK: But the people of the Yukon I am quite sure though proud of their dairy herds do not wish to prevent the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine in that country or other parts of Canada where such sale will be of great benefit to the majority of the population. It is subterfuge to say that because we dealt with the matter temporarily during the war we should not deal with it now at all. Supposing the action during the war was temporary, that does not relieve this parliament of its obligation to deal with the matter now one way or the other. It is purely an economic question. It is not a matter of sentiment in any respect. Both at the last session of this House and at this session the government has shown itself decidedly averse to taking a stand on this question, although I think it is fair to say that at the last session, represented by the Minister of Agriculture, the government tentatively pledged itself to deal with the matter this session. In support of that I shall quote

briefly the words of the Minister of Agriculture when the bill of last session was before the House. Excusing himself for not being in a position at that time to deal finally with the matter of oleomargarine the Minister of Agriculture said:

> We have had before this House evidence indicating that it was more nutritious and also evidence that it was less nutritious than butter. I want to know which is the fact and other conditions in connection with oleomargarine before a permanent bill is brought down if that is found to be desirable. I want time during the recess—

That was the past recess, so he has had the time.

> —to find out if it is desirable to bring down a bill, and, in that event, to know exactly what I am doing. That I could not know at the short time at my disposal. Hence I bring down—

In the classic words of the Minister of Agriculture.

> —this rotten old bill that my hon. friends have passed on three or four occasions.

That is how the minister speaking for the government described the oleomargarine bill of last session. I say that the government through its Minister of Agriculture tentatively pledged itself there to deal with the matter at this session. A bill was brought in at this session. Evidently the Minister of Agriculture did inform himself for he brought in a bill dealing very copiously with oleomargarine, but suddenly and for some unknown reason the government, represented by the Minister of Agriculture, experienced a change of heart and withdrew and washed out from the slate this bill dealing with oleomargarine upon which the Minister of Agriculture has taken the recess to inform himself. Strange to say, the explanation given to the House for the change of heart was that some law officer or departmental clerk without the minister's knowledge and against his wish had so altered and tampered with the bill after it had passed its first reading that the government could not follow it and was obliged to destroy it. Truly an extraordinary situation for the head of a department to find himself in.

It is also true that the Prime Minister expressed his disapproval of the conduct of the Minister of Agriculture in sending out, through his department, anonymous communications seeking to influence those in receipt of such communications against legislation favouring the manufacture and importation of oleomargarine. Perhaps the minister will protect himself in this instance, as he did in regard to the mutilation of this bill, and say that some clerk in his department improperly, unlawfully, without his authority and against his wish, took the stationery of the Department of Agriculture and issued this appeal against oleomargarine. Otherwise he will have to take the responsibility for it.

Now, to ask us to believe that the government consider themselves bound by any pledge, made or implied, by any former government is to put too great a tax on the credulity of the members of this House, too great a tax on the credulity of the public, having in view this government's record in the matter of observing their pledges and carrying out their platform. However, be that as it may, I say this is an economic question to be dealt with now in the best interests of the public. The evidence is that oleomargarine is a good wholesome food composed of nourishing ingredients. It is manufactured under regulations ensuring cleanliness and sanitation. To allow its manufacture will build up an industry with all its attendant advantages, including increased employment in Canada. To allow its importation will provide revenue by applying a tariff charge both to the finished article and to the ingredients which enter into its manufacture. A man of straw is built up to be knocked down by opponents to the legislation in favour of oleomargarine by saying that it will hurt the dairy industry. The evidence is that in the countries allowing the manufacture of oleo the dairy industry does not suffer from that cause. Why should we suppose that the dairy industry will suffer in Canada? That being so, what argument is left against the manufacture and importation of oleomargarine? It would be just as reasonable to prohibit the manufacture and use of homemade bread in the interest of bakeries because the use of homemade bread lessens the consumption of baker's bread. That would be just as reasonable as to prohibit the importation and manufacture of oleomargarine because it might be used in some instances instead of butter. The importation of butter from Denmark and New Zealand gives the Canadian butter makers much more effective competition than the use of oleomargarine, but we hear no agitation to prohibit the importation of butter.

Beyond all question oleomargarine is a health giving food. It is a fact that the Canadian corps overseas were fed on oleomargarine, they were not fed on butter. They got oleomargarine and plenty of it, and they were a healthy lot; there were no healthier men on the face of the earth. Oleomargarine did not injure their health in the slightest, any more than it will injure the health of the people of this country. And it must be remembered that oleomargarine was supplied to the troops

under conditions that permitted of adulteration to a far greater extent than do the conditions of the present day. I say that to admit the quality of oleomargarine cannot be controlled and its use regulated, is to admit inefficiency on the part of those in charge of the administration of the laws of the land. For my part I say: Encourage its manufacture as a Canadian industry, allow its importation, and regulate it, as in the case of any other food, under the pure food laws of this country. I say let the people use it according to their needs, whether as a substitute for axle grease or for food.

Hon. JAMES MURDOCK (Minister of Labour): On the 15th of May, 1922, the question of oleomargarine was discussed in this House at considerable length and a clear-cut declaration of position on the question was made. The resolution proposed at that time read as follows:

> That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that in the best interests of the dairy industry, and of the public generally, the manufacture and importation of oleomargarine should be discontinued in Canada after September first, next.

That resolution was negatived by a vote of 83 to 57, 95 members of the House being absent. It appears to me that was a clear-cut and distinct declaration of position on the part of this House as to what, in the opinion of parliament, should be done in the matter of further prohibiting the manufacture and importation of oleomargarine. That is how the question appears to me, Mr. Speaker, and may I say that I represent a farming community in Ontario second to none. But if that farming community expects me to contend for the protection which I find embodied in the motion before the House they have got entirely the wrong individual to further any such scheme, which I regard as the rankest demonstration of protection that has been witnessed in the House since I became a member of it.

Mr. MARTELL: But did you not vote for greater protection?

Mr. MURDOCK: The hon. gentleman, as usual, is ever ready with a side remark. He is absolutely right in that statement but it merits, in view of the form in which it is made, a little explanation. I find that for these many years protection has existed with respect to very many, altogether too many, walks of life. I find that protection, with the bright lights of the industrial prosperity of those protected has attracted too many of our young men and young women from the farms of Canada. It has brought them to the towns for the purpose of continuing a protection which, in my opinion, is wrong and should never have been tolerated. But I am not ready, as the representative of an important constituency in this House, simply because I believe that the principle of protection is absolutely wrong, first, last and all the time, to bring industrial or business chaos to Canada by saying that we are going to wipe out at one fell swoop all the protection that exists in Canada to-day. Holding that view, Mr. Speaker, I am not ready to quietly acquiesce in encouraging a species of protection which, in my opinion, is less justifiable than any other protection we have had in this country in the years gone by.

10 p.m.

Mr. NEILL: May I ask the minister if he expressed those views to his dairy electors before he was elected?

Mr. MURDOCK: Unfortunately I did not.

Mr. NEILL: Hear, hear.

Mr. MURDOCK: I was elected by acclamation and my constituents did not have the opportunity of hearing these views. I am hoping though that they will have an opportunity now of hearing my views, and I shall be glad to go to them if good fortune should permit, and state the same views that I will express to this House to-night.

Mr. ELLIOTT (Dundas): Will the minister explain to the House how this is protection of the dairy industry?

Mr. MURDOCK: I will try to come to that logically and in sequence. I was much interested in noting the efforts made by two of my hon. friends across the aisle to my right, one of them, the hon. member for Battleford (Mr. McConica) intimating that he was against protection, but that he would vote for this amendment because oleomargarine was not sold and put before the consumer on its merits. Then the hon. member for Strathcona (Mr. Warner) also was in favour of the amendment because oleomargarine is an imitation of butter. These seem to me very plausible apologies for overlooking the rank feature of protection embodied in the matter that is before the House to-night. If the view of the hon. member for Strathcona with regard to the imitation feature is correct, why should this House to-morrow or the next day not legislate against wooden legs and glass eyes and go the whole length in respect of preventing imitations.

Some hon. members referred to the fact that the women of Canada were in favour of continuing the importation and manufacture of oleomargarine. I think that great and

undue stress has been laid upon the fact that this was a war measure which permitted, in the first place in 1918 and since that time, the manufacture and importation of oleomargarine. I want to place before the House the views of part of the community of Canada, whose views I think should be given consideration. Under date of April 22, 1922, there came to me on the letterhead of the Great War Veterans' Association, a letter addressed to the Minister of Labour, reading:

Dear Sir,

I have the honour to submit herewith attached resolution adopted by the convention representing the Province of Ontario Great War Veterans' Association when in session at Ottawa the 21st April, 1922, respectfully urging that legislation may be enacted to permit the continued manufacture and sale of oleomargarine within the Dominion of Canada, which product has proved a boon to large families with small earnings and to those suffering distress through unemployment, as well as the provision of a channel for continued employment of a number of our citizens.

This resolution has been submitted to the Hon. Prime Minister of Canada.

I beg to remain, Sir, yours very obediently.

J. V. Conroy,
Secretary, Great War Veterans' Association,
Toronto district.

This is the resolution:

Whereas oleomargarine is widely known as a good and palatable food of high nutritive value and obtainable at all times at a considerably lower price than butter, and.

Whereas its sale is freely permitted in all parts of the British Empire (except the Dominion of Canada) and in other countries so long as it is sold on its merits, and

Whereas by a conservative estimate there were last winter 200,000 unemployed persons in the Dominion (of whom 17,000 men, three-quarters of them married with dependants, were reported in Toronto) to whom the lower price of oleomargarine was undoubtedly a benefit, and

Whereas members of the Great War Veterans' Association, Inc., know from experience that oleomargarine is a hygienic food which furnishes the necessary fats required in the diet, and

Whereas there is reason to fear that the present regulations permitting manufacture and sale in Canada may be allowed to lapse in September next:—

Be it resolved that this Ontario Provincial Convention, Great War Veterans' Association, respectfully and earnestly urges the Right Hon. the Prime Minister and the members of the Dominion government promptly to take steps to assure the continued manufacture and sale of oleomargarine within the Dominion so that housewives may be enabled to continue freely to purchase oleomargarine for their families if they so desire.

Mr. NEILL: What year was that?

Mr. MURDOCK: April 22, 1922. Those were the views of the Great War Veterans' Association. Then we have also in an editorial the expression of the Labour Leader, and I am rather surprised to note that the Labour party in this House is conspicuous by its absence to-night, as I think this is one of the most important questions concerning labour that has been dealt with for some time.

Mr. LEWIS: I should like to inform the hon. member that the two labour men are in the Banking committee which is sitting to-night.

Mr. MURDOCK: They ought to be looking after the feeding committee.

Mr. MARTELL: I would call the attention of the House to the fact that they are not the Labour party. There are a number of members representing Labour in this House. The minister is one of the best representatives of labour.

Mr. MURDOCK: The editorial of the Labour Leader in part says:

A product which was considered a good palatable food in war times by all competent authorities has a right to be so considered in times of peace. A glaring example of government by orders in council is reflected in the way permission to manufacture, import and sell this product has been granted. Yearly extensions have been made and undoubtedly several manufacturers who would equip their plants to make a high-class product have hesitated to make the outlay and thus create industry because of the uncertainty.

To allow this right to lapse would appear to be class legislation by protecting dairy interests at the expense of the wage earner. Oleomargarine has won a definite place in our commerce and so long as Canadians desire it, they should not be denied the privilege of making their own choice.

I could not in any way add to the statements made by the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster), when he pleaded for the poor family and the working man, that they be permitted to purchase oleomargarine. We have heard to-night, for the first time so far as I know, that a distinct assurance was given at the time when the prohibition of the importation, manufacture and sale of oleomargarine was suspended, that such suspension was but temporary and a war measure only. I should like to inquire why it was that last year when this question was discussed and when by a majority of twenty-six it was, in my judgment, decided that the manufacture and importation of oleomargarine would continue, the question of such assurance was not raised? Is it conceivable that because on the 15th May, 1922, the House passed judgment on this question adversely to those who now desire to prevent the continued sale of oleomargarine, this is an after-thought of an assurance given in 1918, and that they are now trying to bring this forth, as some hon. member suggests, from a camouflaged viewpoint in order to influence this House to make good on some alleged agreement that was given in 1918.

It seems to me that the House should do to-night what was done on the 15th day of May, 1922; it should pass upon this question on its merits, and on its merits alone. A great deal of literature has been read to-night in regard to the comparative food values of butter and oleomargarine. I have before me a statement which it has been stated is an analysis of the energy values of food and which was published by the British government. The author is R. H. A. Plimmer, D.Sc. who was attached to the Directorate of Hygiene of the War Office, and in this analysis the following statement appears:

> Butter, margarine, dripping, lard: As is well known, these foodstuffs consist essentially of fat and their energy value is entirely due to this constituent. The amount of protein present in butter and margarine is a negligible quantity. Butter and margarine have a lower energy than dripping and lard, owing to their content of water and salt. It is owing to the variability in amount of these two constituents that there are differences in the proportion of fat.

It is not necessary to enlarge further on this because I realize, from the documents that have come to my hand during the past few weeks, that it is possible to get a view either one way or the other on this particular question, and you can obtain all sorts of expert advice and decisions in regard to it. But let us come to the real question of protection involved, which is now being advocated openly for the dairying interests of Canada. In my judgment they want protection in its most glaring form. And how much protection is involved? Let us analyze the matter and see. Some of the figures were given to the House this afternoon by the hon. member for Victoria City (Mr. Tolmie), but there were not submitted all of the comparisons which I desire to draw therefrom. In 1916, there was produced in Canada—I am just giving the millions and thousands—26,966,000 pounds of butter, while there was imported into the country 2,091,000 pounds. In the same year we exported of this product 7,787,000 pounds. In 1917, there was produced 34,274,000 pounds of butter; we imported only 466,000 pounds and exported 4,344,000 pounds. The tendency was gradually to increase the ratio until 1921, when we find that there was a production of 128,784,000 pounds of butter in Canada, while in that same year there was imported into this country 4,018,000 pounds and exported from Canada 9,132,000 pounds. Last year, 1922, we produced in Canada 146,863,000 pounds. But that was not sufficient; 6,396,000 pounds of butter was imported into the country, while we exported 21,504,000.

As to the production of oleomargarine, I have here a report of the Canada Food Board for 1918, which gives in detail the results of its work as a food board for the months during 1918 in which it was in operation. At page 57 of the report reference is made to the enormous amount of business over which the board exercised control, and the statement is made that oleomargarine was imported to the extent of 1,000,000 pounds monthly during the year 1918. In 1919, the production of oleomargarine in this country was 10,084,000 pounds, while during the same year we imported 5,221,000 pounds. In 1920, we produced in Canada 10,565,000 pounds of oleomargarine and exported 5,553,000 pounds. In 1921, we produced in Canada only 3,824,000 pounds of oleomargarine, while during the same year only 2,057,000 pounds was imported. Last year, 1922, the production of oleomargarine was 2,326,000 pounds, while the importation was 1,032,000 pounds.

Mr. MARTELL: If the prohibition of oleomargarine is rank protection, what about the prohibition of mechanics from entering Canada?

Mr. MURDOCK: Just at the moment we are not dealing with alien labour, but if we should come to that subject in the course of the debates in this House I hope to maintain a sane, fair and reasonable view on the question. The point I wanted to make in quoting these figures was this: If we are really going to do, here and now, something for the real protection of the dairy interests of Canada, why not let us go the full limit and not only prohibit the manufacture and importation of oleomargarine but put a stop to the importation of the 6,396,000 pounds of butter that came into this country last year to compete with our Canadian butter?

An hon. MEMBER: No.

Mr. MURDOCK: An hon. gentleman says, "We do not ask you to do that". But it would be equally consistent to go that length and adopt the real essence of protection so that nothing but Canadian manufactured butter should be spread upon the bread of any citizen of Canada. That is virtually what is proposed, if I understand the protection that is intended.

Mr. GOULD: Chinese eggs too.

Mr. CANNON: Is the hon. member in favour of abolishing the duty on butter?

Mr. MURDOCK: At this particular moment I am not putting that view forward; nor would I be prepared to support that view any more than I am ready to subscribe to the proposal to prevent oleomargarine being manufactured in Canada or imported into the

country. Is it protection that is really proposed? Well, we have to go back to the records of the House in order to answer that question. This subject has been discussed in previous years. We find that on the third day of April, 1918, a resolution was proposed by the then hon. member for East Lambton to amend an order in council and more strictly to enforce it—

In order that the great dairy industry of Canada should be adequately protected.

Protection was what was desired. Various other orders in council were passed subsequently, until we come down to the year 1920. In 1920 an hon. member in this House spoke against the admission or manufacture of oleomargarine and said:

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,—

Which is admitted.

—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.

Another hon. member said:

It does not want protection.

And the first hon. gentleman said:

It does want protection, so this government says, as did the former government, and in fact every government from confederation down to the present time.

An hon. MEMBER: They must have been Tory.

Mr. MURDOCK: Yes, they were too Tory —and that, Mr. Speaker, is going to be one of the misfortunes of my life, to find myself to-night, I expect, before we get through, voting with the right hon. leader of the Opposition and the other gentlemen associated with him.

Yesterday we had a few very pleasant moments in the House when the right hon. leader of the Opposition referred to the cuckoo government over here, pointing to this side of the House, and it occurs to me that surely there has been some dodging on more than one side if I read Hansard aright. I find that on May 21, 1921, on the motion of the then Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen) the House went into committee to consider a resolution to repeal part of the Oleomargarine Act and permit the importation, sale and manufacture of this commodity. Then on the 25th May the proposed amendment secured its second reading. But let us find the position of the right hon. gentleman somewhat later, to be exact, on May 25, 1921, when he stated to the House:

When the bill was introduced this time the government felt that there was no further reason for a limited time and that in accordance with the best public policy oleomargarine should be admitted without limitation of time. . . . In that from the government would prefer the measure to pass. . . .The government's position is this, we prefer this bill as it is, we believe, though, in view of the opposition that we should accede to the amendment—

Extension for one year.

—rather than imperil the measure, and we propose to accept the amendment if it is the will of the House . . . . I am sorry that opposition to the bill developed on this side of the House or on either side, but under the circumstances, as we are nearing the end of the session, we felt it was better rather than that there should be a prolonged discussion that the bill should pass in a form which leaves the matter just as it is for another year, when under the circumstances of that time the House can again decide what it wishes.

The "circumstances of that time" came on May 15, 1922, when this House decided by a majority of 26 that it was not proper to longer prohibit the manufacture and importation of oleomargarine. In other words, the question was decided in the judgment of the House according to a formula which the then Prime Minister had declared to be proper and right on May 26, 1921, but which yesterday he referred to as a cuckoo attitude on the part of this government that proposes to do exactly the same thing—leave it to the House of Commons to determine what should be done as to the prohibition of the manufacture and importation of oleomargarine in the years to come.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I hold that the people do not need any such form af protection as is here implied. With 146,000,000 pounds of butter manufactured in Canada last year and 6,000,000 pounds imported, as well as 21,000,000 pounds exported, there is all this to-do about a paltry 3,000,000 pounds of oleomargarine manufactured and imported. We hear gentlemen who are absolutely committed to the principle of free trade and no protection getting up to-night and offering, it seems to me, very plausible reasons why they should, under the circumstances, stultify their consciences to the extent of ignoring the protection feature by voting to prohibit the manufacture aad importation of oleomargarine because it is a butter substitute.

Mr. McBRIDE: If I might ask the hon. minister a question—is he suggesting that the farmer should pay a tariff on everything he buys and get no protection whatever?

Mr. MARTELL: You are right there.

Mr. MURDOCK: Absolutely no. No member of this House would be more ready and willing to work with my hon. friend from

Cariboo (Mr. McBride) to remove so far as possible the burdens now placed on the farming community by improper protection. But holding the views I do on that subject, I am not by my vote going to help inaugurate a system of protection which is improper and unfair and is not in effect in any other civilized country in the world. We do not want to go from bad to worse.

Mr. MARTELL: If the minister will permit me—in the light of everything that has been said and of all the votes I have seen in this House, will he undertake to say, whether the question be protection, free trade or anything else, that how the members vote depends in a great many cases on whose ox is gored?

Mr. MURDOCK: Mr. Speaker, that may be good logic and the proper attitude to adopt in Hants, but so far as I am concerned, as I said some time ago, I represent an important agricultural community and I want the farmers in Kent to know where I stand on this proposal to inaugurate another line of protection. I shall be prepared to go before them and repeat what I am stating here in possibly more extended form.

Mr. MARTELL: Will my hon. friend permit me another question? So far as Hants county, Nova Scotia, is concerned, we do not want any protection, if he wishes to know—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. MARTELL: —But I want to ask my hon. friend if he is not advocating what he considers is in the best interests of his constituents, just as I advocate anything that in my judgment is in the interests of my constituents in the county of Hants?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. MURDOCK: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure if I know the rules of the game, but I thought I was here as a member of parliament from Kent county to represent, as best I could, what in my judgment is in the best interests of the people of Canada including my constituents. That is what I am trying to do to-night in speaking as I have. So I think, Mr. Speaker, that the House should take the position it took a year ago the fifteenth of last month when it decided by a majority of 26 that it would be improper any longer to prevent the people of Canada, the poorer classes of Canada, from having oleomargarine where possibly they could not secure butter.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Will the hon. member permit a question? I understand he is an authority on oleomargarine. Will he inform the House what are the ingredients that make up that product?

Mr. MURDOCK: The hon. member for South Oxford, as is so often the case, is entirely misinformed. I am not an authority on oleomargarine. So far as my knowledge goes I never ate it in my life, though I assume I have eaten it, because I have had a great many meals in restaurants. I never bought a pound of it and I do not know how it is made. I care little how it is made, as I am told on what to me is sufficient authority that it is a wholesome food. I know it was sufficiently wholesome to be utilized under war time conditions and I know that the returned soldiers and the poorer people of Canada are now contending that oleomargarine should continue to be used, and their views and their judgment are sufficient for me.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Will the hon. member permit another question? Does he think it is fair to the people who are purchasing oleomargarine that they should not know what goes into it?

Mr. MURDOCK: No, I do not think it is fair, but that is a matter of regulation.

In conclusion I wish to give the comparative prices of butter and oleomargarine in this country during the last few years. The figures given are the Toronto retail prices for January and July respectively in the years stated: 1918, butter, 55 and 52 cents; oleomargarine, 32 and 33 cents, 1919, butter, 60 and 60 cents; oleomargarine, 40 and 42 cents; 1920, butter, 75 and 65 cents; oleomargarine, 42 and 42 cents; 1921, butter, 64 and 37 cents, oleomargarine, 40 and 27 cents; 1922, butter, 49 and 44 cents; oleomargarine, 27 and 27 cents. 1923, January, butter, 46 cents; oleomargarine, 26 cents. There are many times when the widow of a soldier or his children cannot afford to buy butter, and I say it is unfair to establish a protection for the great dairy industry of Canada that will deny to such persons the right to get a spread for their bread which will take the place of a product the price of which may be too high to permit them to purchase it.

Mr. L. J. LADNER (Vancouver South): Mr. Speaker, all the dairymen are not opposed to the importation and manufacture of oleomargarine, and I am glad to say this evening that I can claim to come within that class of dairymen. I have been interested to some extent in a dairy herd, although many of my friends regard me as a lawyer.

An hon. MEMBER: A butter lawyer.

Mr. LADNER: What was the gentleman's remark? Well, there may be some hon. members more slippery than a butter lawyer. I was going to say, Mr. Speaker, that I have been able to see both sides of this question. Last year the matter was discussed in the House for a whole day, and I venture to say that when the debate commenced to-day there was not an hon. member who did not have his mind practically made up on the matter. We would not have had this confusion, we would not have wasted another day in debating whether $800,000 worth of oleomargarine should be brought into this country or manufactured here, if the government had assumed and discharged the responsibility which was deliberately and decisively placed upon them last year.

Mr. PUTNAM: Which government?

Mr. LADNER: Your government. There may be three of them in the House—the parent government, we will say.

Mr. LOGAN: They are all on this side of the House, anyway.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Alleged government.

Mr. LADNER: They do not seem to demonstrate any evidence of being a real government.

Mr. LADNER: In this matter of oleomargarine there is involved a simple question of principle. There has also been indicated in the debates of the House a desire to serve political expediency. Some hon. members represent dairy constituencies; many of them are sincere in their advocacy of the total prohibition of importation or manufacture of oleomargarine. But I suggest that most hon. members are impelled to their conclusions against oleomargarine largely by political considerations. How can it be argued for a moment that it is within the proper authority of parliament, that it is one of the functions of parliament, to prohibit the manufacture or importation of a food which has been demonstrated to be wholesome and useful to the community? The consumer, I submit, is the person to be primarily considered in this question. I know of no better argument on the subject than a few lines contained in the circular issued by the Retail Merchants' Association of Canada, part of which has been read to the House and part of which I will now read. This circular presents the views of the Grocers', Butchers' and Provision Dealers' sections of the association throughout Canada. They say:

> We have no interest to serve, only that of serving the public with what they want, and the fact that the demand from the consuming public for oleomargarine for the past year has been greater than that of any previous year is the best evidence we can offer you that the people want it.

Now, if the people want it, what right has parliament to prevent them from using it? Then the circular continues:

> Before our members undertook to offer it for sale to the general public we made exhaustive inquiries as to the ingredients it contained and its method of manufacture. We consulted with the Chief Analyst for the Dominion government and he pronounced it a perfectly good food, and he stated that it contained no harmful ingredients, and, as on each package is stamped the approval of the Department of Agriculture of the Dominion of Canada, our retail grocers, butchers, produce dealers and general store merchants throughout Canada felt perfectly justified in stocking it and offering it for sale. If our customers did not want it there would be no sale for it, but our experience shows that they do want it, and, seeing that it is a non-injurious and palatable product, and contains nothing that is unhealthful, we are of the opinion that they should be allowed to buy it if they so desire, and no law should be passed to prevent them from having it.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that in that simple statement we have all or most that can be said in favour of the importation and manufacture of oleomargarine. Every country in the civilized world permits it. On what principle does the parliament of Canada deny the people of this country the right to use oleomargarine if they want it? The dairyman's gain, I submit, would be microscopic, even if the manufacture and importation of oleomargarine was eliminated. I have figures on good authority which show that in value there was about $800,000 worth of oleomargarine consumed in Canada in 1922, and about $74,000,000 worth or a little more of butter, or less than 4,000,000 pounds of oleomargarine and about 240,000,000 pounds of butter, including both dairy and creamery butter. If you calculate these figures you will find that of the spread on bread about 1¼ per cent in value is oleomargarine and 98¾ per cent is butter. I inquired from several dairymen who are members of the House as to the profit per pound on butter and I was informed that there is no profit or only a very small profit. This whole proposition I submit simply comes down to this, that the small amount of profit on the $800,000 worth of oleomargarine is not a factor which should cause the government of Canada to put that small profit in the hands of the dairymen and deny the working classes of this country the privilege of obtaining a species of butter fat which is perfectly wholesome, and which otherwise they could not have. If this question is considered on the basis of principle, on the basis of fair play, on the basis of the liberty of the subject, on the basis of the right of

a man to buy what he wants provided it is healthful to him, and considering the infinitesimal advantage there would be to the dairy interests and the great loss to many of the poor people of this country, I cannot understand how any hon. gentleman could deny the citizens of this country this right which is accorded in every other civilized country of the world.

Mr. MARTELL: Will my hon. friend permit a question?

Mr. LADNER: Two.

Mr. MARTELL: In the case of boots and shoes, which are protected, there are very few manufacturers and the public suffer. Would not the same thing apply to the dairy industry? The protection to the dairy industry is for the benefit of the farmers, just as the protection on boots and shoes is for the benefit of the manufacturers, and the public in the final analysis pay the shot, do they not?

Mr. LADNER: The hon. gentleman is entirely wrong. The duty on boots and shoes is only a regulatory measure in order to encourage the manufacture of boots and shoes in this country. It is not total prohibition. It does not say: You shall not wear shoes; go in your bare feet. It says: You can wear shoes, but there will be a small addition to the price in order to encourage the manufacture of that article in this country.

Mr. MARTELL: Is it not the case that the tariff is so high that it almost means total prohibition? In any event it is the same principle, and the principle is wrong.

Mr. LADNER: As the hon. gentleman finds it necessary to resort to such extremes in argument, I think his question hardly merits an answer, because he knows perfectly well that the protection on boots and shoes is not a very high protection.

Hon. E. M. MACDONALD (Acting Minister of National Defence): There are one or two words only that I would like to address to the House on this question with a view to explaining what my position is in regard to it. I come from a constituency in the Maritime provinces which was a pioneer in the dairy industry in our part of the country. I know how important the development of the dairy industry is to the farmers of eastern Canada, and I am sure the experience that we have had there has been equally felt in all parts of this country. There has been no development along agricultural lines which has been so satisfactory and of such benefit to the agricultural people of our part of the country as the development of the dairy industry during the last ten or fifteen years.

All parties in this country down to 1917, about the middle of the war, apart from any question of free trade or protection, had decided that in the interests of the Canadian people from every standpoint there should be a prohibition of the sale and importation into Canada of oleomargarine. That was the situation, and nobody ever questioned it. But solely and only on account of the situation that was created by the war the government of the day under the War Measures Act, without the consent of parliament, without asking parliament anything in regard to the matter, proceeded to pass an order in council which expressly recited the circumstances under which this prohibition was to be removed. It stated that it was due entirely to the abnormal demand for butter, and that as high prices would prevail for this product for some time to come it granted permission for the sale and importation of oleomargarine under regulations to be enforced and take effect "for the period during which the present abnormal conditions continue, the conclusion of such period to be determined by His Excellency the Governor General in Council."

When the provisions of the War Measures Act and the orders in council that were passed under it ceased to have effect, by reason of the fact that abnormal conditions still continued in the country, a statute was passed extending the provisions of this order in council for another year, then later another statute was passed extending it a further year, and last year a third statute was passed extending the permission for the temporary manufacture and importation of this article to the 31st day of August, 1923, and the offering of same and having possession for sale was permitted up to the 31st day of March, 1924.

Now the matter comes to this House by my hon. friend from Cape Breton South (Mr. Carroll) bringing forward a resolution in which he asks the House to reverse the policy of the Canadian parliament and people which has obtained ever since confederation, and to permit the importation and sale of oleomargarine in this country without restriction except in so far as the regulations of the act provide. We have an amendment moved to that resolution by my hon. friend from Missisquoi (Mr. Kay) which I would interpret as meaning, if adopted by this House, and I hope it will be, that these temporary acts shall be done away with and that we shall revert to the condition of affairs that existed before the orders in council and these statutes were passed, and that oleomargarine shall

only be permitted to be manufactured until August, 1923, and its sale permitted only until the following March.

The question is what ought we to do? It is all very well for my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) to argue about the virtue of consistency, but of what use is it for a man to congratulate himself upon consistency in voting to-day for something that he supported five years ago, when in this changing world with the varying conditions that we have seen in that period what would be in the interest of the country to-day might not have been in its interest five years ago? Consistency is not the only virtue a public man should possess. Again my hon. friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster) undertook to give his lecture ex cathedra to the gentlemen who sit next to him as if he had had some holy principle committed to him alone and the Ark of the Covenant was in his charge. I submit that neither of these gentlemen is taking the proper position. Apart from either of their theories, our attitude on this question should be that which would be of the greatest advantage to and contribute to the advancement of the country as a whole.

Now, what is the situation that confronts us? We have the dairy industry developing in Canada in the manner in which it is, and bringing to those engaged in it the greatest amount of money, derived from any part of the agricultural system of Canada outside of that derived from the sale of wheat. Are we to say that it is not wise in the interests of this country to encourage the development of that industry still further? Because somebody says that oleomargarine is good to eat and somebody else says that it is not, are we to imperil that industry? Are we going to give notice to the people in those parts of Canada where it has not yet been developed that they must not co-operate for the purpose of building up this great industry to a greater degree, or that they are not to teach agriculturists proper methods for the production of butter? For myself I care not what theories may be advanced. I believe it is in the interest of the Canadian people that the dairy industry of this country should be encouraged. May I venture the statement, Mr. Speaker, that there is too much of a tendency on the part of many in this House to indulge in theorizing. Why cannot we look every business proposition that is submitted to this parliament squarely in the face, and say honestly what we think in regard to it and whether it is in the interest of the Canadian people or not. If we are actuated by that idea when we approach the determination of this proposition we need not care what theory may be violated or what maxim may be overlooked so long as what we decide upon is in the interest of our people. It does seem to me that this House would be wise and would be doing that which will be best for the country as a whole if we support the amendment which has been submitted by my hon. friend the member for Missisquoi.

The hon. member who immediately preceded me (Mr. Ladner) read from a circular issued by the Retail Merchants Association this statement:

> The fact that the demand from the consuming public for oleomargarine for the past year has been greater than that of any previous year is the best evidence we can offer you that the people want it.

Now I find from an authoritative official statement that in the year ending December 31, 1920, the quantity of oleomargarine manufactured in Canada was 7,182,936 pounds. In the year ending December 31, 1921, the quantity manufactured was 2,632,250 pounds; and in the year ending December 31, 1922, the quantity manufactured was 1,964,243 pounds, or 5,000,000 pounds less in 1922 than in 1920. This shows that if there was a large portion of the Canadian people consuming oleomargarine they are getting heartily sick of it, and that the product is going out of use.

Mr. LADNER: Do the figures which my hon. friend has given cover importations?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): The story in regard to importations is much the same. The importations in the years referred to were reduced in like proportion.

Mr. LADNER: Will the hon. gentleman give the figures showing importations?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I am unable to put my hand on the figures, but they are, roughly speaking to this effect: In 1920 the imports amounted to 5,000,000 pounds and in 1922 they had been reduced to 1,000,000 pounds. The consequence is that instead of warranting the inference suggested by the circular of the Retail Merchants Association the figures show that the people of this country are giving up the use of oleomargarine. Therefore, it seems to me that if the people do not want to eat oleomargarine we should not try to force it upon them. The fact that the unanimous opinion of parliament for so many years was against the use of this article should influence us in our decision. It was never pretended on the part of the then government that the act authorizing the use of oleomargarine was to be anything but temporary in its operations due entirely to the abnormal conditions created

by the war. It would be well, therefore, to follow the example of those who dealt with this question in the past and revert to the legislation which was enforced for so many years in this country. By doing so I believe we will be doing that which will be for the best interests of Canada and its people.

Mr. R. H. HALBERT: (North Ontario): After all the discussion that has taken place in this House during the last four sessions on oleomargarine I had decided not to say anything on the present occasion, and I would not be taking up the time of the House now had it not been for certain remarks made by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock). However, what I have to say will only occupy a few minutes. The Minister of Labour professed to be speaking for the labour people of Canada, and he said it was not fair that they should not be allowed to buy oleomargarine instead of butter. I wonder if he was thinking of the thousands of labour men who work in the mines and in the lumber camps who do not want to eat oleomargarine but are forced to eat it under present conditions or else lose their job? Oleomargarine was allowed to be manufactured in Canada under the War Measures Act of 1917. Up to 1917 we heard no person complaining about the price of butter. Were there no poor in the country then? Prior to that time there was little or no oleomargarine used but we heard no complaints from the poor such as we have heard to-night made on behalf of labouring men.

My main reason for taking part in this debate is because of the allegation that the prohibition is desired for the purposes of protection. We are told that oleomargarine raises the price of beef cattle because of the use that can be made out of the fat of these animals. If I were to advocate the use of oleomargarine the Minister of Labour, with as much truth, could allege that I was asking for protection for the farmers who raise beef cattle in this country. It would be just as appropriate for him to argue that by supporting oleomargarine I was advocating protection for the beef cattle industry as it is for him to say that by urging its prohibition I am recommending protection for the butter industry. It must be remembered that the legislation on this subject was passed during war time. The dairy industry of Canada made no protest against that legislation; they were willing to do anything that would help to win the war. The war has long been over, and all war time measures have gone out of existence with the exception of this. The oleomargarine law has been extended year after year down to the present time.

It has been stated that oleomargarine is a good food. That is for adults. We do not hear it said that oleomargarine is good for infants. I would advise the manufacturers, therefore, not to eat any oleomargarine because their industries are still in the infant stage—so they claim at any rate—and it would not be good for them. If we were advocating more protection for butter the protection argument might be brought in, but it is certainly far-fetched to say that any person who votes for the amendment is advocating protection for the dairy industry. When the manufacture of oleo was not permitted the labouring men of Canada were getting not more than half the amount they are receiving to-day. Still we had no complaints. I think, Mr. Speaker, that under present conditions we should revert to the legislation which prevailed before the war. I am not saying whether I am in favour of the manufacture of oleomargarine or not. Let the

11 p.m.

subject be fought out on its merits and give the dairy industry its just dues because the general belief is that the legislation on this question was only a temporary measure. I think, therefore, we should revert to the former status and give the manufacturers of oleomargarine on the one hand and the dairy industry on the other a chance to fight out the question on an even footing, because we know that this was the thin end of the wedge that was introduced, and now the manufacturers of oleomargarine want to drive it home. Possession, we are told, is nine points of the law, although I do not know whether all the members who are lawyers will agree with that. These people have been permitted to come inside and now they refuse to go out. Let us put both the manufacturers of oleomargarine and the dairy interests on the same footing. I intend to vote for the amendment.

Mr. L. H. MARTELL (Hants): Mr. Speaker, I shall be extremely brief. I am rising only for one purpose. I did not intend to say anything at all on this matter and I know how I am going to vote. I rise particularly to say that I object to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock) or any other hon. member saying that he represents labour. There is not a member on the Liberal, Progressive, or Conservative side who does not represent all classes of citizens in his community and in the constituency which he represents in the Canadian parliament. Personally, I have organized unions in my constituency, and I happen to

be solicitor for those unions. I am not here as a Labour representative; I am not here as a Progressive; I am not here as a Conservative; I am here as a Liberal, and I believe that I represent labour just as truly as hon. members who sit in yonder corner and the Minister of Labour do. One of my chief objects in rising is to protest against certain men setting themselves up in this House as the supreme arbiters in all matters pertaining to the labour interests, so-called, in this country. We are all labourers when we get down to the final standpoint. Some may be lawyers, others doctors, merchants, men who have to take the pick and shovel; in fact, we are all labourers in our particular vocations in life. Personally, I have stood in court when I have defended members of labour unions without money and without price. I do not apologize for that; I am proud of the fact, and I am glad to say that these men, not foreign agitators, but natives of my constituency, are my friends and will vote for me when election day comes around. Therefore, I protest against the Minister of Labour and other members in this House arrogating to themselves the right to be called representatives of labour in this parliament.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: When some of us were elected distinctly on a Labour ticket, how other can we possibly denominate ourselves than Labour?

Mr. MARTELL: My hon. friend may have run on a Labour ticket; but what I regard as Labour is men who are willing to take their place in life amongst all the rest of the people without asking any particular favour, not men who run on a socialistic ticket and who advocate communism.

All I have to say in regard to the subject under discussion to-day is this. Most hon. members know that I am regarded as a radical. I do not apologize for that, but I do believe good radicalism is good Liberalism. My Liberalism is hereditary Liberalism fostered by the fact that my small education has convinced me that Liberalism is right. I am, however, ready to accord to people who cannot agree with me the right to have their particular views. I have particular views of my own; other people have particular views of theirs, but on the subject which is before us to-day, namely the matter of oleomargarine, some of us have been told that we are advocating protection. If protection is going to be the system in this country, then all industries should be protected. I am not saying that protection is the system of this country. What I say is that this is not protection in the way of tariff legislation; it is simply preventing people from being able to put up against the dairy industry of this country a combination of fats, Heaven knows whence they come. I am prepared to say to the people of my constituency: If you want oleomargarine, you can have it, that is if my hon. friends opposite or some other people like the Minister of Labour want to give to the people of this country things that he will not eat himself. I am sure the Minister of Labour, if he had placed before him oleomargarine and good creamery butter such as is manufactured at Selma in the county of Hants, would not eat the oleomargarine. I am not prepared to stand in this House of Commons and give my vote for a conglomeration of Heaven knows what against the good creamery butter of Hants. Therefore, I am going to oppose the question of the admission of oleomargarine into this country.

I come from a seafaring race. When I was a boy at school, my great ambition was, when the summer vacation arrived, to go on a trip with my father on his old boat. After my parents had passed beyond the vale, I went to sea for a couple of years, and all the oleomargarine I saw was used as slush to slush down the masts of the schooner. Are we going to place before the people of the Dominion of Canada slush to eat rather than the good creamery butter manufactured at Selma and other places in Nova Scotia?

I am opposed to oleomargarine primarily because it should not be permitted to come into competition with a natural industry. Oleomargarine is an artificial product; butter is a purely natural product, and if we are going to protect the people of this country, we do not want to protect the decrepit, the aged and those who have passed beyond the three score years and ten. We want to protect the children of the country. As the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Church) has said, nobody has ever said that oleomargarine is a good food for children, and the children are going to be the people who will govern this country in the future. As I have said already, artificial products should not be permitted to come into competition with natural products. Let us protect the children who will be the people of to-morrow, and not those who should be buried if they are not already buried.

Mr. WILLIAM IRVINE (Calgary East): Mr. Speaker, I am very gratified for two things, one the shortness of the speeches on this issue, and the other that some hon. members seem to be becoming rather proud to associate themselves with Labour. I do not know whether that is because there is

an anticipated election, but I am gratified at any rate that they wish to deny to other people the right to represent Labour and say that they are doing that. The hon. member (Mr. Martell), while he was very willing to assume his share of the representation of Labour, very definitely dissociated himself from Labour ideals as expressed by organized Labour.

Mr. MARTELL: Does my hon. friend represent Labour, and does he want to set himself up in this House as a supreme arbiter as to who or who should not represent Labour.

Mr. IRVINE I will allow Labour to say who are to be its representatives, and I do not think that Labour has placed its hand upon the head of the hon. member who has asked the question. I should not have been taking part in this debate but for the fact—

Mr. MARTELL: Will the hon. member permit me—

Mr. IRVINE: —that the Minister of Labour took occasion to refer to the "conspicuous absence" of the Labour members.

Mr. MARTELL: I represent Labour; you represent socialism.

Mr. IRVINE: The Minister of Labour, I am given to understand, stated that the Labour members were not in their seats, and when some hon. member pointed out that they were in the Banking committee, he passed the remark that the feeding committee was of much greater importance than the Banking committee. I am not quite clear as to the inference that the hon. gentleman would wish us to draw from that remark; but if this is a feeding committee and the Minister of Labour is a member of it, then I have no fear for the committee. I have no doubt he can handle the situation, from the point of view of either Labour or anybody else, quite well as a feeder. If, however, he meant to imply that this comparatively paltry question of margarine is comparable with the great question of finance, then I will leave the famous utterance of the hon. gentleman to the laughter of history.

Mr. MARTELL: Will the hon. member permit me a question?

Mr. IRVINE: I have no objection.

Mr. MARTELL: Does he not think that his reference to the Minister of Labour is akin to the Biblical injunction which he enunciates on Sunday, "Feed my lambs"?

[Mr. Irvine.]

Mr. IRVINE: I must ask the hon. gentleman to repeat his question, because I did not perceive the humour of it, and there certainly was nothing of any serious consequence about it.

Mr. MARTELL: You do not know anything about Scripture.

Mr. IRVINE: The hon. gentleman has been quoting Scripture, I see; I did not know he was quite as modern as that. I have no doubt, however, that he can possibly outquote me, for that matter; I do not often indulge in Biblical quotations myself. Nor do I care what text the hon. gentleman cares to apply to my attitude in this argument. But to return to the point at issue. If the Minister of Labour wished to imply that oleomargarine is of more importance than the question of finance, then I shall simply leave his judgment to the people of Canada. If as an economist, if as a graduate from the ranks of labour organizations, if as a Minister of Labour in a government that came into power as the great Moses that would lead us into the land flowing with milk and honey, the best that the hon. gentleman can give us is oleomargarine, and then tell us that finance does not count, I must be content to leave him to the consequences of his own declaration.

The minister claims to be a representative of Labour, I gather from the remarks of the hon. gentleman who has been putting questions to me. I do not object to his claim; he can make all the claims he desires in that direction. That, however, will not get him very far. I am glad, just at this stage, to note that the minister has come into the House, the hon. gentleman who a moment ago was conspicuous by his absence. The seat which was vacant just now is at this moment filled with the august presence—is that proper, Mr. Speaker?—of the minister himself. Let me inform the minister that I, as a representative of Labour, am more interested in giving to the people real good fresh butter instead of margarine; and if the best that the minister can offer them is this substitute, I am not sure that he will get a very great following from the ranks of labour. I assure him that if he does not change his attitude considerably he will have to grease Labour with something better than oleomargarine.

Mr. PUTNAM: What would you suggest?

Mr. IRVINE: I simply desired to explain how it happened that the Labour members were absent from the House when the minis-

ter referred to the fact. This question in itself has nothing more than a passing interest for me. It is not a fundamental question. I do not think it will make a very great deal of difference to Labour whether the minister offers them oleomargarine or not. I have discovered that on all big questions in which Labour interests are really involved the Minister of Labour has not been quite so outspoken as he has been on this comparatively paltry subject. When it comes to a question of protecting the miners of Nova Scotia he sends them guns rather than butter.

Mr. MARTELL: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. IRVINE: When it comes to a question of economic importance—

Mr. MARTELL: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. IRVINE:—such as—

Mr. MURDOCK: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

Mr. MARTELL: I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman has referred to something that occurred in Nova Scotia, with which he associates the Minister of Labour. I submit that this has nothing to do with oleomargarine, which is the question before the Chair.

Mr. MURDOCK: I rise to a point of order. The hon. member for Calgary East (Mr. Irvine) is, unintentionally, of course, misrepresenting the facts, because he cannot instance any situation wherein the Minister of Labour had anything to do with any matter involving a strike in Nova Scotia where soldiers were sent down. I therefore respectfully submit that it is entirely improper for the hon. gentleman to be making representations for the delectation of those who he thinks will agree with him in what he says.

Mr. IRVINE: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I have observed many interruptions in the course of this debate, which after all should be very peaceful.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: It is a slippery matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would request hon. members to be good enough to allow the debate to proceed in that peacefulness and tranquillity which we should have every reason to expect. I would also ask the hon. member (Mr. Irvine) who is addressing the House to confine himself more closely to the question at issue. The question has been well put before the House by the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Carroll) who moved the resolution and by the hon. member who has submitted the amendment (Mr. Kay), and any excursion into a county where any strike may have occurred has nothing to do with it. Any remarks of the kind are irrelevant. I trust that the hon. member will confine himself to the subject matter under consideration.

Mr. IRVINE: I shall endeavour to do so, Mr. Speaker, but I think you will agree with me that, the Minister of Labour having taken occasion to refer to the absence of the Labour members earlier in the evening, I should not be hindered from explaining the reason for their absence.

Mr. BUREAU: The reason has already been given.

Mr. IRVINE: If the Minister of Labour was out of order, then, of course, I am out of order also. But if he was in order, I should think that I ought to be in order in explaining the point he raised. However, I must abide by the ruling of the Chair. I simply wanted to explain that the Labour members were absent because they had been in the Banking committee for six hours. If the government of which the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock) is a member was not in such a hurry to put this Bank Act through we could have been here instead of in the Banking committee.

But to come down to the subject of oleo, from which I was led astray by the logic of hon. gentlemen opposite. In the first place, I am not opposed to freedom of trade of any description, nor am I opposed to the manufacture of anything that any person wishes to manufacture. At heart I am a free trader. I do not care what sort of stuff you manufacture or sell so long as the people want to buy it. Therefore in regard to the principle of this question I am going to vote for oleomargarine. But I add this rider: I want to see oleomargarine so marked that these labour men—whom we are all so anxious about to-night—will not be paying for grease under the impression that they are getting butter. Therefore if those who are interested in getting an oleomargarine bill passed will kindly arrange the legislation so that when a labour man sits down in a restaurant and pays for butter he will not be served with margarine, I am prepared to vote for the bill.

That is all I have to say on this most profound economic question, Mr. Speaker. I think we might have settled it much more speedily. There is nothing involved in this

simple principle that I can see, and I repeat that while for myself I want to have the privilege of eating butter, I am very much concerned to see such economic conditions prevail in Canada that our labour men will all be able to eat butter, I should like to see the margarine plants starved out simply because they could not sell the grease they are handing out instead of butter, and I appeal to the hon. Minister of Labour to help the Labour members bring about such improved economic conditions. Then he will be in a position to claim that he is a Labour man, which he cannot claim to be at the present time.

Mr. J. L. STANSELL (East Elgin): Mr. Speaker, in the interests of the dairymen of Canada I think something should be said to place them in the light in which they wish to appear before the public on this question. There is a great deal of misconception as to the attitude of the dairy interests, and I think as president of one of our dairy breed associations I have a fair idea of what they really desire in this connection. I do not think our dairymen are anxious to say to the consumers what they shall or shall not eat. All they are desirous of getting is a fair deal in a matter that vitally concerns their industry.

I believe I can point out what is the real cause of complaint. I think it will be generally agreed that there has been no complaint on the part of the dairy interests over the manufacture of apple butter, peanut butter, maple butter or similar preparations because they each have their own peculiar flavour and are sold entirely on their merits. What dairymen complain of is the unfair competition from oleomargarine, which is made to taste and smell and look like butter—the article which it is aimed to supplant. The dairymen also feel that another element of unfairness in this competition is the respective restrictions applied to the manufacture of these two articles. The law requires that butter must contain pure butter fat to the extent of at least 80 per cent, with not more than 16 per cent of moisture and a small percentage of salt and other natural milk solids. Those proportions may not be varied, and if departed from the butter-maker is liable to prosecution. But on the other hand the manufacturer of oleomargarine may manufacture his commodity from any material he wishes and the only restriction is that it must be approved by a government inspector as being clean and sanitary. The public are not given the formula by which the oleomargarine is made. A large proportion of the ingredients originate outside Canada and are imported practically free of duty, there being a drawback of 99 per cent. The butter-maker is shut out of the country to the south by a duty of 8 cents a pound. Therefore he has to compete in his home market with an article which is imported free of duty.

I was interested in the remarks of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock). He says he represents a farming constituency, and he added that he did not make known his views before his election, as he was adopted without any questions being asked. I could not help thinking that his was a case of being left on the doorstep for adoption when questions are not usually in good taste.

Something has been said in the course of this debate about settling this question once for all. I submit that this cannot be done, for there is nothing to prevent a resolution or a bill being introduced next session to provide for, or to prohibit, the manufacture and importation of oleomargarine.

This question may be considered from two points of view. We have heard a good deal about the relative values of butter and margarine from the health standpoint. I have noticed particularly that those who claim oleomargarine to be a wholesome product adduce nothing in support of their statement. I have yet to learn of any investigations either in this country or outside that have not shown conclusively that oleomargarine bears no comparison to butter as a life-giving food. I was interested in the eloquent speech of the hon. member for Victoria City (Mr. Tolmie), in the course of which he quoted an authority to the effect that there were certain vitamines present in milk or butter which were not to be found in the product of the slaughter-house. I think his statement ran something like this: He did not understand that nature would be so partial as to distribute these vitamines freely to the dairy cow and have them entirely wasted in the steer. Well, I need only remind the hon. member that the steer is not entirely a product of nature.

From the standpoint of health we have had many investigations and experiments made, all of which go to show that in food value oleomargarine is so far inferior to butter that it can scarcely be compared with it at all. As something has been said about this question being viewed from the women's standpoint, let me quote from the remarks of one who is regarded as an authority on the subject; I refer to Dr. Margaret Patterson. Summing up this question she states:—

> Which do we want in Canada—health for the many or wealth for the few? When one sees the question in writing it looks too foolish to be regarded seriously; yet as a people we act as if we were more interested in

producing a few foreign millionaires than in giving our Canadian children a chance to grow into strong, healthy citizens. We have long since accepted the truism "that every child has the right to be as healthy as knowledge can make it." The knowledge gained in the research laboratories has shown us that milk (whole milk) is an absolute necessity for proper development, both physical and mental, of the child, yet we allow the importation and sale of substitutes for dairy products.

Reference has also been made to the manufacture and consumption of oleomargarine in Denmark. Attention has been called to the fact, too, that when its use was very general in war time, considerable difficulty was experienced through illness of children and it was found that the only way to effect a cure was to have a resumption of the diet of butter fat. I would like to mention one more experiment that was not referred to either last session or this in the progress of the discussion on this subject—one that comes closer home. It is from the same authority that I formerly quoted, and it says:

An indisputable demonstration of the necessity of butter to the growing child was given us quite near home. It was during the war, when both as a matter of patriotism and economy, oleomargarine often replaced butter. In an orphanage for boys the board ladies decided to reduce expenses, and also save butter to be sent overseas, by serving the boys in the orphanage oleomargarine. Shortly after the butter was stopped there was a great deal of illness. The children seemed to have no resistance and contracted every disease with which they came in contact. The teachers began to complain that the children were not making progress in their work as they had previously done and were restless and inattentive. The nurse also noted that the increase in weight had either stopped or very markedly decreased. The doctor made careful inquiry and when he learned of the butter substitute he at once thought that this was the cause. But he could not make the board ladies believe this, for they had heard a lecture on the food value of oleomargarine. They had even heard a doctor say that it contained more calories to the ounce than butter, therefore the theories of the orphanage doctor were all wrong. Fortunately, the doctor had been keeping abreast with the findings of the research workers. He asked the ladies to allow him to provide butter at his own expense for the boys in one of the cottages. This he was allowed to do, and in the course of a few weeks the difference was so marked that even the board ladies were convinced and the supporters of oleomargarine will find no market for their product in that school.

But you say: Does not the importation of oleo keep the price of butter from soaring away beyond the reach of the labouring people? I believe it has the opposite effect. It tends to spoil the market for our home dairy product. It is not fair to ask our farmers—

Mark you, this is from a woman not engaged in farming.

It is not fair to ask our farmers with dairy cows to compete with the product of the American slaughterhouses, nor can we expect our Canadian farmers to keep up an expensive dairy herd unless they are assured of a home market for their produce. When we educate our people to the value yea, the absolute necessity of plenty of milk and butter in the daily diet, we will have a constant demand for the products of the dairy farm. This will ensure an abundant supply. The question of demand and supply always regulates the price. When the farmer is sure of a market for all he can produce he will produce more and at a reduced cost. The price of butter will be lowered to the consumer. Butter is cheap food at any price, for it contains that which is essential to health, and which money cannot buy as a separate product.

This is the opinion not of the dairy interests but of a noted lady physician in the city of Toronto who has the welfare of growing children and the rising generation at heart. What she points out is the result of investigation.

A great deal has been made of the argument that we should not say what a man should eat or drink. But we must confess that we are saying it by legislation all the time. There are many countries in which articles of food that we ban are in common use. We believe that horse meat is not fit for food, but there are some countries in which this form of meat is very largely consumed by the people. I presume it might at least be considered fit to eat if the horse had been in good condition and free from disease, but we in Canada do not recognize it as wholesome food for the people; therefore we say that this form of meat must not be offered for sale. Now, we could argue on behalf of the man who came from a foreign country and who wished to partake of his favourite article of diet, as our friends argue on behalf of oleo, that parliament has no right to forbid that man from having the food to which he has been accustomed and which, in his case, has proved to be wholesome. So that considered from the standpoint of health we have a perfect right at least to give the benefit of the doubt to the consumer, especially to the children, in an effort to protect them as far as possible by giving them the most wholesome product we have at our disposal. If there is to be any doubt, let us err on the side of safety.

A great deal has been said about the poor man in this connection. I have personally asked a good many questions on this point, and I have yet to hear of anyone who was pleading for the poor man and his family who would admit that he used oleo for himself. It is always a case of someone giving advice for the benefit of the other fellow. It is very much like the argument of those who say, "Go back to the land;" they always want the other fellow to go back. In my own experience we have not had any complaints from labouring men or poor people; we have not had any requests from them for the continuance of the manufacture and importation of oleomargarine. We have had complaints from the lumber interests and from the Retail Merchants' Association. It has been claimed that the manufacture of oleomar-

garine is on such a small scale that it does not affect the dairy interests. But I believe that once the oleomargarine interests were assured that they would not be disturbed they would quickly take steps to put the business on a very dangerous competitive basis. In a local town, where dairying is the chief industry, oleomargarine has practically for the first time made its appearance in the local stores. It was featured very strongly in window displays and I asked the proprietors why this was done. Invariably the answer was that they would make a larger profit for themselves in handling oleomargarine; therefore they were pushing the sale of it. In other words, the profits allowed them were greater than they could obtain in the sale of butter.

I am not going to express an opinion as to what should be done as the result of promises. But I believe I can say this, representing the dairy interests, that it was generally understood by the dairymen that if they submitted to this as a war measure it would be regarded as a temporary measure only. Rightly or wrongly they have come to that conclusion and they have been waiting with a good deal of patience for the time when abnormal conditions would be considered as safely past and they would again have possession of the home market that they are so well fitted to supply. The statement has been made that if it was in the nature of a promise the present government could not be expected to carry out promises made by the former one. I have nothing to say regarding that, except that the present government might well take a little warning from the experience of the former one. Whether a promise was made or not, let us consider it from this point of view: It has been amply brought to our attention in this House that the present condition of farming is anything but rosy, and especially is that true of dairy farming. We have a large staff in our agricultural colleges, and we have heard a good deal in various parts of the country, as well as in this House, urging people to take up dairy farming, because it returns more fertility to the soil, enables the employment of more labour and is generally the most satisfactory method of farming. With all of that I can quite agree.

There is no use encouraging an industry unless you can provide a market for its output. We must admit that the condition of European countries is not now such as to enable them to buy the amount of exports we would like to send them, and the home market has been invaded by many of these countries. We are therefore faced with the problem of finding a market for what we produce at present, rather than of how to encourage greater production. Even if oleomargarine only displaces butter to the extent of four or five million pounds a year that is a market well worth catering to, and the money invested and the thousands of men and women engaged in the dairy industry should be sufficient I think for this House to have some concern for its welfare. It it comes to a choice between encouraging an industry based on importations from tropical or foreign countries and encouraging an industry at home, surely there can be only one answer from this House.

If we consider this question from the health standpoint, if we are to believe the results of investigations so far, there is no question as to the advisability of feeding our Canadian boys and girls butter in preference to oleomargarine. I will go further and make this statement, that if the food values of the two are carefully analyzed it will be found that at present prices, although oleomargarine can be bought cheaper, a dollar's worth of butter contains very much more food value than a dollar's worth of oleomargarine. Because the competition of oleomargarine is unfair, for it trades on the reputation of butter, because I believe it is in the interests of this country to encourage our people in the use of the best product and because the condition of the dairy industry is such that it needs every encouragement we can possibly give it, I have only one choice and that is to oppose, as at present regulated, the manufacture and importation of oleomargarine in every legitimate way.

Mr. LUCIEN CANNON (Dorchester): As a representative of a rural constituency wherein the dairy industry is of great importance I wish to give a few explanations before I cast my vote. On the other hand I also wish to give the assurance to the House that my remarks will be very brief. This debate has been long, and I could add very little to what has been said.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw your attention to the fact that most of the speakers who have addressed the House have treated this question as being one where high principles are at stake. I do not think that any high principle is at stake in this matter. The question is very simple, and should be treated in a very simple way: Should butter be preferred to oleomargarine? In my opinion good fresh butter should be given the preference.

We are told that we cannot vote in favour of the amendment introduced by the hon. member for Missisquoi (Mr. Kay) without being considered high protectionists. That argument was made by the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock). But how can that argument be seriously put forward? How can it be high protectionist to support an amendment that my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) is opposing? Is there a man in this House who can be considered more of a protectionist than the right hon. gentleman who leads the opposition? He has fought for protection since his entry into this House. He has fought for protection on the floor of parliament whenever the occasion has arisen, and to-day therefore can I be considered a protectionist if I vote the other way from him?

Another argument which has been brought forward is that by voting for this amendment we interfere with the freedom and liberty of the citizens of this country. Can this argument be seriously considered, Mr. Speaker, when it is brought forward by the hon. gentleman, for instance, who represents Swift Current (Mr. Lewis), who is a strong prohibitionist? Is it interfering more with the liberty of the citizen to prevent him from eating oleomargarine, which may be most unhealthy, than it is to prevent him from drinking beer or wine if he wishes? I say that these arguments have nothing to do with the question. It is not a matter of protection; the attitude of the leader of the Opposition proves it. It is not a matter of the liberty of the citzens of this country; the attitude of the hon. member for Swift Current proves it.

It has been said that the dairy industry is of great importance. I do not wish to add to the arguments which have been brought forward in support of this industry. It is an important industry, and it should grow every year in Canada. I am quite sure that every member of this House will give to that industry the encouragement that it deserves. An argument was brought forward by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) this afternoon that struck me particularly. The amendment mentions that we should revert to the condition of things as it existed before the order in council was passed under the War Measures Act. The hon. Minister of Finance said that parliament was in no way bound by acts or orders in council passed by former governments or by former parliaments. With all due modesty, with all due respect for the hon. gentleman's opinion on account of his vast parliamentary experience, I say that if there is one thing which is important in Canada it is political consistency. Can one government undo what former governments have done? Can one parliament undo what former parliaments have done? Constitutionally, yes, but as a matter of political expediency, if that course were followed, where would be stability?

Mr. FIELDING: I admit at once that where there is a contract made the government is obligated and must carry it out. That is quite a different thing from an order in council.

Mr. CANNON: If an order in council was passed permitting the importation, manufacture and sale of oleomargarine, and it was worded in such a way that it told the dairy industry of Canada that the agreement was an agreement with these people for only a short period and that it would not last any longer—

Mr. MEIGHEN: What agreement does the hon. gentleman refer to?

Mr. CANNON: I say that it is an implied agreement. When an order in council is passed saying that such-and-such a thing will prevail for only a limited time, I say there is an implied agreement that that period will not be exceeded. That is the ordinary interpretation to give to plain everyday English.

Mr. MEIGHEN: With whom?

Mr. MURDOCK: Will the hon. gentleman repeat that part?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. CANNON: I think the leader of the Opposition had the floor.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I was asking the hon. member with whom was the agreement?

Mr. CANNON: The agreement was with no person in particular; it was with the people of Canada in general and especially with the dairy industry.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the agreement was with the people of Canada one would think the people through their representatives might release the other party to the agreement.

Mr. CANNON: There is no doubt about that. I say that according to our constitution this parliament can undo what a former parliament has done, but should we adopt this attitude of undoing what former parliaments and former governments have done where will be stability in Canada?

Mr. FIELDING: Then we can repeal no legislation?

Mr. CANNON: Certainly we can repeal legislation. I shall give an example to the House. For instance, when the Irish treaty was passed by the Lloyd George government and there was very strong opposition in parliament to it. The people who opposed the Irish treaty were the people who put Lloyd George out of power, nevertheless they respected the treaty that statesman had entered into with the Irish people. That is the way the English constitution is to be interpreted. On the one hand we have the Minister of Finance telling the manufacturing interests of Canada we are going to have a stable tariff. But how can we have anything stable in Canada if on the other hand the same gentleman says in the House that we need not be consistent.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion let me say that before the French Revolution there was a class of philosophers who wanted to replace God by nature. Since then we have had the Americans in industry, who wanted to replace nature by chemistry. In Canada we want to stick to nature and the longer we do so the longer we protect the farming industry, the longer we protect the dairy industry and the longer we can hope that Canada will be a happy country.

Mr. GEORGE BOUCHARD (Kamouraska): Mr. Speaker I would feel more at ease dealing with this question of oleomargarine in my mother tongue, but I believe there are no more converts to be made among the French speaking members of this House. Consequently, I crave your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, and that of the House whilst I add my remarks to this debate. The fact that this matter of oleomargarine covered more than seventy pages of Hansard last year, and will cover about the same number of pages this year, renders it hard for a new member to be original on this question. I am glad, however, to raise my voice in this debate and to summarize the reasons which induce me to oppose the motion of the hon. member for Cape Breton South and Richmond (Mr. Carroll) and to vote in favour of the amendment.

In studying the history of oleomargarine, Mr. Speaker, we find that it was introduced shortly before the Franco-Prussian war, and that in 1870 Mege Mouries was awarded a prize for his invention by Napoleon III. From this it will readily be seen that the introduction of this article of diet was essentially a war measure, and was naturally looked upon with favour at a time when rats were at a premium for eating purposes. At first oleomargarine was made entirely from animal fat, principally fresh beef. Gradually the proportion of animal fat was decreased and replaced by vegetable fats such as cocoanut oil, cohune oil, cotton seed oil, kapok oil, and sometimes by fish oil.

An hon. MEMBER: Coal oil. Whale oil.

Mr. BOUCHARD: That is why we have to be selfish and protect ourselves against the oleomargarine. These oils are transformed into hard fats by a process known as hardening, or hydrogenating. This is accomplished by treating liquid oil with hydrogen in the presence of a catalytic agent, such as nickel, or its oxides, or salts, or other agents. It is generally agreed that a small quantity of the catalytic agent often remains in the finished product. Practically all oleomargarine is emulsified in skim milk or in cream, in order to give it the flavour of butter. In considering any article of diet, its nutritive value is a most important factor. Any food to be efficient must not only provide heat and energy but must also promote growth. Recent researches in nutrition have demonstrated that certain elements known as vitamines are essential to promote growth. These same researches show that while butter contains a very high percentage of these essential vitamines, oleomargarine is almost entirely, if not wholly, deficient in them. From this we may logically deduce that compared with butter, so far as its nutritive value is concerned, oleomargarine is an inferior article of diet. In this connection, I may well quote the following from Dr. McCollum's book entitled "The Newer Nutrition," which is recognized as an authoritative treatise on this subject.

> The vegetable fats and oils such as olive oil, cottonseed oil, peanut and cocoanut oils, although good energy yielding foods, do not furnish this dietary essential. The body fats of animals such as lard, beef fat, etc., are not important sources of the fat-soluble A.

Practically all of McCollum's findings have been endorsed by the Lister Institution of Great Britain and the British Medical Research Committee. I would not like to tire the House with the quotation from Dr. McGill's statement as the hon. mem-
12 m. ber for Strathcona (Mr. Warner) has already given it. This all tends to prove, however, that in the last analysis, nature has endowed the cow with the best process for producing good edible fat.

The supporters of this resolution have given the impression that the importation and manufacture of oleomargarine is a benefit to the poorer classes. This argument is poorer than the poor to whom it refers. No one in this House I am sure has more sympathy

for the poor than I have, being one of a large family brought up on a small farm where the conditions were very hard and where many sacrifices were necessary to secure my education. I know by experience the meaning of privation. If cheap food is required for poor people, as undoubtedly it is in many cases, why should we not induce them to eat raw materials similar to those from which the oleomargraine is derived such as good refined lard or good oils, both of which are just as nourishing and almost twice as cheap as oleomargarine. "Poor people" they say, and yet by legislation they would invite them to pay a tribute of 10 cents to 20 cents a pound tc manufacturers and distributors of oleomargarine. "Poor people"—this sounds well at first, but would it not be better if the poor people, instead of getting two pounds of oleomargarine, bought one pound of lard and one pound of genuine butter for about the same amount of money?

"Poor people!" and we are to make them and the country poorer by legalizing the sale of a food so evidently deficient in vitamines. If any class of people requires good butter, full of vitamines, it is surely the poorer class who have not the means to indulge in fresh green vegetables all the year round, and whose staple article of diet in the winter time is potatoes which, as hon. members know, are very deficient in vitamines and many other things.

The statement has been made that the competition of oleomargarine with butter would tend to keep down the price of butter. When we consider, however, that our Canadian butter has to compete on the world's market, the weakness of this argument will at once be realized. As a matter of fact, if the Canadian supply of butter was insufficient to meet the needs of the home market—a condition of affairs which would naturally tend to raise the price—New Zealand or some other butter producing country would soon send its products to Canada and this would reduce the price at once.

Let us now glance at the history of legislation concerning oleomargarine in Canada since 1886, when this question was first discussed. From that date until 1917, oleomargarine was absolutely excluded from the Canadian market. In 1903, the Hon. Sydney Fisher, Minister of Agriculture in Sir Wilfrid Laurier's cabinet, reiterated the viewpoint of the government on this subject.

Following this, in 1914, the Hon. Martin Burrell, Minister of Agriculture when the Conservative party was in power, took exactly the same stand, and in the debate which was aroused he made the following statement:

> I am not saying that oleomargarine is not a wholesome product to eat but if you allowed the sale of a substitute looking exactly like butter although not made of the same ingredients you would have a tremendously large staff of inspectors to prevent men from selling it as butter. They have had a great difficulty in the United States over that, and I believe the general opinion of this country would be against it.

Of course at that time there was not much question of the vitamines. In 1917, however, an order in council was passed, and as this order in council has been fully quoted, I would call the attention of the House just to the following words:

> Such regulations to be in force and to have effect for the period during which the present abnormal conditions continue. . . . and as a war measure only.

That is, we see that oleomargarine was invented as the result of a war, and was also introduced into Canada under similar circumstances. Thus doth history repeat itself.

When the division comes on this resolution, the responsibility for saying whether the promise made to the farmers of Canada in 1917 was only another scrap of paper or not, rests with the hon. members of this House. My Progressive friends will readily agree with the statement that agriculture is the backbone of the economic structure of this country, and that dairying is one of the most important parts of the agricultural industry. It is recognized that this industry must be developed upon a much larger scale, and this has already been pointed out by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) and other hon. members. How can we expect, however, that prospective investors will put money into an industry over which there hangs such a sword of Damocles as is represented by the unfair competition of an inferior substitute for butter?

It may be said that this is only another form of protection; but my Progressive friends have already admitted, in principle, that growing industries need protection, and when we consider the highly specialized state of the dairy industry in New Zealand, Denmark, Holland, we cannot do otherwise than admit that here in Canada, this industry is still in its infancy. Admitting this principle, let us begin by protecting our basic industry, an industry which should appeal to you as it does to me, as l'industrie par excellence. Let me quote a statement which I read recently:

> The decline in dairying, an industry which more than any other farming industry maintains best our soil fertility, would have an unfavourable effect upon farm practice in all sections where dairying is now practised and extending.

If this resolution is carried, and a law permitting the importation and manufacturing of oleomargarine is placed upon the statute books,

the door will be opened for numberless frauds. In this connection let me quote from the Journal of Agriculture, Quebec, under date of July, 1917:

> The question of controlling the manufacture and sale of margarine involves so much, a small army of inspectors would be required. Even then frauds will be numerous. In England, where, I think, they usually observe laws perhaps better than we do, there are two cases of prosecutions weekly for offences against the Margarine Act.

I would not have hon. members infer from this that every manufacturer and importer of oleomargarine would sell his product for other than what it is; but it must be remembered that much of the margarine wihch is sold goes to boarding houses, lumber camps, and so forth, where workmen are boarded and where they are supposed to be given butter.

In conclusion, and before resuming my seat, let me emphasize again the following points: First, that oleomargarine is a very inferior substitute for butter, and while possibly deceiving the eye, the palate, and even the stomach, will never deceive the physical nature, and especially that of our children who will be unable to find in it the vital elements of real food; secondly, that its importation and manufacture have been prohibited by all previous governments; and that it is a real menace to the development of the dairying industry.

Mr. A. W. NEILL (Comox-Alberni): I will not detain the House, Mr. Speaker; I promise to introduce no arguments that have been advanced by any other member, which at this stage of the game will be a somewhat difficult undertaking. I wish for a moment to deal with the position of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock). He told us that he represented a dairy constituency; that his views—shall I say his sinister views?—on the oleomargarine question had not been put before the electors prior to his election; that he had not put them before those people since, but that he intended to carry out those views, as he believed in them, without any regard to his constituents. Now, I think I can best leave the electors of the county of Kent to deal with that situation.

I have seen in another House a member coming from an election where he did not have to fight for his seat and proclaiming in that House his indifference, his aloofness, his absolute independence of the men that presumably had sent him there. I have seen more than one man do that, but I have never seen the same man do it more than once. I think it is Solomon who describes this situation somewhat aptly. He says:

> There is a way which seemeth right unto a man, but the end thereof is death.

I am sorry that the minister devoted so much time to a consideration of this agricultural question, with which he is evidently only imperfectly acquainted. I do not, of course, blame him for that ignorance because the matter does not come within the scope of his ministry. It is regrettable, however, nevertheless, that he spent so much time on the subject, because there is a field that opens directly in his own department which presents a much larger scope of undeveloped territory demanding instant attention. There was a pledge, we are told, in connection with oleomargarine; there was also a pledge in connection with labour. In the Treaty of Versailles, and confirmed by labour conventions later on, there was a very definite pledge given to labour, by virtue of and in reward for their services during the war, that a certain definite schedule of labour reforms would be aimed at, and carried out at the earliest possible moment. Canada was one of the signing parties to the agreement, and that was five years ago. So far as I know, not a single iota, jot or tittle or these reforms have been carried out in this country. So that this is a matter that presents great scope for a man of the energy of the Minister of Labour, without his delving into these remote subjects of more strictly agricultural concern.

Now, there is no need for me to go into the merits of the case, and I do not propose to do so, especially seeing that I spoke at great length on the subject last year, and in view of the fact that the amendment of the hon. member for Missisquoi (Mr. Kay) has limited the discussion entirely to the question of a pledge given and the desire to fulfil that pledge now. I can only say, in order to save time, that I entirely and heartily endorse the stand taken, first by the leader of the Progressive party (Mr. Forke), and secondly, by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King). It would be painting the lily and adorning the rose for me to try to add anything to the able way in which those hon. gentlemen have dealt with the subject. There is no question that the pledge was given. The conditions have passed away and now the time has come —in fact, it has long since passed—when that pledge should be fulfilled.

The right hon. the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) stressed to some extent the point that the order in council was of a temporary character, and he indicated that the government of that day only had power to pass, under the War Measures Act, legislation

for a temporary purpose. That, no doubt, is true. But the order in council went further than that, for it not only took certain action but it specifically stated that there would be a time when the suspension of the prohibition would cease to take effect. Not only did it say when that suspension would cease; it even went to the trouble and the precision of defining the body who would decide when this condition had arrived; the conclusion of the period of suspension was to be determined by His Excellency the Governor General in Council. It is true that the order in council no longer exists; we are aware of that. But the temporary character of its enactment was carried on into legislation, because we find the word "temporary" apears in the title of the act into which the order in council was later crystallized.

I desire for a moment to turn to a consideration of the stand taken by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), who asked us more than once, when or where a pledge would end. He told us that a government had no business, or was not bound—I think that was the precise word—to carry out the undertakings of its predecessors. While that is technically true, it is so only in a very limited sense. There is no doubt the government of to-day can cancel the laws of yesterday; they can cancel their own laws. But a government cannot cancel contracts without providing some compensation therefor. That is the difference between changing a law with the consent of parliament and cancelling a contract or repudiating a pledge, legally or even morally given, with all its obligations. The Minister of Finance asked us again and again, when does a pledge end? I think the answer is obvious: a pledge ends when it is fulfilled. A promise ceases when it is carried out. Let us consider a few illustrations.

Any hon. member of this House who has been under the necessity of pawning his watch in a case of temporary financial embarrassment will understand what I mean. This experience has never occurred to me, because in the many periods of my financial disability I have never had a watch worth pawning. But one can realize if he did find himself in that position, that he would not get his watch back until the pledge was redeemed in the ordinary way. Or take a more business-like illustration—a mortgage, say. I am speaking now of a hypothetical case under British Columbia law, which follows the English law, and may or may not be different from the law in the province of Quebec. In a mortgage, the outstanding feature, the gravamen, is personal obligation. There is a phrase indicating a promise to pay to So-and-So the sum borrowed. That is the centre, so to speak, of the mortgage. Of course, the bondage of the land is also valuable, but that is only as collateral security, and if that security diminishes in value and does not realize the amount of the mortgage, then a personal obligation rests upon the man who borrowed the money to repay it out of whatever other funds he may possess. In other words, his pledge continues until he has paid back the money. The same thing is true in reference to a note. I am not aware that our note wears out like a suit of secondhand clothes, if you have it long enough. There is, it is true, a statute of limitations with regard to debts. But who would suggest that we should invoke the statute of limitations in connection with the moral or legal obligations of a government?

I think the example cited by the hon. member for Missisquoi was a very good one, that is, in connection with the British government. The case there was even stronger than it is here. In the matter of the removal of the embargo on cattle, the British government had no order in council that could bind them; they had no legislation that could compel them to do what they did. It was a simple fulfilment of a promise given by a British statesman across the table to a Canadian statesman. But the British government made good on it. The British government did not want it, the people did not want it, and they held an election on it and said, "We do not like it, it is going to hurt us"—they thought it would at any rate—"but we have made a promise and we must stick to it." For my part I am proud to be associated with a government and a parliament that will follow the very best traditions of British public men in this regard.

I should like to say a word regarding the Progressive party in this House—not by way of commendation, Sir, for that would be presumptuous on my part, but the man on the outside sometimes sees conditions from a somewhat different angle to that from which they are viewed by those immediately concerned. I do not think that up to date the party has done anything that will strengthen them more in the confidence and esteem of the country than by the action they have indicated they are going to take on this measure to-night. It will be years before they will have a very great—shall I say?—clientele outside the farmers. It is to the farmers of the country that they must look in the first place. They have been accused in the past of being one-sided, parochial, short-sighted, but the action they intend to take to-night, as expressed by the leader of their party and by many of those who follow him, will show

that they are capable of taking a broad, national view of this subject, and as a consequence they will secure the esteem and support of farmers from one end of Canada to the other—the first occasion I think on which they have received it.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. NEILL: Well, at any rate I am sure that this action will be favourably received from one end of Canada to the other and will materially increase the standing of the party in the country. I am safe in saying that. They have deserved the name which is given to them of the National Progressive party, for their attitude shows that they have taken a national and also a progressive view in the best sense of the word in regard to this subject. I have criticized them in the past, and therefore I am glad to be able, on behalf at least of the dairy farmers of my constituency and, I believe, of British Columbia generally, to thank the National Progressive party for the stand they are taking to-night.

Referring to the original motion moved by my hon. friend from Cape Breton South (Mr. Carroll), I think hon. members will find that if they look at the amendment introduced by my hon. friend from Missisquoi (Mr. Kay), which I think the right hon. leader of the Opposition described as clumsy, they will find I think that it is clear-cut and distinct, for it indicates exactly what is proposed to be done under it. But let me refer for the moment to the original motion. You will find there a strange confusion of ideas. In the first half dozen lines it provides that despite certain acts—and it is quite proper to express it in that way—such and such shall happen, that the offering for sale and so on of oleomargarine shall henceforth be permitted. So far as that goes you understand clearly the position. It says, in defiance of certain acts to the contrary, that henceforth the sale and manufacture of oleomargarine shall be permitted. Had it stopped there it would have been intelligible, but the motion goes on to say, "subject to the provisions of the said Oleomargarine Act." Well, the said Oleomargarine Act—there is only one, which has been extended from time to time—says that oleomargarine shall go out of business on the 31st day of August. So while in the early part of the motion the hon. gentleman expresses a determination that its sale and manufacture shall henceforth be permitted, he also says that it shall be "subject to the provisions of the said act." If it is subject to such provisions, the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine will automatically cease on the 31st August. Had the hon. member put in the words, "in other regards" or "subject otherwise to the provisions of the act," that would have expressed a different meaning. But as it stands the motion is vague and confusing and ultimately binds the government to nothing and is in sharp contrast with the distinct meaning which is expressed by the amendment.

The hon. member who introduced that motion has, as we all know, a high legal standing in his profession. He is a man of repute in his profession, and we all know his ability as we have seen it expressed in this House—and I am not saying this in sarcasm at all, I am speaking the sober truth. However, believing that as I do, it is impossible for me to so impugn the hon. gentleman's motive as to suggest that he drew that amendment wrongly by accident, blunder or incompetence. While it might be in order for me to so assume, I do not believe it is justified by what we know of his ability and his reputation. Therefore I think I am justified in concluding that he drew it in that way of deliberate intent; and, if so, I am pleased to say that I am proud of his action in that regard. If he did so of deliberate intent, why then he put that abortive, or at least non-effective, resolution on the order paper presumably to stop other resolutions that might be more effective, and he has taken this method to show—and I honour him for it—that the Swift Company of Chicago have overdone their lobbying in this House and he has shown this House I hope that he possesses —and I always thought he did— a rugged independence that would never allow him by any means to be put in a position where it might be suggested he was the man Friday of any alien corporation in the States or anywhere else. Now, I have sat in this House for over four months and watched with a good deal of interest and a certain amount of disgust the persistent lobbying in this House of these alien interests from Chicago. They have camped in the galleries, they have haunted our rooms, they have slept on our doorsteps, so to speak, and one of their main arguments has been their desire to give the poor workingman of Canada a wholesome food at a cheap price. I have sometimes wondered when I have seen the lobby that is carried on whether, if they succeed in establishing oleomargarine permanently in Canada, that poor workingman would not ultimately have to pay the price of this lobby, because you can easily conceive that when conditions are such that there are only two companies allowed to

manufacture oleomargarine in Canada it would be easy, once its manufacture was permanently established, to so manoeuvre and manipulate prices that the cost of this extensive lobby would be amply repaid out of the pockets of the poor workingmen for whom the Swift Company of Chicago profess to take such an altruistic interest. I have sometimes wondered when I have seen all this going on whether it was these paid lobbyists or whether it was we ourselves who took the oath of office when we came down here that we would act in the best interest of our constituencies and the country. It is not they who took the oath, it is we. We have got to answer to our God so far as our oath is concerned, and to our constituents for the pledges we made before election and since. Therefore I would suggest that we throw aside all these paid arguments and address ourselves to the consideration of this subject animated only by the oath we took and the pledges we gave that we would one and all of us legislate in the best interests—putting it on the lowest basis—of our constituents. If we do that I think the aggregate result will also be in favour of the best interests of the people of Canada.

Mr. W. C. GOOD (Brant): Mr. Speaker, I should like to submit to the House that the amendment which has been proposed serves rather to becloud and sidetrack the real issue. I think this issue ought to be faced, and it might as well be faced now as at any time. I therefore move, seconded by Mr. Shaw:

That the amendment be amended further by adding thereto the following words:

"and that the government do before the end of the present session submit to parliament such legislation in the premises as may be deemed advisable."

Mr. SPEAKER: Does the hon. gentleman intend to speak on this sub-amendment?

Mr. GOOD: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I have not much to say further. In my judgment it is necessary and desirable that the real question we have in the back of our minds be settled before the end of this session. If the first amendment which is now before the House should carry, it will leave the whole matter in the air. The government may choose to do nothing. I do not think it is desirable that the government should be enabled to simply sit tight. I think the issue ought to be faced and decided, and it is for the purpose of bringing the matter to a head in that way that I move this further amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is on the sub-amendment. Those in favour of the sub-amendment will please say "aye."

Mr. T. W. BIRD (Nelson): Mr. Speaker, I was about to rise before this amendment was proposed, and I was about to say that I did not like the amendment. I do not like its head; I do not like its body, and now that it has got a tail I do not think that it is improved thereby.

My intention in rising was to make a word or two of explanation, because I intend to vote against the amendment, and now against the amendment to the amendment. I think it is always easier to make an explanation before one votes than afterwards. I do not envy the position of some hon. members who will have to explain themselves afterwards. I do not wish to impute any motives to those who are responsible for this amendment or who support it, but I have observed certain things in the debate that have raised questions in my mind. For instance, I have thought that some of the hon. members have been supporting the amendment from purely humanitarian motives, a kind of inverted Benthamism, the least good for the least number. Now, I do not take very much stock in humanitarian arguments on economic questions. I think that all good economics, all just economics, are fundamentally humanitarian and that you do not need to be continually dragging in the widow and the orphan and the poor workingman. I have a great deal of respect for the poor workingman and the widow and the orphan, but for the purpose of rational discussion it might be just as well if we abolished them. I think we could even afford to bury them in wool or, perhaps still better, in butter, I do not, as I say, take any stock in that kind of argument. We hear it frequently in discussions of questions of this kind but I do not think it deceives anybody.

Now, another thing occurred to me, I hope I am not going out of my way to impute motives, but it seemed to me that this amendment was not so much an amendment as a convenient sand-hill in which political ostriches might hide their heads for the time being, until somebody made a definite move in the matter. It seems to me that everybody is waiting for somebody else to declare himself on this question. I do not know whether or not this is general, but it is a type of procedure which I personally object to. I think hon. members ought to be willing to say "no" or "yes" to the motion on the order paper without all this seeking of convenient refuges and putting it up to somebody else to take the first step in the matter.

Then, again I have thought that perchance some moralist had invented this amendment in order that the sanctity of pledges might

be observed. I think that pledges from parliament to parliament ought to be observed and held in veneration, and also pledges from one party to another. That is, pledges of governments or parties when in power and out of power ought to be held sacred, too. If we are going to talk about pledges let us talk about pledges per se—in themselves. I do not think there is a great deal in the moralistic side of this argument. I cannot persuade myself that there is much sincerity in it. I do not think this parliament is greatly concerned in the keeping of pledges. I cannot say that any hon. gentleman sitting opposite can claim to be specially interested in the sanctity of pledges. There have been those who have referred to this amendment as a piece of protection for the farmers, and I honour the frankness of the hon. gentlemen who take that position, because I think it is the only straightforward position to take. I am standing here to-night not as one who is a hard and fast believer in consistency. I do not draw that distinction between expediency and principle which the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) does. For instance; I believe that expediency is principle, or a kind of principle. It all depends on how you use it. If you use it openly and with a declared purpose and without any intent to mislead or deceive, I think that is justifiable. I have a great deal of sympathy with some hon. members on my own side of the House who imagine that by prohibiting oleomargarine they are doing a service to the cause of agriculture. However, I have been watching this process very keenly, and I hope with some foresight, and it seems to me that the farmers of this country are beginning to nose around the protection trough, they are beginning to sniff around it. They have seen other people in it for fifty years and they have been shoved aside or have been persuaded to keep aside. But to-night the farmers of Canada, it seems to me, are beginning to see the attractions of that trough and some of their old time prejudices are being held less firmly than before. Will any man stand up in this House and say that they are to be blamed for that, that they are swallowing their principles? Why, what are principles for but to be swallowed:

> A marciful Providunce fashioned us holler
> O' purpose thet we might our principles swaller.

It is not the swallowing that is wrong; it is the inopportune time that we choose to swallow. This is a very opportune time for the farmers to swallow their principles, because they will go down very easily with oleomargarine—or butter. I want to point out this, and I hope I do not need to point it out because everybody with his eyes open will have seen it before now, that the farmers of this country are of the same flesh and blood as farmers elsewhere in the world, and we have seen the British farmer go to his government with the plea for protection; we have seen the United States farmer go to his government with the plea for protection, and we have seen the Canadian farmer to-night not exactly asking the government for protection but just hovering around and trying to hint to the government that they would like some protection if they dared give it to them. That is the position. Now where are we coming to? We are coming to this position; we are just beginning to get in the thin end of the wedge and by and by you are going to have a Farmers' party in Canada that will be one hundred per cent protectionist. They will all be in the trough then.

Mr. HALBERT: Never.

Mr. BIRD: You are getting in it to-night, those who are going to vote for this amendment. I am laying down lines of logic, and those who say "never" will be up against something in the future. I am not speaking against any gentleman in the Farmers' party to-night who thinks he ought to vote against oleomargarine to protect the farmers' interests. That is what we are all coming to. For fifty years the farmer has been wedded to a theory, and where has it got him? He trusted to a free trade party to bring him relief, and where has that got him? The farmers of Canada cannot afford to go on for another fifty years on the same principle. They must have something more to live on than simply professions. I was wondering to-night how much difference it would have made to this debate if someone could have given us an authoritative definition of what a dairyman is. Supposing Mr. Speaker could have settled for this House what a dairyman is. Is it the man that milks the cow, or the man that milks the man that milks the cow? That is what we are up against to-night, and that is why all the parties are divided because they do not know whether they are supporting the farmer or the manufacturer, and we are slithering around all over the place on this question of oleomargarine simply because we do not know whom we are supporting.

Mr. GAUVREAU: Speak for yourself.

Mr. BIRD: I am speaking for myself and I think I am speaking for a good many more too, if they would only get up and say so.

Some hon. gentlemen are very eloquent from their seats in this House, but we rarely see them on their feet to express their opinions. I foresee the time, and you can judge whether I am speaking ironically or not, when this party here will have lost all the faith they ever had in the free trade party in this country. I do not think they have lost it all yet. We are still hoping we will get some support from the free trade party in this country, but our faith has been badly shaken and I think it has pretty nearly got to the vanishing point. What are we going to do? There is a party at the other end of this House, the high protectionist party, and what are we going to do when he have lost faith in the party across the way? We are going to turn to this party at the other end. We are all going to be high protectionists. We are going to turn to them and say: "Get out a scheme, you protectionists, and you manufacturers' associations, and come and hold conferences with the long-suffering farmers of Canada and see if we cannot get some remedy for the position we have been in for the last fifty years. We have to do something. We cannot live in a vacuum. We have got to have actual benefits." That is economics. We are not here to prate about theories or anything of that kind. You cannot live on theories. Who is the theorist in this House anyway? Who is the expedient man in this House? Why I was amazed today and I rubbed my eyes when in another place I saw a high protectionist quoting Adam Smith as a sound economist. I thought that was about the furthest I could get, but to-night I rubbed my eyes again when I saw sound free traders advocating high protection, and protection as somebody has said, in its worst form, but I would say in its most naive form. It reminds me of the story of the deputation of orange growers that went to McKinley to get a duty on bananas. He said, "We do not grow any bananas in America," but the deputation said, "We know that, but we calculate like this: We think if the people get their stomachs full of bananas they will have no room for oranges." That seems to be about the position of the advocates of the elimination of oleomargarine. They seem to be afraid that if the people get their stomachs full of oleo they will not have room for butter. I say that is the most naive kind of protection you can think of. Where are we getting to? Our principles are all up in the air together. We are none of us on solid ground, and therefore we have to get together as all sensible men should and try and arrange a practical solution for the difficulties of the dairyman, however you may define him, and for the farmer generally in this country. I am only throwing out a hint to the party to my right. I leave it to them to work it out as best they can.

One hon. gentleman said to-night that this was the first time that the Progressive party had ever done right. That is a very significant remark that I would like the members of the Progressive party to think about. It seems to me that is where the confusion of right and wrong comes in. His right is our wrong and our wrong is his right. This is the first time we have done right, which means to our way of thinking, the first time we have ever done wrong.

Mr. HAROLD PUTNAM (Colchester): I did not intend to delay the House and would not have risen but for some rather remarkable statements which in the last few moments have fallen from the last speaker, the hon. member for Nelson (Mr. Bird). From his occupation and training I had hoped for a logical speech; I had expectation of a charitable speech, but as far as any attempt on his part to interpret my reasons for casting the vote I shall give is concerned, he was utterly uncharitable, and therefore I must occupy a few moments to make myself clear.

Mr. BIRD: The hon. gentleman seems to imply that I had some direct implication with regard to himself. I have not heard the hon. gentleman speak.

Mr. PUTNAM: I did not intend to imply that, but I take up his imputation of motives. He professed some lingering faith in the Liberal party and some hope in the Conservative party but he showed an absolute lack of that greatest grace of charity towards many of us who are voting for this amendment from a special reason. The hon. gentleman professes his inability to distinguish a humanitarian from an economic question, and he gave the concrete and instanced or implied that those of us who are voting on this question on the basis of child welfare were not sincere, and he said in terms that only those who approached it from the standpoint of protection for the farmer were doing so with any straightforwardness, or words exactly to that effect. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is a fact that two hon. gentlemen in this House the hon. member for Strathcona (Mr. Warner) and the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Bouchard), based the major portion of their speeches on the argument of child welfare, and I for one found my information in that regard very much supplemented and buttressed by the excellent speeches of these two honourable members, and I cannot thank the

hon. member for Nelson for telling us that the only straightforward vote from those opposed to oleomargarine will be on the part of those who are frankly for protection for the farmer.

I was impressed, Mr. Speaker, with the humanitarian aspect of this question which the hon. member for Nelson (Mr. Bird) professes so frankly to ignore. In this country we have rather a unique climate. It is very rigorous in the winter, it is in many parts very severely warm in the summer; and while, for the moment, I cannot recall exact figures it is a tremendously unfortunate fact that infant mortality in Canada is comparatively heavy. That infant and child mortality is heavier in the Canadian cities. I am not going to say that solely because the children in the country have plentiful access to the products of the dairy the mortality there is less. But, Mr. Speaker, that fact stands as a very obvious circumstance in connection with an unfortunate situation. Now while the hon. member for Nelson professes to ignore the humanitarian aspect of this question he has done nothing to dispute, or dispose of, or disprove the statements and the arguments of two or three hon. members of this House who at least did base their case upon the welfare of the little child who cannot even say what is palatable always—the little child of the poor man. That child should have access as freely and openly as possible to products of the dairy during his growing years. It is not disputed that oleomargarine lacks the vitamines which are necessary for the bringing of that child to a healthy maturity. Oh, you may say, he will get them elsewhere, he will get them from vegetables. But let us remember that those fresh vegetables are just the very things that the poor man in the cities cannot always afford, that he gets but a very small quantity, and in many cases none at all. Having regard to the parents of whom these poor children are begotten does it need more than the opinion of a layman to recognize that if it is a bad and an unwholesome thing for the children to be reared without the vitamines of butter, that the parents themselves, getting along on oleo, minus these vitamines, will unfortunately reflect that very deficiency in the life of their little children.

Mr. Speaker, we are confronting a problem as to how we shall get immigrants to this country. I am not going to utter any word of censure or reproof on anything that has been done, but we all know that it would be a valuable asset to raise a good healthy Canadian as compared with importing a foreigner and trying to convert him and educate him in Canadian ways. I believe it is quite within the conception of probability that children of the Canadian poor are dying in our Canadian cities in substantial numbers, or that their health is becoming impaired, because the products of the dairy are not circulated freely enough amongst them. You may tell me "Oh, the poor man may get nothing at all for his children if he does not get oleomargarine." But, Mr. Speaker, we have to look at the question from a sensible basis. In those long years when oleomargarine was prohibited in Canada the child of the poor man did get its butter, and the parents of the poor children yet to be born got their butter. There is tangible argument here that child welfare cries out that oleomargarine should be discouraged because it is a plagiarism of butter; and I for one, though I represent an agricultural community, hope to-night that I am taking higher ground. I most respectfully resent the imputation that the hon. member for Nelson has cast against the vote which I intend to pass. I shall not have the blood or the impaired health of any child crying from the ground because of any vote of mine to-night which might encourage the consumption of oleomargarine and thereby necessarily discourage and lessen the use of butter amongst the children of the poor or amongst the potential parents in the ranks of the poor. With all the goodwill in the world certain women's organizations in the cities of Canada have been working for the permanent recognition of oleomargarine by the law of this country. I must humbly advise them that I consider such propaganda inimical to the ultimate health and life of the children of the poor.

Mr. PIERRE F. CASGRAIN (Charlevoix-Montmorency): I rise to a point of order. I do not believe that the sub-amendment proposed by the hon. member for Brant is in order and I would ask for your ruling on the point. Rule 36 provides that when a question is under debate no motion is received unless to amend it with a view to improving it, or accomplishing some such good purpose. The sub-amendment provides that the government of the day, before the end of the present session, shall submit to parliament such legislation as in the premises it deems advisable. The resolution before the House asks that the manufacture, importation and sale of oleomargarine shall henceforth be permitted; and the amendment of the hon. member for Missisquoi declares that the prohibition respecting oleomargarine was, under the War Measures of 1917, only removed for a certain limited period of time. Now, the only thing necessary in order to carry out the object of

the hon. member for Brant is to pass no legislation because I understand that the continuation of the importation, manufacture and sale of oleomargarine was permitted only until next August or September. Therefore it is not necessary to bring in any legislation such as is contemplated by the sub-amendment. We do not need to introduce any legislation when the permission given expires in August or September, and it will not be permissible after that time for any person to import, manufacture or sell oleomargarine. I therefore maintain that the hon. gentleman's sub-amendment is out of order.

Mr. GOOD: Does the hon. member think I am proposing this in order that the prohibition shall lapse?

Mr. CASGRAIN: No, but you ask the government to bring in a law to enforce the motion made by the hon. member for Missisquoi. I say that is not necessary. You obtain the same result by not bringing in any legislation.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Question.

Mr. SPEAKER: I should like to hear the opinion of the House on the point of order.

Mr. GOOD: May I speak to the point of order? I only do so to remove what I think is an entire misapprehension on the part of the hon. member for Charlevoix-Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain). I may say very frankly that I am not in favour of the prohibition of the importation and manufacture of oleo. The hon. member assumed that I was in favour of that, and that it was the reason why I moved the sub-amendment. I may frankly state that my purpose in moving it was to prevent inaction which might result in the automatic revival of the prohibition. I want the matter to be settled. I do not want the government to dodge the issue and to allow the whole thing to drift back again to where it was in 1914.

Mr. FIELDING: My hon. friend is arguing the general merits of the question. That is not a point of order; he must speak to the point of order.

Mr. GOOD: Perhaps I was departing a little bit from the point of order, but I wanted to explain the purpose that I had in mind in order to clear up the objection which is raised.

1 a.m.

Mr. GRAHAM: How could that be an amendment to the amendment which does not provide for that?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not agree with the amendment, but certainly I see no substance to the point of order. How it can be argued that the amendment is out of order passes me. Let me put it in this way: The amendment calls upon the government to come down to parliament with a bill. The hon. member argues that if the government decide against oleomargarine, they do not need a bill. Such may be the case, but how does that argue against the validity of the amendment? If it were an argument against the validity of the sub-amendment, it would be an argument against the validity of the main amendment. We do not need, for example, to pass any legislation or any resolution to get rid of the present legislation. It dies of itself. The argument would be equally valid against the main amendment, but in my judgment it is equally invalid against both. I argued against the main amendment on the ground that it is a direct negative, and I think it is, although His Houour the Speaker ruled against me; but I submit this is no argument against the validity of the sub-amendment.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): The question as to the relevancy and regularity of the first amendment was settled by you, Mr. Speaker, and the statement of my right hon. friend on that has no relevancy to the point raised by the hon. member for Charlevoix-Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain). May says at page 261 on the question of moving a sub-amendment to an amendment:

> Every amendment proposed to be made, either to a question or to a proposed amendment, should be so framed that, if agreed to by the House, the question, or amendment as amended, would be intelligible and consistent with itself.

The effect of the amendment of the hon. member for Missisquoi (Mr. Kay) is along the line that no legislation should be passed at all. That is its effect. The hon. member for Brant (Mr. Good) comes along and proposes a sub-amendment which declares that the government should bring down legislation to give effect to the amendment when manifestly and clearly no such thing is possible. Therefore it is a direct negative, and the suggestion of the hon. member for Brant is a direct contravention of the rule I have read and also a similar rule which is laid down by Beauchesne in rule 333 at page 93. To put the matter again, if the House should agree to the proposition of the hon. member for Missisquoi, it declares itself committed to a proposition which involves no legislation being introduced. Then the hon. member for Brant asks the House to

stultify itself by declaring that the government, if they deem advisable in the premises, should bring in some legislation to give effect to the amendment. This, of course, would be absolutely absurd, and I cannot see how it would be possible to vote for such an amendment.

Mr. FIELDING: A resolution might be absolutely absurd and yet absolutely in order. The sub-amendment may be absurd—I am not arguing the point at all; I think it is a mistaken amendment—but it is simply adding words to a previous amendment, and although I cannot see any necessity for it, on the pure question of order, I do not see any objection to it.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): To show that the sub-amendment of the hon. member for Brant is out of order, let me say that the main motion is that legislation be introduced. That substantive question is before the House, and surely it cannot be in order to have it again brought before the House in the form of an amendment.

Mr. SHAW: I should like to point out in answer to the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean), that the sub-amendment is rather contradictory of the original proposed resolution. The original proposed resolution suggests that legislation should be provided that oleomargarine shall henceforth be permitted. I take it that that means a permanent oleomargarine measure. The government in their wisdom, if acting under the sub-amendment, may bring in legislation looking to a continuance of the permission to manufacture and sell oleomargarine for a year or, perhaps, a longer period.

Mr. GRAHAM: If the amendment to the amendment carried, how would the amendment as amended read? What would be the sense to it?

Mr. FIELDING: The question is not whether there is any sense to it or not; the question is whether or not it is in order.

Mr. MEIGHEN: With all deference to the minister, I think it makes sense. The amendment reads, that all the legislation passed, that is, in 1918, should be swept away, in order that the matter will stand as if such legislation had never been passed; that is, in the words of the amendment, that the matter will stand "in the same position as before the enactment of the said temporary suspension." If we were in the same position as before the enactment of the 1918 legislation, we would be free to enact as we liked, and the government would be free to bring in legislation as though previous legislation had never been enacted.

Mr. GRAHAM: If the amendment carried, would any enactment be required?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The government would be free to bring in legislation. For the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) to say that they cannot do so, is absurd. Further, the amendment to the amendment recommends that this legislation brought in such as the government deems wise. Certainly this makes sense. I am against the sub-amendment, but it is an amendment undoubtedly.

Mr. FORKE: I understand this amendment means that it simply puts the situation back where it was prior to the legislation that made it possible to manufacture oleomargarine. If this amendment is carried, it still remains open for the government to introduce legislation if they see fit. That is the only reason I could find for supporting the amendment.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: The motions moved appear to be a direct negative of each other from beginning to end. This process started about a week ago on a bill introduced by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) followed by a resolution in the name of the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Carroll) and a further amendment introduced by the hon. member for Missisquoi (Mr. Kay), which was a direct negative. It appears to me that this is another negative. The words used by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) that the resolution might be absurd but be in order, I think will apply to the whole process. It has been an absurdity from the beginning to the end, and it has been an encroachment upon the privileges of parliament to introduce such a process of shirking responsibility as we have had.

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion which was introduced this afternoon by the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Carroll) briefly expresses the desire that the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine should be made lawful in Canada henceforth. The amendment moved by the hon. member for Missisquoi (Mr. Kay) expresses the desire that the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine should not be made lawful, but that we should revert to the situation in which we were before the order in council granting a temporary suspension of the prohibition was passed. The drafting of this amendment is amply justified by May, pages 253 and 258. It is my authority on the subject. The amendment states that the suspension was

but a temporary war measure and that it should now be removed and the question left, without prejudice, as to its merits, in the same position as before the enactment of that temporary suspension.

The prohibition against oleomargarine will be resuscitated, by the simple efflux of time, in a few weeks or months from now. That prohibition might be qualified or it might be complete. The sub-amendment, in my humble judgment, is in order because it asks that before that time shall have arrived the government shall take action and therefore say during the present session what it will do. In other words, the government is directed by parliament to take action not later on in a few weeks or months but now whilst parliament is in session on the proposition submitted in the amendment as moved by the hon. member by Missisquoi (Mr. Kay). I therefore rule the sub-amendment to be logically in order.

Mr. W. F. CARROLL (Cape Breton South and Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I have very few words to say in reply; I shall confine my remarks now to a consideration of the order in council passed in 1918. It has been stated that the order in council as drafted contains a pledge to the dairymen of the country that the manufacture of oleomargarine would be prohibited at the close of the war. I say that there is no such pledge in the order in council; no pledge of the kind was intended when that order in council was drafted. The order in council simply conformed to the usual order passed under the War Measures Act of 1914. I believe it was passed in August; and when hon. gentlemen make any assertion of the kind that has been put forward in this debate, they are evidently doing so without having fairly read the order in council and the act based thereon. I was not a member of the House at that time, but I have no doubt in the world that the dairy interests of this country were never approached in the matter, and never approached the government, because I do not think that the government of that day made known to any interests in Canada, dairy or otherwise, any order in council which they intended to pass based upon the War Measures Act of 1914.

Some hon. gentlemen say that for fifty years oleomargarine has been kept out of Canada. Yes, Sir; and for five hundred years the franchise was kept from the people of England, but they ultimately got it; and for sixty-five years responsible government was kept from the Canadian people in some provinces, but they, too, ultimately obtained their right. So that this is no argument whatever against the importation and manufacture of oleomargarine in Canada. The manufacture of this butter substitute is not an imposition on anybody in this country; it absolutely is not. On the other hand, it undoubtedly is an imposition on the Canadian people to deprive them of oleomargarine if they desire to have it. You are not imposing on any people in this country by allowing the manufacture of oleomargarine, because you do not compel anyone to eat it or even to have it on his premises. The member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill) had a few kind words to say about myself, and no doubt he meant them. But I do resent the latter part of his speech wherein he talks about paid arguments in this House. So far as I am concerned, I want to assure the hon. gentleman that my arguments are not paid for except by the indemnity I receive. And when the hon. member goes on to refer to certain interests staying around doors, I should like him to look around the galleries to-night and say who, apparently, are taking more interest in this matter—the paid servants of the dairy industry, or those whom he pretends to see there, and whom I have not seen, as representing the oleomargarine interests of the country. My hon. friend from Missisquoi in his opening remarks said that I was less belligerent to-day than I was on the last occasion this subject was before the House. I am never very belligerent, Mr. Speaker, but sometimes I am spirited; and I shall continue to be spirited so long as hon. members break the rules of the House by using in reference to myself language which you, Sir, declare to be unparliamentary. Before I sit down, I hope that hon. members will give to this question a fair meed of consideration. If they do, I believe they will vote for the main resolution and against the amendment.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): I am rather reluctant to crave the indulgence of the House even for a moment. I desire to state, though, that while I agree to the validity of the sub-amendment offered by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Good) I am compelled to oppose it. Did the sub-amendment stand alone, the principle it embodies would receive my support. I feel it is quite consistent with the amendment, and should be added if the amendment is to carry. In other words, if the amendment is a correct statement of fact and principle and goes into effect, it should be followed by action on the part of the government. I cannot support it because it is an addition to and incorporated with the sub-amendment. The sub-amendment I regard as a false statement as the

official imprimatur of this parliament, a false implication to the people of Canada. Consequently, no matter what is appended to it, I must vote against it.

Anyone who believes the amendment I cannot understand voting against the sub-amendment. I disbelieve the amendment; I believe it is a subterfuge, admirably described by the hon. member for Swift Current (Mr. Lewis) as camouflage. It is only a means of escape from an affirmative or a negative answer to the main motion. The amendment states that assurances were given at the time of the prohibition of oleomargarine that the suspension was but temporary. The implication is that some contractual assurance was given certain persons that at the expiration of the temporary measure parliament would not be free to enact such legislation as it liked. No such assurance was given. Nothing was done save the passing of legislation, first by order in council and subsequently by this House. It is passing strange to me, Mr. Speaker, that this House of Commons, which last year knew everything it knows to-day, which last year knew all that was embodied in the order in council, which last year knew every word of the statute, and which last year felt itself perfectly free to enact a prohibition of oleomargarine or to enact an abolition of such prohibition, should now after twelve months find that it had tied its hands behind its back four years before it deliberated last year. Nobody has ever insinuated that there was anything in the world in the way of an assurance that was not contained in the order in council and in the legislation. We knew of the order in council last year, we knew of the legislation. Then how is it that we felt perfectly free last year, and now we find ourselves fettered and shackled? Really to assert to any person that parliament is not free at the close of temporary legislation to do as it feels right in the interests of the people of Canada is an affront both to its intelligence and to the intelligence of the nation.

I make an appeal to hon. members of this House to face this as we ought to face any situation. Leaving aside the question of government policy—and I think the government should have a policy—the matter is now before parliament. Then let us be honest, do not let us try to escape a clear yes or no under an assertion of an assurance, which assurance never existed. That is my appeal to hon. members. I make no further argument on the main motion or on the question that we ought to get finality. I make an appeal that we sweep aside these subterfuges and get to the question, and that hon. members vote yea or nay upon it. I have stated my position upon it already and I will buttress it by no further argument.

Hon. members who are opposed to oleomargarine, who believe it is bad for the dairy industry and for the nation in general, who think it is going to hurt little children and all the rest of the community, let them sweep away the arguments and push oleomargarine aside. Why should hon. members put this amendment between themselves and oleomargarine? Why does the hon. member whose heart is bleeding for the little children and who thinks they are going to be hurt argue against the merits of oleomargarine behind an amendment of this sort? Is the man who believes that oleomargarine is an unsound food, that it is deleterious to health, that it is condemned by medical authority—is he going to stand up and say that he is not free to express his opinion because of an assurance given by a government or by a parliament five years ago? Could anything be more absurd? Were it not parliamentary I would say: Could anything be more cowardly? I can understand hon. members being opposed to oleomargarine. I am free to admit that I am myself opposed to the unrestricted manufacture and importation of oleomargarine under conditions as they are to-day, and I can understand hon. members being opposed to oleomargarine under any conditions. Such a position may be right; I do not think it is. But I cannot understand hon. members who have opinions upon the subject at all seeking to hide the expression of those opinions and their reflection by a vote in this House behind an amendment which, I repeat, is an affront both to the intelligence of the House and of Canada.

Hon. W. R. MOTHERWELL (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I am induced to say a word or two in reply to my right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) who intimated that there was no promise or assurance given the people of Canada or the dairymen except that implied in the order in council. Even if that were so, in addition to the very distinct assurance implied in the order in council, we have the sworn testimony of Mr. Stonehouse, president of the Canadian Dairymen's Association, taken before the Agricultural committee this session, in the course of which he said:

Therefore the expressed—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I regret to say that the hon. minister may not refer to a statement made before a committee unless its report is before the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Question.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

Mr. DONALD SUTHERLAND (South Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I have refrained from taking part in the debate up to the present, but in the face of the statement made by the mover of the resolution with regard to the influence of paid servants of the dairy industry claimed to be in the galleries, I wish to take exception to any implication that I am in any way influenced by any person outside of those I am here to represent. I repudiate any such suggestion, and I am surprised that it should come from the member who moved this resolution, with which I am not in accord.

I have heard something with respect to the order in council which permitted the manufacture and importation of oleomargarine. I have a very distinct recollection of the time it was passed and from that time down to the present I have been strongly opposed to the regulations which were issued in pursuance of that order. I have stated repeatedly that I was not opposed to the manufacture and importation under proper regulations, but the regulations which have been in effect are such as have never been in effect in any other country in the civilized world. The manufacturers and importers of oleomargarine have been given a freedom and a liberty such as has obtained in no other country, I care not where you go, and it was for this reason that I have so bitterly opposed the continuation of the permissive legislation.

A year ago we had a lengthy address from the hon. Minister of Agriculture in relation to this matter. He is a practical farmer and realizes the unfairness which was done to those engaged in dairying by reason of the legislation which has been renewed from year to year. We have heard a good deal during this debate with regard to the injurious effects of oleomargarine on the health of the people, and we have also heard claims made that it is a splendid food and the people should not be debarred from using it. But these statements of the wholesomeness and food value of oleomargarine have never been supported by any conclusive evidence. Notwithstanding that this has been a bone of contention during the past four or five years, and that we have to-day a Department of Health and officials by the thousand to enforce the law, there is not a member of the government who can tell parliament what oleomargarine really is—not one. If there is a minister present who can give such information, I should like to hear from him. The Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock) told us about the poor man and his children, about the families of the soldiers who went overseas and did not return, about the man who was earning a small wage, and the importance of a cheap substitute for butter. Let me call attention, Mr. Speaker, to something that may open the eyes of my hon. friend in regard to this matter. In 1919 valuable evidence with regard to the manufacture of oleomargarine was secured by a cost of living committee of the parliament of that day, and it was brought out how highly coloured June butter was purchased to be mixed with these other ingredients in order to make the product look like butter and thus deceive the people. When the question was asked, "Why do you go to all this trouble and expense; if oleomargarine has the virtues you claim for it, why not sell it on its merits?"—the reply came "Oh, it would be like eating lard; the people would not eat it at all." So that shows there has been a deliberate attempt on the part of the manufacturers of oleomargarine to deceive the people and induce them to consume this article by making it look and taste like butter. We are voting millions of dollars to the Department of Health, yet not a particle of evidence is laid before parliament to show whether this stuff that has been consumed in this country has or has not any merits. It is impossible for a private member to secure this information, but it is not impossible for the Minister of Agriculture and members of the government to secure it. The Minister of Finance (Mr Fielding) has been taking an active part in this matter; if he were really anxious to put before parliament the conditions as they actually prevail in this regard, this could very easily have been done. I remember a speech delivered by the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) a year ago, and I thought he was very extreme in the statements he made on that occasion. I would just like to refer to some of the evidence given by the manager of one of these packing houses with regard to the manufacture of oleomargarine. He was asked about fixing the price of oleo—the value of the oils imported for the manufacture of oleo does not fluctuate from day to day or from year to year—and he stated:

> I think every man in business gets all he can.

And a little further on:

> I am not an expert in the prices of the retail trade. I have not given it the same study, but I do not

think you are getting anywhere if you blame a man for taking—

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. gentleman is reading from the report of a committee which has not been laid before the House, he is out of order.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: The committee of 1919 was one I had been referring to. It is true that what I am now quoting was stated before a committee of this House, the report of which has not been presented to the House.

Mr. FIELDING: This session?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Yes.

Mr. FIELDING: That is out of order.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I presume it is out of order if the committee do not want to hear it —and I am not surprised that some of them do not want to hear it.

Mr. FIELDING: It is out of order even if the committee should want to hear it.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: It may be out of order, but it will not be forgotten. I am sure it is on the records of the committee which have been published, and if any hon. members desire to secure the evidence to combat the arguments advanced by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock) all they have to do is to refer to the evidence given by Mr. McLean, general manager of the Harris Abattoir Company, to show—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is an old member of the House, and he knows the rule just as well as I do. I am sure he will not insist on referring to the evidence taken before a committee which has not yet reported to the House.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I submit to your ruling, Mr. Speaker. I was merely refreshing the minds of the members so that they might later refer to this evidence in order that the matter might be cleared up in their minds. But I have here something further dealing with the matter, and I presume it will be in order. It is taken from a newspaper report—the Toronto Globe—of a speech delivered by the hon. Minister of Agriculture in 1922 before the Ayrshire Breeders' Association in the city of Toronto. The report states:

> On the question of the manufacture and importation of oleomargarine, Mr. Motherwell said that, being introduced as a war measure, it had served its purpose and would do well to die a natural death. "All that we want to do with oleo is to do nothing at all," the speaker said. The legislation expired on September 1, 1922, and it would be up to the other fellow, he said, to make the next move.

I have been wondering since who the other fellow was. I remember about a year ago the Minister of Agriculture frantically waving above his head a bill he was moving the House to adopt and characterizing it as "this rotten old bill." The "rotten old bill" is evidently going to be revived again because the government have not enough courage—or shall I say backbone?—to take a decided stand on this matter. They are fooling away the time—perhaps that is too strong a term to use; the time of parliament is being taken up day after day and year after year when everyone knows that there was in the order in council passed in 1918 an implied promise that the measure then passed was to be a war measure and a war measure only. The order in council said:

> —to be in force and to have effect for the period during which the present abnormal conditions continue, the conclusion of such period to be determined by His Excellency the Governor General in Council.

Yes, His Excellency the Governor in Council can decide this matter at any time; why has it not been done? Why all this subterfuge? Why all these attempts to make it appear that this is democracy, that the government are placing the responsibility upon parliament? When I saw the bill which appeared in the name of the Minister of Agriculture about a week ago, providing for the reinsertion of the suspended clause of the act of 1914, I thought the government were going to have the courage to deal with this matter, but when it came up in the House, the minister, to my amazement, asked leave to withdraw the bill. The hon. member for Cape Breton South, a private member (Mr. Carroll) has had this motion on the order paper since the second of March. Now, that is surely not democracy. It is certainly not responsible government but an evasion of responsibility.

Just a word in regard to what has been said about this being a protective measure. People are inclined to think that anything that savours of protection is not to be encouraged in this country. We have from the Atlantic to the Pacific a staff of officers who are preserving order, who are protecting the people; and the farmers are entitled to protection just as well as any other class. They contribute their quota toward the government of the country; I venture to say that no other class contributes as much as they do to the prosperity of Canada. When you look through the list of bills that has been introduced this session and last session you can come to no other conclusion than that the government are making it as difficult as they can for the farmers to carry on and do business. Is any attempt being made to

see that the farmers are enabled to manufacture dairy products profitably? We have a protective tariff of three cents a pound on butter—why do they not put on a specific ad valorem duty as in the case of agricultural implements and other manufactured articles. When it comes to agricultural implements the duty on these implements is doubled, when the price is doubled; consequently, the protection on them is doubled. But in the case of butter when it is at 25 cents a pound the duty is 3 cents a pound under the British preference if it comes from the British Empire as it does, and if it goes up to 50 cents a pound the duty remains at 3 cents a pound but the protection is reduced by one half with an ad valorem duty such as the manufacturers of agricultural implements enjoy, their duty is doubled, but in the case of the other product it is decreased. This is the opportune time for the manufacturer of oleomargarine to get in his work. The cost of peanut oil, cocoanut oil, cottonseed oil and all these other things does not fluctuate as does the price of butter, and he takes advantage of the opportunity and comes in as the Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock) has pointed out, and he quoted figures here tonight from year to year showing that sometimes the cost of oleomargarine in this country was up to 40 and 45 cents a pound. What is the price of butter to-day? It is quoted in Montreal at 34 and 35 cents a pound. So is there any injustice being suffered by the people of this country?

Take the price of cheese, 18 cents per lb. If the same price was obtained for butter to-day on a butter fat basis, it would be selling at 39 cents a pound when you compare the values of the two commodities. The manufacturer of cheese to-day has a great advantage over the manufacturer of butter, and this is why there is no progress being made in the manufacture of butter in this country. I know that in western Ontario many of the creameries have been closed up, and let me point out there is nothing so important and so essential to carrying on successful agriculture in this country as the butter-making industry. There you have the very fundamentals which are necessary in order to carry on agriculture successfully. We have seen in old Ontario, farms that have been cropped for many years and finally practically abandoned, and there has been a great effort and an immense amount of labour has been applied and money spent in trying to bring them back to a successful state of agriculture. The same thing applies to western Canada at the present time, where in many sections they have cropped and cropped year after year and now the farms are congested with weeds, the fibre of the soil has been exhausted, and it is drifting everywhere to-day. You cannot bring this land back to a condition where you can operate it successfully without going back to the primary agricultural industry, that of butter-making. In that case you raise the young stock on the farm. You engage in the raising of cattle, hogs and all these other things, and the product of the farm is converted into a product that is easily exported and that is much cheaper to export than is grain. In that way and that way only can this be brought about. But what do you find? You find during the past few years that the very things that are so essential to carrying on agriculture in this way have been lost sight of.

I hope I have done my utmost to see that parliament would put into effect some regulations which would protect the farmer with regard to the thing which is so necessary for feeding the young animals he is endeavouring to raise on the farm. The pollution of the mill feeds of this country as they have been and as they are being polluted to-day is a crime against the farmers of Canada and is responsible for driving thousands of them from the farm. The farmers of this country are entitled to protection and to something different from what they have been receiving from this government and from preceding governments. You may talk about the importance of having the farmer stay on the land, but how can you expect the farmer to stay on the land? They go in the mills and feed stores and purchase a load or a carload of mill feed so polluted with poisonous seeds—yes, and this information is all in the Department of Agriculture, that thousands of animals have died from the effect of the poisonous seeds found in these mill feeds, and no steps being taken to remedy this condition of affairs. Now we are asked to permit the continuance of a condition with regard to something that is going to be used as the Minister of Labour has pointed out to regulate the price of butter in this country. Yes, it is going to be a very convenient thing. It is a matter of small importance to him in view of present conditions, although nearly $400,000 has been handed back to the two manufacturers of this article during the past four years in a rebate on the customs duties collected upon the ingredients which go into the manufacture of this article, and some years there has been a great deal more imported for which rebates have been granted than there have been pounds of oleomargarine manufactured in this country, notwithstanding the fact

that from 15 to 20 per cent of the article manufactured is made of skimmed milk. It is a very clever scheme that has been devised of recent years, particularly in the United States, where the chemists now extract the butter fat from milk and put back into it cocoanut oil, peanut oil and other extracts of that kind and then put the product on the market in competition with its genuine article.

Much has been said and particularly by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding)—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Question.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I know hon. members are getting anxious, but there is no particular hurry. The Minister of Finance a year ago in reply to the speech made by the hon. Minister of Agriculture, said:

So it is that we are setting ourselves up against the civilized world if we adopt this resolution.

A little further on he says:

The whole question is this: Here is a commodity that is traded in by every country in the world except Canada. Surely there is no reason why it should not be traded in in this country, unless our people are lacking in the intelligence that we believe they possess. It is because I believe they are intelligent, because I believe they are able to know what they want and able to make a distinction, because I believe they are not going to be so easily fooled and humbugged into having oleomargarine pawned off on them as butter, that I am going to oppose the motion made by my hon. friend from Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill).

I was surprised to get a certain piece of information from the Minister of Agriculture to-night. I have always understood that Canada was a dairying country. I have been down in the eastern townships of Quebec and have heard eloquent speakers declare that there was no finer agricultural, grazing or dairying country in the wide world than those eastern townships of the province of Quebec, but to-night I learn from my hon. friend that that is a mistake. It is a country in which the dairying interests are in such a perilous condition that at any moment they may be destroyed by the butter which is being brought up from the Argentine.

Mr. FIELDING: It sounds a pretty good speech.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: A pretty good speech. He talks about the civilized world and Canada being the only country where the farmers are afraid to come into competition with conditions as they find them here.

I have here some of the regulations which are in effect in some of the states of the union where dairying is carried on even more successfully and scientifically than we are doing it in Canada. For instance, in the state of Minnesota the regulations provide:

The use of milk and milk products are forbidden in the manufacture of oleomargarine; the manufacture of oleomargarine in imitation of, or in semblance of butter of any shade of yellow, even by the selection or proportion of any fat or other ingredient which may color the product, shall be taken as an intent to deceive or defraud the consumer or purchaser thereof; labelling of receptacles and packages is very strict, and package must show, with substantial accuracy, percentage of each ingredient and the name of each animal or vegetable from which the fats or oils are derived.

Why is it that the government has absolutely refused to specify on the containers the ingredients of the oleomargarine sold in this country? Yet that requirement is insisted on in the case of many other articles. The ingredients are supposed to be placed on containers of mill feed. Even in the case of the mill feed to which I have been referring you will find printed in small letters on the bottom of the container "screenings not exceeding mill run." In the case of fertilizers it is necessary to enumerate the articles and percentage of which they are constituted. But when it comes to an article of food consumed by the people the manufacturers are given the absolute right to put into it anything they see fit providing it is something that is not absolutely putrid. So far as the actual ingredients of oleomargarine are concerned the consumer knows nothing about them. In regard to the splendid speech delivered by the Minister of Finance, who dilated upon the conditions prevailing throughout the world, let me say that the value of dairy products in the state of Wisconsin in the year 1919 was $144,655,000 and they have this provision in their regulations:

Any person manufacturing, selling, offering or exposing for sale any commodity or substance in imitation or semblance of butter, the product of the dairy, shall be deemed guilty of a violation of this section—

And so on. Note this also:

Under this section if, in the manufacture of any oleomargarine, fats, oils, or other ingredients are selected and used in such proportions as to cause the oleomargarine so manufactured to resemble butter of any shade of yellow, such fats, shall be prima facie evidence in any prosecution under this section that such oleomargarine was manufactured with an intent to deceive or defraud the consumer or purchaser thereof.

What do we provide? We permit manufacturers to colour their oleomargarine and to put it in pound prints the exact size of butter prints, and we allow that product to be sold in the retail stores by the retail merchants of this country. On the other hand in many other countries it is not permitted to be sold in the same retail stores where butter is sold. In France, for instance, the retailing of oleomargarine is not permitted on the same premises in which butter is being sold; and in Wisconsin the name of each ingredient in the oleomargarine must be printed on the container, also each animal or vegetable from

which the fats or oils are derived. Many other states of the American Union have recently passed very stringent regulations with regard to oleomargarine. There is no article of food in which such a great amount of fraud has been perpetrated, and is still being perpetrated as in the case of filled milk and oleomargarine. Consequently I think it would be much more satisfactory and in keeping with good administration in this country if a proper stand had been taken by the Minister of Agriculture and the government on this question. I am satisfied that the Minister of Agriculture realizes the seriousness of the situation, he has given evidence of that, but it appears that his influence with the government has not been sufficient to enable him to get their consent to refusing to take any action and allowing the law to revert to the condition in which it was prior to 1917. We export butter, at an enormous expenditure, to about seventeen different countries to-day. We are in a position to manufacture much more butter than we are manufacturing at present, and it is idle for anyone to argue that what is proposed in regard to oleomargarine is a measure of protection for the consumer, or for the poor of this country. I venture to state that in nine cases out of ten those that are asking for the continuance of the oleomargarine regulations are not those who intend to use the commodity, or have any desire to do so. We have had requests from Lumbermen's Associations and from retail merchants who are anxious to retail oleomargarine at a profit. We have had requests from women's organizations—some of them even in this city—the members of which would not touch oleomargarine if they knew it for anything. These are the people who are so solicitous about the poor of Canada. Nevertheless they are not taking any steps to see that the poor are not being imposed upon, or to put them in a position where they can purchase an article of food and know what they are paying for. It is a deceptive counterfeit which is being placed on the market. If this article is good and wholesome why not come out and let the people know what it contains. Strict regulations are enforced with regard to the manufacture of butter. Is there not a necessity for still more rigid regulations with respect to oleomargarine. I almost feel impelled to speak at length owing to the attitude of the government on this question. I cannot conceive of any government pursuing such a policy as the present government is adopting with regard to oleomargarine. We have had differing statements from various members of the cabinet. They have no mind on the question; they say it is one for parliament to decide. That is something new in the way of parliamentary government in this country. If the government are going to shirk all responsibility for the measures they originate that may possibly account for the length of the session, and for the numerous special committees that are sitting and which have not yet reported. The fact that these committees have not reported precludes the possibility of dealing with many questions which ought to be dealt with, some of them having a direct bearing on this matter. It is all very well to be ruled out of order on the ground that committees have been sitting and hearing evidence but have not yet reported. I venture to state that there are committees which have dealt with every possible thing that will come before parliament during the present session. One committee in particular has taken a stack of evidence, and it will be the end of the session before the report is brought in. In the meantime we cannot do anything until the report is presented. Yet the government continues to sit here day after day refusing to accept the responsibility which belongs to them, and to take a definite stand on this question.

Mr. PUTNAM: Would my hon. friend be in favour of putting into force in Canada regulations corresponding to the Wisconsin regulations?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I would be heartily in favour of it. I have advocated that for years back. Do not permit any milk or milk products to be mixed with other ingredients in view of the strict regulations which are in effect respecting dairy products. Why should it be possible, when dairy products are subject to such strict regulations, 2 a.m. to take those products into some packing houses, manufacture them into an article and place it on the market? Moreover the country to the south of us has placed a tariff barrier of 8 cents a pound on butter. We have also a similar duty on oleomargarine, which is absolutely prohibitive. If this is a good thing for the country and if the people want to use it, let them use it by all means, but let them know what they are doing. Let us put a proper protective tariff on it. It is all very well to talk about protection and free trade. That is a beautiful theory; but it is not a theory with which we are faced in this country, it is an actual condition, and this condition prevails to-day by reason of the tariff which has been erected against us by the United States. We must take action according to conditions with which we are confronted and deal with them

in that way. I am not going to impose on the good nature of the House. There are two amendments. After one is disposed of there will be ample opportunity to speak later.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is moved by Mr. Carroll:

Resolved, that it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend The Oleomargarine Act, chapter twenty-four of the statutes of 1919 (second session), and the amending acts, by providing that notwithstanding anything contained in The Dairy Industry Act, 1914—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Dispense.

Mr. SPEAKER: I cannot dispense.

—or in any other statute or law, the manufacture in, and importation of oleomargarine into Canada, and the offering for sale, the sale and the having in possession for sale, of oleomargarine, shall henceforth be permitted, subject to the provisions of the said Oleomargarine Act and to such regulations as are now or may hereafter be established by the Governor in Council.

It is moved in amendment by Mr. Kay:

That all the words after the word "that" in the first line thereof be struck out and the following substituted therefor,—

"In view of distinct assurances given at the time the prohibition of the importation, manufacture and sale of oleomargarine was suspended by order in council in 1917 under the War Measures Act of 1914, that as such suspension was but temporary and a war measure only it should now be removed and the question left, without prejudice as to its merits, in the same position as before the enactment of the said temporary suspension."

It is moved in amendment to the amendment by Mr. Good:

That the amendment be amended by adding the following words:

"And that the government do before the end of the present session submit to parliament such legislation in the premise as may be deemed advisable."

I do not wish to contravene the wishes of the House when I insist upon putting the question, but the putting of the question is probably the most important function of the Speaker. Of course, at the beginning of the proceedings, when the Speaker orders that the members be called in, the formal reading of a motion may be dispensed with. But when the vote is being taken the Speaker is bound by the rules of the House to put the question.

The House divided on the proposed amendment to the amendment of Mr. Good which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs.

Campbell,
Davies,
Drayton (Sir Henry),
Gardiner,
Garland (Bow River),
Good,
Harris,
Hoey,
Irvine,
Kennedy (Edmonton),
Knox,
Lewis,
Maclean (York),
Macphail,
Shaw,
Speakman,
Spencer,
Stewart (Humboldt),
Tolmie,
Wallace,—20.

NAYS

Messrs.

Archambault,
Bancroft,
Beaubien,
Béland,
Benoit,
Binette,
Bird,
Black (Huron),
Black (Yukon),
Boivin,
Bouchard,
Boucher,
Bourassa,
Bowen,
Boys,
Brethen,
Brown,
Bureau,
Caldwell,
Cannon,
Cardin,
Carmichael,
Carroll,
Carruthers,
Casgrain,
Chaplin,
Charters,
Chevrier,
Chisholm,
Church,
Clark,
Copp,
d'Anjou,
Déchêne,
Delisle,
Denis (St. Denis),
Desaulniers,
Desrochers,
Dickie,
Drummond,
Duff,
Duncan,
Elliott (Dundas),
Elliott (Waterloo),
Euler,
Evans,
Fafard,
Fansher,
Fielding,
Findlay,
Fontaine,
Forke,
Fortier,
Fournier,
Gendron,
Gervais,
Gordon,
Gouin (Sir Lomer),
Gould,
Graham,
Grimmer,
Halbert,
Hanson,
Hatfield,
Healy,
Hodgins,
Hopkins,
Hubbs,
Hudson,
Humphrey,
Jelliff,
Johnston,
Jones,
Kay,
Kellner,
Kennedy (Glengarry & Stormont),
Kennedy (Port Arthur & Kenora),
King (Huron),
King (Kootenay),
Laflamme,
Ladner,
Lanctôt,
Lapierre,
Leader,
Leger,
LeSueur,
Logan,
Lovett,
Lovie,
Lucas,
Macdonald (Pictou),
MacKelvie,
Maclean (Halifax),
MacLean (Prince, P.E.I.),
McBride,
McConica,
McDonald (Timiskaming),
McGiverin,
McIsaac,
McKay,
McKillop,
McMaster,
McTaggart,
Malcolm,
Manion,
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Marcile (Bagot),
Martell,
Maybee,
Meighen,
Michaud,
Millar,
Milne,
Morin,
Morrison,
Morrissy,
Motherwell,
Munro,
Murdock,
Neill,
Ouimet,
Parent,
Pelletier,
Prevost,
Pritchard,
Putnam,
Raymond,
Reed,
Rinfret,
Robb,
Roberge,
Robichaud,

Robinson,
Robitaille,
Ross (Simcoe),
Ryckman,
St. Père,
Sales,
Savard,
Séguin,
Sexsmith,
Sinclair (Oxford),
Sinclair (Queens, P.E.I.),
Spence,
Stansell,
Steedsman,
Stevens,
Stewart (Argenteuil),
Stewart (Hamilton),
Stewart (Leeds),
Stork,
Sutherland,
Thompson,
Thurston,
Tobin,
Vien,
Ward,
Warner,
White,
Wilson,
Woods,
Woodsworth—162.

The House divided on the proposed amendment of Mr. Kay which was carried on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs.

Archambault,
Bancroft,
Beaubien,
Béland,
Benoit,
Binette,
Black (Huron),
Boivin,
Bouchard,
Boucher,
Bourassa,
Bowen,
Boys,
Brethen,
Bureau,
Caldwell,
Campbell,
Cannon,
Cardin,
Carmichael,
Casgrain,
Charters,
Chisholm,
d'Anjou,
Déchêne,
Delisle,
Denis (St. Denis),
Desaulniers,
Desrochers,
Dickie,
Drummond,
Duff,
Duncan,
Elliott (Dundas),
Elliott (Waterloo),
Evans,
Fafard,
Fansher,
Findlay,
Fontaine,
Forke,
Fortier,
Fournier,
Gervais,
Gordon,
Gouin (Sir Lomer),
Gould,
Graham,
Halbert,
Hanson,
Hatfield,
Hodgins,
Hoey,
Hopkins,
Hubbs,
Humphrey,
Jelliff,
Johnston,
Jones,
Kay,
Kellner,
Kennedy (Glengarry & Stormont),
Kennedy (Port Arthur & Kenora),
King (Huron),
King (Kootenay),
Knox,
Laflamme,
Lanctôt,
Leader,
Leger,
Logan,
Lovett,
Lovie,
Lucas,
Macdonald (Pictou),
MacKelvie,
MacLean (Prince, P.E.I.),
Maclean (York),
McBride,
McConica,
McDonald (Timiskaming),
McIsaac,
McKay,
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Marcile (Bagot),
Martell,
Maybee,
Michaud,
Millar,
Morin,
Morrison,
Morrissy,
Motherwell,
Munro,
Neill,
Ouimet,
Parent,
Pelletier,
Pritchard,
Putnam,
Reed,
Robb,
Roberge,
Robichaud,
Robinson,
Robitaille,
Ross (Simcoe),
Sales,
Savard,
Séguin,
Sexsmith,
Speakman,
Stansell,
Stewart (Argenteuil),
Stewart (Humboldt),
Stewart (Leeds),
Stork,
Sutherland,
Thompson,
Thurston
Tobin,
Vien,
Ward,
Warner,
Woods—125.

NAYS

Messrs.

Bird,
Black (Yukon),
Brown,
Carroll,
Carruthers,
Chaplin,
Chevrier,
Church,
Clark,
Copp,
Davies,
Drayton (Sir Henry),
Euler,
Fielding,
Gardiner,
Garland (Bow River),
Good,
Grimmer,
Harris,
Hudson,
Irvine,
Kennedy (Edmonton),
Ladner,
Lapierre,
LeSueur,
Lewis,
Maclean (Halifax),
Macphail,
McGiverin,
McKillop,
McMaster,
McTaggart,
Manion,
Meighen,
Milne,
Murdock,
Prevost,
Raymond,
Rinfret,
Ryckman,
St. Père,
Shaw,
Sinclair (Oxford),
Sinclair (Queens, P.E.I.),
Spence,
Spencer,
Steedsman,
Stevens,
Stewart (Hamilton),
Tolmie,
Wallace,
White,
Wilson,
Woodsworth—54.

PAIRS

(The list of pairs is furnished by the Chief Whips).

Messrs.

Mackenzie King,
Gendron,
Low,
Kyte,
Gauvreau,
Preston,
Simpson,
Garland (Carleton),
Malcolm,
Papineau,
Marler,
Guthrie.

Main motion as amended carried on division.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC DEBENTURE HOLDERS

Mr. FIELDING: The Prime Minister stated that he would lay on the table of the House the representations of the Grand Trunk debenture holders. I now submit the document.

On motion of Mr. Fielding the House adjourned at 2.50 a.m. (Thursday).

Thursday, June 7, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING

Mr. GAUVREAU moved the adoption of the Third Report of the Joint Committee on Printing.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

W. F. WOOD: STEPHEN P. CARNEY

Mr. STEWART (Leeds):

1. Were W. F. Wood and Stephen P. Carney convicted on or about the 17th November, 1922, at Minto, Manitoba, for failure to comply with the Income War Tax Act of 1917?

2. If so, what was the punishment imposed in each case?

3. Have the fines imposed been paid in each case?

4. Has the fine of one of these convicted men been returned along with costs, and the fine of the other convicted man retained?

5. If so, at whose request or at whose representation, written or verbal, were such fine and costs remitted?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING:

1. Yes.

2. Penalty of $50 and costs or, in the alternative, two months in jail.

3. Yes.

4. Yes.

5. Kilgour & Foster, barristers, Brandon, Manitoba.

MILITIA PENSION ACT, AMENDMENT

Hon. E. M. MACDONOLD (Pictou), (Acting Minister of National Defence) moved that the House go into committee at the next sitting to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, (1) That it is expedient to amend the provisions of the Militia Pension Act by providing that the period of service entitling officers, retired compulsorily, to pension, shall be twenty years; and that any officer so retired, who served on active service during the Great War and was appointed to the Force on or after the 1st January, 1919, and prior to 31st December, 1921, and since such appointment has served continuously in the Force for not less than ten years, shall be entitled to pension as provided in section four of the said Act.

(2) That the period of service required of every militiaman to entitle him to pension shall be twenty years, or fifteen years if incapacitated for duty by infirmity of mind or body, and he shall be subject to return to service if he ceases to be incapacitated, and if he has completed fifteen but less than twenty years service, his pension shall be an annual sum equal to one-fiftieth of his annual pay and allowances for every completed year of service.

He said: His Excellency the Governor General, having been informed of the subject matter of the resolution, has given his consent thereto and commends it to the consideration of the House.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Would the minister take this occasion to let us know the exact effect of the resolution, for purposes of discussion?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I have not my memorandum by me, but in a general way I might explain that the original provisions of the Militia Pension Act stipulated that the period of service entitling them to pensions of both officers and men should be twenty years. In 1919, the period was reduced to ten years. It is now proposed to return to the former standard and provide that the service shall be twenty years. It has been found, particularly among non-commissioned officers and men, that many persons have been taking advantage of the shorter period to leave the service in order to secure the pension. I shall be prepared to deal with the matter fully when the resolution is in committee.

Mr. CHURCH: Mr. Speaker, before the motion is adopted—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. There can be no debate on the motion at this stage. When the resolution is in committee the hon. gentleman will, of course, have an opportunity to discuss it.

Motion agreed to.

RETURNED SOLDIERS' INSURANCE

Hon. H. S. BELAND (Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment) moved that the House go into committee at the next sitting to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, That it is expedient to amend The Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act by providing,—

(1) That in any case where an application for insurance under the said Act has been received, and the applicant has died prior to the delivery to him of the policy of insurance, the approval of the application by the proper officer and the receipt of the initial premium shall be deemed to have been sufficient to put the insurance into force, unless it can be shown that the application was fraudulent, and any insurance moneys which would have been payable had the policy been delivered to the applicant shall now be made payable, subject to a deduction of the amount of premium due from the date of application to the date of death.

(2) That any applications which were rejected prior to 1st July, 1922, under any conditions set forth in section 2 of the amending Act of 1922, or the schedule thereto, shall be reviewed, except in cases where the applicant is suffering or has become impaired as a result of self-inflicted wounds or immoral conduct, or where the application was fraudulent, and provision be made to give the right on such review to any applicant now living to insure, and if the applicant has died, the amount of insurance for which he applied shall now be made payable, less the amount which would have been due as premium from the date of application to the date of death, notwithstanding that no effective insurance contract was completed, and provided that the application was approved.

He said: His Excellency the Governor General having been informed of the subject matter of the resolution has given his consent and recommends it to the consideration of the House. I do not know whether any explanation should be forthcoming at this stage,

but I will content myself with saying at the moment that there is a slight deficiency in the phrasing of the second section of the resolution which carries the proviso: "Provided that the application was approved." The meaning intended is, provided a sufficient time has elapsed after the application in order that, in the ordinary course of procedure, it might have had an opportunity of being either approved or rejected. When the resolution is before the House in committee I shall fully explain it.

Mr. SPEAKER: In justice to the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Church) I beg to state that I was in error a minute ago when I ruled him out of order. He is entitled to address the House. Rule 17A is so involved that sometimes I am inclined to make too drastic a decision under it.

Motion agreed to.

DRY DOCK SUBSIDIES

Hon. J. H. KING (Kootenay, Minister of Public Works) moved that the House go into committee at the next sitting to consider the following proposed resolution:

That it is expedient to amend the Dry Dock Subsidies Act, 1910, and amending acts, and to provide that when the amount expended for the work and materials upon a dock of the first or second class shall have equalled seventy-five per cent of the cost thereof, and the Chief Engineer of the Department of Public Works shall have certified thereto, half yearly payments at the rate of four and one-half per cent per annum may be made on ninety per cent of the cost of the work done and materials provided at the time of such payment.

He said: His Excellency the Govenor General has been made conversant with the subject matter of the resolution and recommends it to the consideration of the House.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I think the minister might give an explanation and, if possible, a defence of this resolution. It strikes me as a most remarkable one. It apparently provides that when a certain fraction of a work is done interest may be paid on a much larger fraction. Will the minister intimate to the House the case that is to be affected by this resolution?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): I do not say it is not in order, but it is exceedingly unusual at the first stage of these resolutions to call for an explanation. I should think that in the general interest of the business of the House it is not a desirable practice. I do not want to raise any question of order, but in all my experience I cannot recall a case where an explanation has been called for at the moment the formal motion was made.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Explanations are not very frequently demanded, but they are undoubtedly in order. I am not encouraging the practice, but we are going into Committee of the Whole—

Mr. FIELDING: Not now.

Mr. MEIGHEN: —and will not then have an opportunity to debate the general principle.

Mr. BELAND: A motion will be made to go into Commitee of the Whole at the next sitting, and my right hon. friend will then have an opportunity to speak on the motion.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think my hon. friend is wrong. The motion now is that at the next sitting we go into Committee of the Whole, and the Speaker at the next sitting will simply call the motion and leave the chair.

Mr. BELAND: I submit that the motion has to be formally put by the Speaker, and before he leaves the chair my right hon. friend will have an opportunity to speak as long as he wishes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think my hon. friend is right, because, if so, the motion has no meaning. The motion to-day is, that at the next sitting the House go into Committee of the Whole. If the motion passes now, why should it have to be decided again?

Mr. FIELDING: All the House decides is that it will take up the question for consideration. The present motion does not commit anyone in the least.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Although I have not my notes with me I have no objection to giving a brief explanation of the subject matter of the resolution. It is a simple amendment of the Dry Dock Subsidies Act. The present act allows the payment of 75 per cent of the subsidy when 75 per cent of the work has been done. That is the limitation. As this one work in particular is nearing completion it is found that it would be an advantage to the contracting firm to be allowed to receive 90 per cent of the subsidy instead of 75 per cent. It is not sought in any way to increase the amount of subsidy or the commitments of the government. The amendment does allow certain funds which are appropriated under the act to be used at an earlier date for the construction of the dock. I shall be able to show later that the department is fully secured in the work

already done and that this amendment will not have the effect of imposing any further financial obligation upon the government. I hope to be more fully prepared to explain the amendment to-morrow. But, as I have said, our obligations will not be increased, and therefore I trust the amendment will receive the fair consideration of the House.

Motion agreed to.

OPENING OF BANFF-WINDERMERE HIGHWAY

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. H. C. HOCKEN (West Toronto): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put an inquiry to the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart). In common with other members, I presume, I have to-day received an invitation to attend the opening of the Banff-Windermere Highway on the 30th June. Will the minister give us any assurance that it would be wise for us to accept this invitation?

Hon. CHARLES STEWART (Minister of the Interior): That is largely in the hands of the opposition, I imagine.

HEBRIDEAN IMMIGRANTS

ADJOURNMENT MOTION—MR. SPEAKMAN—TO DISCUSS MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

Mr. ALFRED SPEAKMAN (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, I beg to ask leave, under Rule 39, to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance. The matter which I wish to discuss is the case of a body of Scottish immigrants, recently landed in Canada with the assistance of the Department of Immigration, a large part of whom, to the number of about two hundred, is still camped in a disused school building near the city of Red Deer, Alberta, unable apparently to find an opportunity either to go upon the land or to secure employment. This is a situation in which departmental responsibility is involved is at once a hardship to these people themselves, and is a deterrent to future immigration into this country.

And leave having been granted:

Mr. SPEAKMAN: Mr. Speaker, the House will remember that some time ago a comparatively large party of Scottish immigrants from the Hebridean islands, to the number of between four and five hundred, came to this country. Their advent was advertised extensively throughout the Dominion and, I presume, throughout a good part of the world because the news went through at least the United States and Great Britain. Those people are, I imagine, amongst the most desirable class of immigrants which this country can secure. They were accustomed to hard work; they were industrious, frugal, ambitious, anxious to succeed. They sold their little holdings in these islands and came to Canada. I had an opportunity of meeting a part of that body of men and women as they went through this city on their way to the West, and I can assure you that from personal contact with them I consider them to be a class of citizens of whom Canada might well be proud, a class of citizens who, given a fair opportunity, could be expected to succeed, if anybody could succeed, in this country. They met with some difficulty on the way here. They were delayed through storms on the ocean, through washouts on the railroad and other circumstances over which no one had control and as to which no fault can be attributed to anyone. They might have been pardoned, had they been inclined to take a somewhat gloomy view of this country, but the reverse was the case; when I met these men and women they were filled with hope, filled with optimism, filled with the ambition and the intention to succeed. They went on. They got to my own city of Red Deer, where they were intended to be located and where preparations had been made, to some extent at least, to receive them. A building of some considerable size in the vicinity of that city, which had been used as an Indian Industrial school, had been prepared for their accommodation in order that they might use it as their headquarters, from which they might go to secure the land they were desirous of obtaining and where their wives and families —because the greater number of the men were married men—might remain while the men were in search of land or of employment.

So far things had moved fairly smoothly. But a large number of these people who went there with such high hopes, hopes which were justified by the information they had received, are still in that building and unable to locate themselves upon the land which they had hoped to occupy. A great many of them are without funds, and from information I have received are dependent upon the charity of individuals. I believe that is a circumstance which is the most serious menace to our country that it is possible to conceive. We had a debate here—I am not going to quote from that debate, as I understand it would be against the rules of the House to do so—but we had a debate on immigration, in the course of which the need for immigration

was stressed from all parts of the House. It was pointed out that Canada was a land of opportunity for desirable people who wished to come here. From this part of the House some notes of warning went forth; it was suggested that it was not sufficient to bring these people here, simply to land them in Canada and let them shift for themselves; that if they were brought here, adequate care should be taken to give them a proper opportunity to locate themselves and to build up their homes. Now, that was stressed, and I think, Mr. Speaker, that the situation which has evolved itself has proved the truth of that contention and proved it to the hilt.

There were, as I say, something over four hundred of this desirable class of immigrants many of whom were scattered between here and their ultimate destination, taking up temporary employment in various provinces, but the majority of whom arrived at that city of Red Deer. Their destination was a part of the country which, I consider from my experience, to be a very good section indeed—a place where it is possible, if it is possible anywhere in the province, to succeed; a place largely devoted to mixed farming; a place where there is plenty of water, plenty of rain; a place where growth is usually assured year by year; a place where wood is available; a place pre-eminently suitable for small farmers and homesteaders, for men desirous of working in a concentrated way by putting in part of their time, possibly in assisting their neighbours who are farming on a larger scale—a place, I say, where if they could be properly established, they would have every chance of success.

In the statement which I placed before the House I made the assertion that some departmental responsibility was involved, and I consider, Mr. Speaker, that that assertion was well founded. What are the facts? In the first place this was a small selected body which we had hoped, and the department had hoped, would be the forerunner of a much larger body to come later. Long before these people came the department knew, at least roughly speaking, the number of people that might be expected; they knew that on account of the extensive advertising which had been given to this group of people, upon the reception accorded to them would depend to a large degree at least the success of any future immigration into Canada attempted from that part of the world. In these circumstances it seems to me it is the part of wisdom and common sense that the Department of Immigration should ensure, so far as humanly possible, the success of that detachment. More than that, these people came out here on information which they had received concerning this country. After this somewhat unfortunate situation had arisen, the gentleman in charge of the party was asked who he considered was to blame for what had happened, who was to blame for these people not finding the conditions prevailing here that they had been led to believe they would find when they arrived here. They had been led to believe—and I am not saying they had been so informed directly by the Department of Immigration—that they would find a land where they could get free homesteads within reasonable distance of a railroad, or, as an alternative, where they could purchase land close to a railroad at low prices, on long term payments—terms which would not involve payment during the first one or two years. But when they came here they found the reverse was the case. As I say, the gentleman in charge of this party was asked who was to blame. He was not anxious to attach blame to anyone; he perhaps imputed some blame to himself, having been on the land in the first place to look over the situation. He said the information had been received in various ways, being partly contained in pamphlets furnished to these Hebrideans. He was asked:

Did the Western Canada Colonization Association encourage these men in any way to come to Canada?

And he answered:

Yes; they sent out the pamphlets.

The further question was put:

Is that where these promises of land and homes and passage come from?

To which the answer was, "Yes." Now, it may be said that the government is not responsible for pamphlets issued by the Western Canada Colonization Association, and that might have been said with truth had it not been for the fact that by the granting of a sum of money to that company, the government to all intents and purposes became a co-partner with it in its endeavours. Having become a co-partner in that way, I contend that the department and the government—

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? Will he give me the name of the individual who is giving out this information?

Mr. SPEAKMAN: Certainly. It is Father Macdonell who was primarily responsible for bringing these men out.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Is that direct evidence from Father Macdonell, or is it a newspaper report?

Mr. SPEAKMAN: This is purporting—I had better say that now—to be an interview given in Father Macdonell's own name—

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): That is just what I want to know. It is "purporting" to be an interview. I have not seen an interview given by Father Macdonell, but I am prepared to bring letters from him direct. If my hon. friend will correct that, I am quite prepared to let it go on.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I am prepared to correct it to this extent: That this is information which has been spread over the country in newspaper form. If it is incorrect, I am not going to back the information—

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I want to be clear on that point. Did or did not Father Macdonell give that information?

Mr. SPEAKMAN: Father Macdonell did not give that information direct to me, and I am not going to vouch for its accuracy. I am simply giving it for what it is worth; if it is incorrect the Minister of the Interior will be able when he speaks—

Mr. HOCKEN: What paper is it?

Mr. SPEAKMAN: The Calgary Albertan.

Mr. STEVENS: Is it given as a quotation from Father Macdonell?

Mr. SPEAKMAN: It is quoted. It is in quotation marks as being the direct words of Father Macdonell himself. I am not going to vouch for the accuracy of that. As I said before, if the Minister of Immigration has other information and can show that this interview was not given by Father Macdonell, and that these were not his words, I certainly am prepared to take the minister's word against the newspaper report or against any interview appearing in the public press. But if the facts are as purported to be set out by Father Macdonell, it is very evident that the government and the Department of Immigration cannot escape from that part of the responsibility. I shall not, however, in view of the statement made by the minister now, in view of the fact that he demurs to my using the article in this way—I shall not press that particular point home. As a matter of fact, as far as the purpose of my argument is concerned, it is not necessary; because apart altogether from whether these pamphlets were issued by the Western Canada Colonization Company or not, the fact remains that the Department of Immigration knew these men were coming, and it was the direct duty of the department and of the government to see that correct and accurate information was placed in their hands.

Now, what is the result of that unfortunate situation which had its commencement in inaccurate information sent out in some way or other from this country and placed in those men's hands? The result is this, instead of having the men placed there in a position to be located on the land, in a position where they might go ahead and become self-supporting citizens, become an asset to Canada, become an incentive possibly to future immigration from the same part, these men are now becoming discouraged. That I think cannot be gainsaid. They feel that Canada is not the land which they hoped it was. They feel they have not been given the assistance and encouragement in settlement that they hoped for and believed they had a right to expect they would receive. And the direct result of that is this: It has been stated that some of the speeches made from this side of the House were wrong and should never have been delivered because of the effect they would have throughout the world on intending immigrants, that it was a bad advertisement for Canada, a bad advertisement because we tried to avert this very situation by placing the truth before people before they left their homes to come here, and then allow them to come here and make their homes in this country if they so desired. But, Mr. Speaker, could anything suggested in this House, could anything said by any hon. member of this House, so effectively damn any immigration to this country as the situation itself which has arisen and the publicity that has been given to it—whether that publicity is built on an accurate statement of interviews or not—and the publicity which is being given to the situation through the press of this country and the publicity which will be given and has been given to it in the press of the Old Country? I will say, in order to anticipate any criticism on the part of the Minister of Immigration, that I have not as yet received any papers from the Old Country at home which contain any such statement, but I think you could fairly well say that if a party of Old Country people just arrived here have become discouraged and despondent in any way, they will certainly be acquainting their friends at home with the facts, and another thing, if articles such as this appear in the press of this country they will be copied by those interested in the Old Country. I think we can take that for granted without having seen the articles at all.

Now it may be said that the government or the Department of Immigration cannot assume parental responsibility for the care of these people, that they cannot take these people and act like a father to them and see them located on the land.

Mr. McMURRAY: Has the hon. gentleman other information than the mere newspaper from which he has quoted, or is he just talking, basing his argument on what he has read in a newspaper?

Mr. SPEAKMAN: The hon. gentleman can rest content. I have had letters. I do not purpose reading them, because they were private letters; but they contained this information among other private information. I think the hon. member can take my word for it when I say I have had direct information from people at home with whom I am well acquainted, who have a knowledge of the facts from being on the ground, and for whose character and the accuracy of whose information I can fairly well vouch. But apart from that, I would like the hon. member to notice this: Whether right or wrong these things have gone out to the world through the press of this country, and no contradiction of any kind has been sent out by the Department of Immigration denying the truth of these statements, and it seems to me that if I had nothing to go on but the situation which has arisen from the accounts in the public press, it would still be a matter of public importance to bring it to the attention of this House. If the facts are not as stated here, then it seems to me the remedy is in the hands of the government and of the department, and that it was its duty to put a countervailing article in the press to contradict these things and give the facts as they are.

Mr. MARTELL: Does not my hon. friend think that these men coming from the Hebrides or old Scotland should have been induced by the government or by Father Macdonell, or whoever is bringing them out, to start a new Scotland in the province of Nova Scotia, where they could devote their time to fishing and farming?

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I will leave the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Martell), whose habit of asking questions is growing somewhat upon him, to settle that matter with the Department of Immigration himself.

Mr. MARTELL: That is no answer. The member for Hants is from Nova Scotia.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: Then I leave the member for Hants, if he has a grievance, to take it up with the government and not to take it up with me who am not responsible for the action of the government.

Mr. MARTELL: You are talking about something you do not know anything about.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: Does the hon. member intend to convey the idea that in speaking of the situation which has arisen at Red Deer in the vicinity of my own home town that I am discussing something of which I have no knowledge, or is he simply, as was stated by another hon. member in the House, talking?

Mr. MARTELL: Will my hon. friend permit me? All I have to say is this—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member may not interrupt without the permission of the hon. member who has the floor.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I am not discussing whether the immigrants went to the right place or not. I am not discussing whether the Department of Immigration should have encouraged them to go to Nova Scotia or not. I am discussing the situation which has arisen from the fact that these immigrants have gone into the vicinity of Red Deer in the province of Alberta. I am discussing the situation which has arisen and which at present exists, not any supposititious case.

Before I was interrupted by the hon. member I was speaking of the governmental responsibility involved. I was going on to say that whether the government had any responsibility for the pamphlets placed in these men's hands or not, whether or not these pamphlets were issued by the Western Canada Colonization Company has not very much to do with the main question, which is that the government, knowing these men were coming, should have seen to it that they knew the truth about the country before they set sail, and then having come here the problem before the government was—and they had ample time to prepare for it—to make sure before these people went to any district that they might find some place upon which they might set their feet, some land which they might take up.

We will go a little further. What is going to be the result of the situation which has arisen? Is it not going to be this, that the opinion will go abroad, and will rightly go abroad, that if this Department of Immigration is unable to successfully cope with the problem involved in bringing into Canada a limited number of selected immigrants of the best type, is unable to look after and locate four or five hundred people, then the department and this government cannot successfully cope with any extended immigration policy, cannot bring in, and locate, and in any way assist in settling, any large number of people?

We are faced with a situation with two points of view. In the first place these people are suffering a hardship. They have been brought out to this country, rightly or wrongly, to a part of Canada where they ought to have a chance to achieve success, but they are now in a position where they see their hopes dwindling, where they see the small capital which they had saved in the Old Country disappearing, and when the time of the year they should get on the land is fast going by, and apparently—and I hope to be reassured on that point by the Minister of Agriculture—with no immediate prospects of relief in that direction. Apart from the hardship inflicted on these men what effect is their situation going to have on the men who, it was hoped, would follow them? It was hoped that a much larger number of their relatives and friends would follow them out here; but do you think, in view of the existing situation, in view of the difficulties these men are encountering, in view of the fact that they are unable to locate themselves, do you think for one moment that their relatives or friends, or neighbours will come out here and attempt to locate in Canada? I have noticed one or two editorials written on this subject. I hasten to say at once that I am not going to vouch for the accuracy of the editorials but I presume they reflect, in each case, the opinion of the editor and will be read and believed by at least a large part of the people of this country. The editorial I am about to quote is from the Calgary Albertan:

A couple of hundred Hebrideans, the very best type of new settlers have come from northern Scotland intending to make their homes in this province. They came with great expectations, hoping soon to be located upon their own farms, willing and anxious to make their own way by their own toil. They asked nothing but opportunity. Their hopes have not been realized. They have not been located. They are now living partly on charity in a somewhat congested and uncomfortable way in a large dormitory in or near to Red Deer. They are earning nothing and are eating up their small store.

Some one has blundered.

Who did make the mistake may be an interesting question which can be determined later on. The important problem just now is to get these people satisfactorily settled.

The editorial goes on to point out that the hope was entertained of getting further settlers by reason of the successful settlement of these men, and we come now to this point: Mistakes have been made whether by the Department of Immigration, whether by Father Macdonell, or whether by the men themselves to some extent I do not know at the present time. At any rate, mistakes have been made, this situation has arisen, and I am hoping to hear, later on, what the Department of Immigration intends to do to alleviate the existing condition and to bring in possibly more men of this desirable type. These editorials are being circulated throughout the country. I read another one in a Saskatchewan paper; I am not going to read it but it is practically along the same line. "More blundering" is what they say in the headline and they emphasize what was stated in this House.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): What paper has the hon. member reference to?

Mr. SPEAKMAN: The editorial to which I am now alluding appeared in the Saskatoon Daily Star of June 2nd. It says:

The 300—

The editorial says 300 but the figures are not correct; however the essential part of the editorial is correct.

—sold their holdings in the old land, according to their statement, in the expectation that they would find cultivated homesteads, on easy terms of payment and close to a railroad, awaiting them. Instead of forming a colony, as they had anticipated, they will be scattered. The long term loans promised them will not be forthcoming. They find that cultivated farm land near transportation facilities has a higher value than they believed and that it must be at least partly paid for on occupation.

Something which we who live in this country, which anybody familiar with the country, could have told them before they left the Old Land. Then they could have come prepared to meet those conditions. The editorial is correct.

The Hebrideans will make a success of their venture. No one will say that they do not share the opportunities which are the privilege of every western citizen.

I hope that prophecy is true.

But why were they deceived? Are delusion and overstatement the only means of bringing people to this country? If the truth about western Canada is so unsavory that it cannot be told to a prospective emigrant from the Old World, then the sooner it reverts to the Indians the better.

That is what this editorial says and that is what we contend. We do not say that the country is only fit for Indians, but that if you cannot get settlers here by telling the truth as to the conditions they will find when they get here so that they shall be prepared when they do come to adapt themselves to those conditions, it is far better not to have them come here at all. It would have been far better for them to have stayed in the land from which they came than to have moved to Canada and find themselves in such a mess as they have got into now. Because it is the effect of the experience of these men that

we have got to reckon with in connection with our immigration policy. Now, I have no doubt other hon. members who are interested in this subject will be anxious to take part in this debate. Because of that and because I wish to give the Acting Minister of Immigration and Colonization a fair opportunity of stating the other side of the case from a departmental point of view, and bearing in mind the fact that I shall have an opportunity of closing the debate and concluding my remarks, if I think it necessary, I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your courtesy and take my seat.

Mr. L. H. MARTELL (Hants): Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman I think is out of order, he has already spoken. Or, perhaps, he put a question.

Mr. MARTELL: I put a question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: Then the hon. member may proceed.

Mr. MARTELL: I may say at the outset that I am going to be brief and probably that statement will afford ground for applause. But as a representative of the province of Nova Scotia which, in all matters which are dealt with at Ottawa, may be considered the province that was passed by, I rise to say this: When the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Speakman) referred to Father Macdonell endeavouring to bring emigrants to this country the only mistake made was that they did not locate in the province of Nova Scotia. These people come from the Hebrides, a portion of Scotland where they are used to engaging in divers occupations. If they had come to the province of Nova Scotia they would have an opportunity to fish and also to farm on a small scale. We are not asking for special concessions for the province of Nova Scotia. All that we do ask is this—that in so far as immigrants are concerned the people of that province shall be treated in exactly the same way as other portions of the Dominion. The unfortunate thing in connection with our immigration policy, it seems to me is that when we ask for immigrants they are required to go out to the prairies. Men who are used to fishing, men who are sailors, men who had small places of their own on the ocean shore, are required to go out to western Canada and become progressive farmers; whereas such men as these coming from Scotland should be located in the province of Nova Scotia where they can engage in fishing for certain portions of the year, where they can engage in farming or other occupations, where they are likely to make a success. The most desirable place for people from Scotland is in the old province of Nova Scotia. They hail from old Scotland and it would be well if they settled in new Scotland. I say that although I do not claim to be a Scotchman.

Mr. LEWIS: Have you positions vacant for such men in the province of Nova Scotia at the present time?

Mr. MARTELL: I did not catch the hon. member's question.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would ask hon. members when they put a question to use the third person.

Mr. MARTELL: Repeat your question.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go on.

Mr. MARTELL: My hon. friend seems to entertain the opinion that because he comes from the Old Land he is superior to the people who have been born and reared in the Dominion.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. MARTELL: All I am asking is that when such immigrants as we are referring to are brought to Canada, they should be placed in the Maritime provinces or in the old province of Quebec. If they are settled in these parts of Canada they can rest assured that there are ample opportunities for them to engage in occupations which will yield a good living for themselves and their families without any subsidies from the Dominion government. In Nova Scotia we have a province where diversified industries are carried on; there are all sorts of industries in that province. Any man who is actuated by desire to make a good living for himself and his family, and with a desire to have his family educated, cannot find a better place in the whole live world than the little province of Nova Scotia. My hon. friend from Prince Edward Island might prefer the conditions in his province, but the conditions there are very much the same as ours. We have the finest fruit growing country in the world and the finest fishing—

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion for adjournment for a special purpose gives rise to discussion under well-defined rules. I would call attention of hon. members of the House to paragraph C, subsection 7, rule 39, which says—

The motion must not revive discussion on a matter which has been discussed in the same session.

The discussion on the motion can only be on the lines of the matter of urgent public importance. There are several rulings on this matter. At page 105 of Beauchesne's Parliamentary rules and forms, I find the following:

A motion under this rule must be restricted to a single specific matter of recent occurence; and as the matter to be discussed must be of an urgent nature, no notice should be given of an intention to resort to the motion on a future occasion.

The point is that there is restriction in the debate to the matter which is under consideration. The whole question of immigration cannot be brought up in the discussion. The question introduced on this occasion has been clearly explained by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Speakman) as a matter of urgent public importance. That is the only question before the House. No advertisement of any special province for immigration purposes could be the subject of this debate. I would ask the hon. member to confine his remarks to the question before the House.

Mr. MARTELL: I bow to the ruling, but I think the hon. member for Red Deer in the course of his disquisition was intending to criticize the government for things that occurred in regard to immigration. If I misunderstood it, then I apologize to you Mr Speaker, and bow to your ruling, for which I have the deepest respect. But when the hon. member undertakes to criticize Father Macdonell for what he has done, I wish to say that the province of Nova Scotia would approve of what he has done and would welcome all these immigrants.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: Does the hon. member consider that in my remarks there was any implied criticism of Father Macdonell or any criticism of the government's general immigration policy? I was critcizing this as one direct result of the policy.

Mr. MARTELL: The hon. member is apt to criticize everything the Minister of the Interior does. All I have to say to him is this—and I do not want to get away from the question before the House—that the people of Canada are absolutely
4 p.m. satisfied with what the minister is doing. He is doing his best and no man can do more, as the saying goes. My hon. friend could not be satisfied with anything the Minister of the Interior did at all. Now Mr. Speaker, I am not going to discuss this matter. But seeing that my hon. friends opposite are somewhat selfish in their interests, all I have to say is that, irrespective of what the motion may be, if the rest of this country are not prepared to take Father Macdonell's immigrants, the county of Hants—I need not say anything about Nova Scotia—will take them all, because they are sturdy highlanders and are quite willing and able to make their living in any sphere of life in which God may place them. I have nothing more to say beyond this, that I want the whole question considered on its merits. And when the hon. member undertakes to move the adjournment of the House to discuss a matter of urgent public importance, I think he should have something of greater interest than the discussion of something that pertains simply to the particular constituency of Red Deer, where he wants people to settle, but he does not want the proper people to go there.

Mr. H. C. HOCKEN (West Toronto): Before the minister replies, I wish to put a question which he might answer. I have been fully informed by the friends of Father Macdonell as to his whole plan, and I am very much surprised to hear the information that has been given to us by the hon. member for Red Deer. The minister will remember that an important delegation waited upon him, including the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Boivin), the member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Carroll) and some others, and laid down a plan for taking care of the men whom Father Macdonell was bringing over. I think the information given to the minister was that an organization had been completed clear across the continent, so that those men who are coming out under his auspices would be taken care of perhaps better than any other group of immigrants that have ever come to Canada, I would like the minister, when he replies to the question put by the hon. member for Red Deer, to tell us whether this organization that Father Macdonell created has fallen to pieces, or whether he still hopes to make it operative, so that the men he brings out will be taken care of as he promised, as we all hope they will be; and if he will fulfil his part of the undertaking that he entered into with the Minister of the Interior.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Will the hon. member for West Toronto be just a trifle more explicit, because unfortunately there are many schemes that come up and get into the hands of men who are anxious about immigration, and they listen to them and unfortunately make use of them; and then they do not materialize. Did my hon. friend have reference to the scheme suggested by the Catholic organizations for the loaning of money to these men? I am not just clear on that.

Mr. HOCKEN: As I understand it, Father Macdonell laid before the minister a plan by which he would have an organization represented at every point across the continent, and this organization would undertake to look after these people in co-operation with himself, and perhaps with the Department of the Interior. Does the minister not remember that plan being outlined to him by Father Macdonell?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I cannot say that I remember the plan the hon. member has referred to.

Mr. HOCKEN: I have it from a very close friend of Father Macdonell that that was done, and that the full details of his plan were submitted to the minister and approved by him. If I have been misinformed, I do not implicate the minister. But what surprised me was to hear that these Hebrideans, of all the immigrants that have ever come to Canada, have got into trouble of any kind, because I understood they were coming out with the most complete form of organization to take care of them that had ever been created in Canada for such a purpose.

Hon. CHARLES STEWART (Argenteuil, Acting Minister of Immigration): I have no knowledge of any definite scheme of the character the hon. member has described. True, Father Macdonell has made representations to organizations that were sympathetic for the purpose of securing money to loan, to establish his immigrants upon land, and they had made considerable progress. I cannot say that it is fulfilled, because outside of having a knowledge of it, I was not consulted about the matter particularly further than that I knew it was a general scheme of loaning money to establish newcomers on land by an organization interested in their welfare; but as to the scheme suggested by my hon. friend, I must confess I did not hear it, because when I became acquainted with Father Macdonell he was bringing people to Ontario and establishing them on farms, and they were being brought from the very locality in which those settlers who are now located at Red Deer were recruited. He seemed to be achieving considerable success, and was anxious to branch out in a larger way. I say frankly that, so far as my knowledge goes. Father Macdonell is one of the most successful colonizers we have working to-day in behalf of immigration and colonization. I shall deal briefly with the question raised by my hon. friend in reference to this party of Hebrideans who have come to Canada under the auspices of the Rev. Father Macdonell and the Rev. Father MacIntyre. My hon. friend has laid considerable stress on the advertising generally which induced these people to come to Canada, and he declares that he cannot but hold the Department of Immigration responsible for that publicity. Very well; so far so good. I may say to my hon. friend and to the House too, that this is a matter of which I have been somewhat apprehensive myself. I do not think that we can possibly exercise too great care in controlling the advertising matter sent out, and I would not say for a moment that copies of the scheme of settlement of the Canada Colonization Association did not reach these settlers. I will say, however, and say it most emphatically, that never at any time did the Canada Colonization Association have anything to do with the movement of that party, apart from discussing with Father Macdonell the possibility of their assistance. And if the scheme of the Canada Colonization Association got to Scotland, if copies of it reached the hands of these settlers, it may have been carried to them by the party who came here last summer, who are now associated with these settlers, and who, I take it, would give first-hand information with regard to what they have seen in Canada. In order that the people might have an accurate knowledge of the conditions in Canada, I have been pleased on every occasion to place at the disposal of the representatives of settlers, in any locality on the continent or in Great Britain, who desired to look the situation over, every facility to study conditions in this country. Last year the Holland government sent a representative directly representing it in the person of Baron Sandberg, who travelled through Canada, being in charge of immigration work for the authorities in Holland. He gained information at first hand and from actual observation while in Canada. The government of Italy sent out Miss Garibaldi who travelled throughout Canada and carried back to her country personal knowledge of conditions here. The government of Switzerland was represented by Mr. Fitz Beck, who went from one part of this country to the other investigating, on his own behalf, conditions as they actually exist in Canada. And I know of no better way for the people who intend to come to this country to get information than from their own representatives who are engaged in the work of immigration and colonization and who come here to investigate matters for themselves.

The Immigration department cannot be responsible for all sorts of representations that

are made regarding conditions in Canada—that is an utter impossibility. There are thousands of people interested in selling land in Canada; there are private individuals who are anxious to further sales. Why, I was so eager to ascertain from my hon friend from Red Deer (Mr. Speakman) whether Father Macdonell had really made the statements attributed to him in the press, why I wished to nail the allegations down, was simply because I myself have been constantly in touch with Father Macdonell with respect to the difficulties he has experienced at Red Deer. Last year, in common with the other persons I have referred to, four farmers from Barra and South Uist, from which these settlers come, visited Canada under the auspices of Father Macdonell and travelled through the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, carrying out a thorough investigation. And they are four members of the present party who are here to-day.

Now, I am willing to assume all the responsibility that my hon. friends would place upon me, and I have taken the greatest precautions to see that those people who are coming to Canada as immigrants shall be given exact information as to the conditions they may expect. But there is one unfortunate circumstance that we must take note of, and that is the fact that too many decided to come at once. Let me state, however, that more than half of these people are comfortably settled; more than half of them have been established since coming to Canada, and twelve families of them will be settled in the next day or two at Westlock and twelve more at Ohaton. I say most emphatically, Mr. Speaker, that there is not a particle of criticism coming to the department or any of its officials in connection with this matter, and I defy hon. gentlemen, either on this side of the House or on the other, or anywhere else for that matter, to adduce any definite evidence to show that on a single occasion we have failed to carry out to the fullest extent any promise we made with respect to the settlement of these people. At their disposal have been placed two of the soldier settlement inspectors, and Mr. Boyd, the superintendent in charge of western Canada, has been on the ground ever since they arrived, offering whatever assistance is within his power. Furthermore, because these people are largely of the Roman Catholic faith, I apealed directly to the Bishop of Edmonton, who is interested in their settlement, and who accordingly has sent a representative to work in conjunction with us in the endeavour properly to establish them. I firmly declare that a large part of the discontent that has arisen among some of these people who are not already settled has been engendered through influence from outside sources, by persons who are not responsible. Such persons go to these settlers and suggest that they should be on free homestead land. God knows, Mr. Speaker, I should be delighted to put them on homesteads if I could; and we did secure positions at Winnipeg and elsewhere, for all those who desired to take them. But these people are anxious to settle in a colony, which is natural, of course; and this is one of the difficulties we have to cope with. I want to assure the House quite positively that I have no complaint to make concerning them. They are a splendid type of people and I trust we shall be able to assist them to adapt themselves completely to their new surroundings. Naturally, however, this is somewhat difficult of achievement just yet; they are in a strange country and in a new environment. If any one of us were transplanted into such changed conditions and new atmosphere we should certainly be homesick for a while.

I might state at this stage that the abandoned buildings and land at Red Deer, of the old Indian school, which was utilized for some years for the training of soldiers who were to be placed on the land, we have now equipped and placed at the disposal of the settlers that they might be comfortable. The four farmers who came here last year, after looking the country over, decided that, from the standpoint of the settlers, the broken country was preferable to the park-like localities. The broken country was perhaps more akin to the land from which they were coming. But these four representatives were delighted with the land; I know, because they were in my office and had a personal conversation with me before going back to Scotland. I do not know that anything else could have been done by us. I do not think we have left undone anything that we might have done. It is true that not all the women and children have been moved from the Red Deer headquarters to their homes on which the men have been established. That has taken some time, and will take some time yet. Probably it will be July 1 before the last members of the party are settled. But the fact that they have found the land perhaps higher in price than they had been led to believe; the probability that stories had been told them that inspired the expectation that there were homes that they could walk into; and the further fact that they have no live stock and little or no capital, have all had a tendency to create a feeling of unrest among them.

Then, when they are told: "You should not be established in this way, you should go on

a homestead," they become absolutely dissatisfied. Let me ask my hon. friends who have gone through the homesteading experience in western Canada: Is it a good thing to take a stranger who has no money and place him with his wife and perhaps seven or eight children thirty or forty miles away on a prairie homestead? What earthly chance would he and his family have? I do not believe that that is the proper way to encourage people to come into this country. But there are others who hold the contrary view and say to these newcomers, "You should not take this load of indebtedness upon your shoulders, rather you should secure a grant of land."

We have been endeavouring to give these immigrants the best possible advice, we have placed at their disposal our officials, trained in the business of settling people on the land, and we are leaving no stone unturned to make them comfortable and happy. To be frank, when I heard that 416 souls were coming out together I had doubts about the advisability of so many coming in one party. I do not think they should come in parties of more than 25, which is about the size we can handle most satisfactorily. I do not wish it to be inferred that every new settler will be given the same personal assistance that we are giving to this particular body of immigrants, for I do not think the government could afford to do so, but inasmuch as I believe in what my hon. friend has said, that the best propagandist you can have is a satisfied settler, I have deemed it advisable to see that everything humanly possible should be done by our officials to settle these people comfortably and satisfactorily. Not only that, but I sent Mr. Black, the deputy minister of the department, to Red Deer in order that he might bring to me firsthand information of what is going on, although we are in daily communication with our officials who are already there. I have his wire, sent yesterday, in which he states:

Settlement Hebridean party proceeding satisfactorily. Utmost assistance consistent with their ultimate welfare being given.

I expect to receive a detailed report from Mr. Black within the next day or two, but from what I have heard from Father Macdonell he expects to have every one of these people comfortably settled upon the land.

I do not say for a single moment that there are not some members of this party who have become dissatisfied. They are extremely desirous of settling in a solid community. I need only repeat what I have said on many other occasions, that I am not particularly favourable to such a settlement. I think a man has a better chance of success if he will go in amongst people who know the country and how to take advantage of the local conditions. In this way newcomers quickly learn to adapt themselves to their new environment and are much better off among those already settled on the land than in a solid community of their own people where they are likely to be constantly meeting and discussing real or imaginary grievances, which has a tendency to make them dissatisfied with their new home. Our officials are endeavouring to settle these people in the way I have suggested and to settle them comfortably. True, these newcomers have not very much money, and I am well aware that they will have a somewhat trying time at the start, as all new settlers do; probably they will go through the same experience that many of us went through—many a night I slept under the wagon when I could not get to my house, and I did not have a very comfortable house at that—and I am not speaking of something I do not know anything about. But, unfortunately, if people are encouraged to think they are coming to a bed of roses, that everything is going to be made easy for them and that they will have no difficulties to overcome, there is bound to be trouble and disappointment.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I say most emphatically that nothing has been left undone in our efforts to help these people. We have kept constantly in touch with the situation. Some newspapers are prone to spread propaganda rather than take the trouble to investigate the facts. To say that we are not having difficulties would be a stretch of the imagination. Of course we are having difficulties, and I expect to have more, in fact we are bound to have difficulties as long as we are engaged in this work; but I have no apologies to make on behalf of the men in the Department of Immigration for the way in which they have handled the four hundred Hebridean immigrants to this country.

Mr. ROBERT FORKE (Brandon): Mr. Speaker, as a Scottish immigrant I may be allowed to engage in this discussion. Although I know very well that the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Speakman) is anxious for the welfare and prosperity of these immigrants, I was glad to see the minister (Mr. Stewart) reply with such vigour, because it may be that he has not been getting just exactly fair play. I quite agree with what he says as to the difficulties newcomers will have to surmount, the trials they will have to undergo and perhaps the heartaches they will have to suffer, before they succeed. But I am not saying this to

let the Department of Immigration down easily, because I do believe they need to be very critical of the class of people they bring into this country and to be very careful to look after them thoroughly once they reach here. My only reason for speaking is that I have on my desk a few lines which seem to me appropriate in connection with what the Minister of Immigration said about the heartaches and homesickness of these new immigrants, and I now quote them:

> From the lone sheiling of the misty Island;
> Mountains divide us, and the waste of seas;
> Yet still the blood is strong, the heart is Highland,
> And we in dreams behold the Hebrides.
> Fair these broad meads—the hoary woods are grand,
> But we are exiles from our fathers' land.

That portrays faithfully the feelings of these people. I am not a Highlander myself, but I know a little about the Highland temperament. The Highlander has a poetic temperament, and I know very well that when he comes to Canada he is very apt to get just a little downhearted amid his strange surroundings. On the other hand there is a resilience in the Highland nature that will quickly come on the rebound, and I am confident that you will find these men and women making good in the not very far distant future. From the way in which the minister has spoken to-day I am sure he will see to it that his department does everything possible to assist these immigrants, and I can only hope that they will become so well satisfied in their new homes that there will be a continual stream of these Highlanders coming to Canada—the Scotland of North America.

Mr. A. E. ROSS (Kingston): Mr. Speaker, I am quite satisfied that the department has done a great deal for these immigrants, but I think it should have gone somewhat further with advice. There is one side of this matter that perhaps some hon. members may not know. These immigrants come from the island of Lewis, and some of us are aware that this island was purchased, some years ago by Lord Leverhulme, who ever since has been endeavouring to get these people to fish or to emigrate. He believes that they should go to work and fish in the interests of Lord Leverhulme, who at the present time is trying to establish fish markets for his particular benefit, having already acquired control of the manufacture of soap in the Old Country. Therefore he is telling these people to move off to the coast and fish in his interests or get out of the island. That is another side of the matter which should interest parliament, and I would therefore ask the minister to put forth every possible effort to see that these people are suitably settled in this country. They are the people who have supplied their full quota of sailors to the British navy, they are loyalists to the extreme and make the very best class of citizens. I cannot understand their spirit if they are giving up now or becoming disheartened; that is not a quality that can be attributed to the Scottish people of the past. I believe that if these people are given support and encouragement they will make good. But like the member for Hants (Mr. Martell) I think that a mistake has been made. You cannot take the men of that part of the Highlands which are close to the sea, close to the smell of the water, and put them out on a plain and expect them to make good. They will in time drift to the water or to their compatriots; and if there is any trouble now it will be to the interest of this country for the department to assist these people and place them where they will be situated close to their compatriots. I appeal on behalf of Father Macdonell, who was with us in the service at the front, who is an enthusiastic Scot and a Briton, and who is seeking only to see that these people are comfortably established. I have no doubt that he knows well the history of the people on that island and he will endeavour to see that those who come here are placed in this country where they will make good. These facts are worth bringing to the attention of the minister, and I hope he will see that if these people are not satisfied at Red Deer they will be taken to some other part of the country and placed where they will make good rather than be permitted to go to the United States.

Hon. W. R. MOTHERWELL (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Speakman) thought it necessary to move the adjournment of the House to discuss a subject based upon an alleged interview in a newspaper as responsible—or as irresponsible, if you choose to put it that way—as the Calgary Albertan. We all want immigration; is this the way to get it? It looks to me as if my good friend the member for Red Deer was looking for trouble rather than an alleviation of trouble. His whole attitude, the tone that he adopted, bespoke a belligerency that perhaps he did not intend. His intimation that these settlers are discouraged is not a surprise to me. If my hon. friend makes speeches out in Red Deer the way he does in this House and the way some other hon. members from Alberta do, then I am not surprised that these settlers get discouraged. I was an im-

migrant to that western country; I went from Portage la Prairie when there was not a foot of railway between that place and the Pacific. I know how easy it is to discourage immigrants. I know that people who went out there often started back, homesick; possibly it was the first time they had ever left their home fireside. When these Hebrideans, with a strong attachment for their fireside and their country, finding themselves for the first time in a strange land, are told yarns such as are floating round in the newspapers of Alberta, is it any wonder that they are discouraged? As a matter of fact, I have been expecting exactly this thing to happen ever since I heard that these splendid Scottish settlers had gone to Red Deer. What is the nature of the environment there; what is the atmosphere with respect to immigration? What is the attitude of the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Garland) and of the hon. member for Battle river (Mr. Spencer) with respect to immigration? Have they encouraged immigrants to go there? Have they held out to them the right hand of fellowship when they got there? What has been their general attitude? If these immigrants have read some of the speeches made by the hon. member for Bow River or the hon. member for Red Deer, it is no wonder they have the blues and feel like going back to Scotland. Until hon. gentlemen from Alberta take a different attitude toward immigration and toward these various questions that arise, they are going to be a long while settling the plains of the West from any source whatever.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): Will the minister permit a question? He has suggested that the result of some speeches made by members from Alberta has been to discourage immigrants. Is it not likely that the rosy speeches made by Mr. Duncan Marshall in the Old Country, when he was describing conditions in Alberta, and then the actual conditions that the people found when they got there, have been more likely to cause discouragement than any attempt on the part of hon. members from Alberta to portray the facts?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I did not see any statement by Mr. Duncan Marshall to the effect that my hon. friend describes. If he will let me know what the statements were —I know he was run over by a steer or something of that kind; is that what my hon. friend refers to?

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): I was referring to the fact that in the literature of the Western Canada Colonization Association it was stated that Mr. Duncan Marshall was over in the Old Land drumming for settlers.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I do not know what my hon. friend is driving at; it seems to me he is pretty hard put to it for something to chew about. The hon. member for Red Deer asked the question, can the government be relied upon to engage in any considerable scheme of immigration? And he based that question upon an alleged interview published in a newspaper. There is no question that the remarks of the hon. member for Red Deer, whether they were so intended or not, could not be accepted in any other way than as a straight attack upon the Department of the Interior. I think the whole incident has been most disgraceful, Mr. Speaker. We will never get anywhere in the development of our country and the settling of unoccupied lands if this kind of attitude is taken by hon. members. And I would point out that arguments of this kind are made in connection with the first effort of any considerable proportion to place first-class settlers in a first-class district in the province of Alberta.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that the hon. gentleman shall have leave to withdraw his motion?

Mr. SPEAKMAN: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no reply; it is a motion for adjournment, not a substantive motion.

Mr. D. F. KELLNER (East Edmonton): Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the two ministers who have spoken upon their consistency in the matter of government policy. They have tried to convey to the House the impression that there is practically nothing the matter with these immigrants who are stranded in Alberta; that this is purely a case where some members of the House wish to criticize the government. I think the Minister of Immigration (Mr. Stewart) before he concluded his remarks admitted that he had some information from Alberta to the effect that these immigrants were not wholly satisfied with the conditions. Now the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) rises and states that this subject has been brought up, not with a desire to better conditions, but purely for the purpose of criticizing the present administration. I think that statement is wholly unfair; I am convinced that the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Speakman) brought this matter to the attention of the House and of the government with the sole desire of bringing some relief to those who

are in the position that has been described. The minister should be sufficiently familiar with western conditions to know that immigrants cannot be brought into this country and left there without any further attention unless they have a considerable sum of money —that is, if they hope to make good. I would ask him how it is that the Western Canada Colonization Association, which this government is backing, are not taking charge of these men and seeing that they are properly located. As I understand it, that is a duty they are supposed to fulfil under the contract they have entered into with the government.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The hon. member has asked me a question and I would like to answer it. No such undertaking is in the contract. The Western Canada Colonization Association wish to bring in immigrants and settle them on the land. They are inducing them to come to this country. These people came to Canada upon the understanding that the services of the Soldier Settlement Board would be placed at their disposal. If I might be permitted to say so, Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but think there is an attempt being made to try to blacken this immigration scheme because of the fact that some bad advertising or so-called bad advertising of the Canada Colonization has been promulgated in this House and this particular immigration is being tied up with it. Let me say to my hon. friend that the Canada Colonization has nothing to do with this. I want to reiterate that; I have said it before. If there was any connection at all, it was the pamphlets that my hon. friend speaks about. I have no knowledge of them. These men may have seen these pamphlets in Scotland, but never at any time was there any connection between this party and the Canada Colonization.

Mr. KELLNER: Possibly I did not understand the Minister of Immigration correctly. If they had no association with this enterprise, far be it from me to try and attach any responsibility to them. However, I think the minister will admit this, that if we are going to have agents in Europe encouraging people to come to Canada, most assuredly we must have agents in western Canada to look after them when they get here. I cannot see how there is any prospect of them making good and I think the minister himself is well enough acquainted with conditions in that part of the country to know that there is no prospect of them making good unless there is someone there to encourage them and assist in their settlement when they arrive.

[Mr. Kellner.]

Mr STEWART (Argenteuil): Would the hon. member suggest any better agency than the agency which was placed at their disposal, the trained field men of the Soldier Settlement Board?

Mr. KELLNER: I would like to inform the minister that any agency which is not satisfactory could hardly be said to be a very efficient one.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Does the hon. member make the statement that they are unsatisfactory?

Mr. KELLNER: Most assuredly, if we are to believe these reports, that is the only conclusion we can arrive at. I think the minister himself said that he had information that the conditions were not satisfactory.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I must contradict this. I do not want to interrupt, but I cannot sit still and allow such a statement to be made. If any hon. gentleman got that impression from my remarks I must take occasion to correct him. What I said was that some of the members of this party were not satisfied, and I thought that was to be expected, but I did not say that I knew of widespread dissatisfaction.

Mr. KELLNER: The only difference between the minister and myself is that the minister assumed that I said that one hundred per cent of them were dissatisfied, and he admits that his information is that some of them probably are not satisfied.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I will go further than that and say that I have definite information that 5 out of 416 are not satisfied. Is that good enough?

Mr. KELLNER: The whole situation as I see it is not one for us to get into an argument over here in this House. If the minister claims that conditions are as good as we can reasonably expect, then for my part I am willing to accept that. But if these people need some special attention, I believe it is well that we should discuss it in the House, and that the government should accept the responsibility and see if they cannot relieve the situation. I have no desire in any way to criticize the minister unfairly or to get him in wrong, if I may use the expression, in the portion of the country from which he comes, but if an unsatisfactory condition does exist I think he should be anxious to lend his assistance and that of the department in an endeavour to remedy it.

I was about to say when I was last interrupted, that if we are going to have agents in Europe to encourage people to come here, in my hum-

ble opinion it is necessary to have agents in the West to look after them when they arrive. There was a time several years ago when our two hon. ministers who have spoken homesteaded in the West. Homesteading then could be done very cheaply. But that day is past. The cost of equipment and of living while they are waiting to be settled has greatly increased, the cost of the land has increased, and unless these people have a considerable sum of money with them there is no prospect so far as I can see for them to immediately settle on the land and make good; and unless the department is prepared to have some organization that will take care of these people for the first few months I cannot see any prospect of evading this trouble. I would appeal to the minister, unless he is entirely convinced that conditions are not as represented in that press report, that he lend his influence and the influence of his department to making the conditions at least somewhat better than they are.

Hon. E. M. MACDONALD (Acting Minister of National Defence): I shall not detain the House more than a few moments. I happen to be a son of the Macdonalds of the Hebrides islands. My forefathers came to this country 160 years ago. They came to what was then an unknown land. They landed in Nova Scotia and they had no buildings prepared for them; the land was not ready for the plough; they had to go into the forest and cut down the trees to build their houses. Then they had to clear the land. Day by day and year by year hundreds of these men and women endured these hardships. Then there came in a continuous stream of other men from the Hebrides and the Western islands and peopled the whole of eastern Nova Scotia. The men who came in after years had to go through all these privations that the first settlers endured. There was nobody there representing the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment or any other governmental institution to look after them when they arrived. They fought their way along and they gave to Canada, to the church and along educational lines the leading men of the Dominion for the last seventy-five years. There are more men and women speaking Gaelic in eastern Nova Scotia than there are in the whole Western islands to-day. This year, within a month, we are celebrating the 150th anniversary of the landing of these first Scotch settlers in the town where I have the honour to live and the county I have the honour to represent. I mention this fact because as one who has read the history of the privations of these men and women and the story of their wonderful achievement, I sometimes wonder whether the men of this twentieth century are built of the same fibre as the stalwart men and women of one hundred and fifty years ago, and I would ask the House in considering the situation of these sons of the Hebrides who have come here in these later days to make a comparison in some slight degree between the difficulties they may be undergoing for the moment and the hardships which their fellow-clansmen endured and the difficulties they overcame over one hundred and fifty years ago.

I had the pleasure of meeting Father Macdonell on his way to the West, I had not had the opportunity of meeting him before. I discussed with him, being a Highlander myself, the story of the Macdonald highlanders and the genus of the race from which he and the men whom he was taking to the West sprang. I pointed out to him that, as the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Ross) has said, the Highlander is naturally a mystic. He is born under the conditions outlined in the poem which the leader of the Progressive party (Mr. Forke) so aptly quoted, and it is under such conditions that the genus of the race has developed. When these people are transplanted to the foothills of the Rockies, knowing the sentiments they entertain towards the land of their forefathers, transplanted into a community which is utterly foreign and where conditions are vastly different from those they have been accustomed to from boyhood—

Mr. McISAAC: And a dry province.

Mr. MACDONALD: —I can understand something of the strangeness and perhaps a little irritation that they feel for the moment. My hon. friend suggests it is the absence of the beverage to which they have been accustomed. Well, at least there will be a lack of something out there to cheer them in their dull hours and pessimistic moments. I am sure it would only be fair on the part of the hon. member for Red Deer—in view of the explanation which has been given by the minister, and which indicated that the solicitude of the department and the interest of the government is to see that these sons of old Scotland who have come to the Dominion and gone out to that western land shall be given every possible attention—to withdraw his motion.

Hon. R. J. MANION (Fort William and Rainy River): I wish to make a few observations on this question because it illustrates to me, and I think will illustrate to the House,

the great necessity of taking better care of immigrants when they come to this country than has been the policy of governments of the past. Unfortunately, we have been in the habit in Canada of inviting people to come and settle on the land, and we have allowed them to enter our ports and then left them to look after themselves. Now, no better class of emigrants can come to this country than people from Scotland, and in this connection I wish to draw attention to a statement I noticed in the press this morning from Mr. Woods, an editor of Alberta. I know nothing about this gentleman's politics, or anything of that sort, but he condemns Canada very severely. He has just returned from a trip to the Old Land and he condemns Canada very severely for not taking her proper place in looking after just such settlers as these, settlers from Scotland; in not attempting to get enough of them in comparison with the attempts being made by Australia and New Zealand. And he goes on to make the statement that to-day in the British Isles, Australia has taken the foremost position which Canada occupied up till very recently in the estimation of the people of Britain, because of the lack of energy that we have shown in going after and getting British emigrants for this country, which lack of energy he claims has been particularly shown at the present time. However, it is not that I wish to point out, I wish to impress upon the government that the utmost should be done when we get immigrants to come to this country to look after them on their arrival. The old methods of the past—and all governments pursued those methods—cannot be followed at the present time in this country. Canada must in the future when she gets immigrants—

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I would like to say this to my hon. friend: Mr. Woods is a personal friend of mine, and I had the pleasure of seeing him in my office on his way home. I would not interrupt my hon. friend except for one thing and that is his attributing to Mr. Woods the statement that we were still behind in our immigration propaganda in the Old Land. I am sorry Mr. Woods should have stated that because he gave me a different impression while in my office, namely, that once we had been behind in the matter of immigration but we were now in a much better position.

Mr. MANION: I was merely quoting Mr Woods to this effect—the statement must have been given out yesterday to the press because it was published in this morning's paper—that Canada had lost the foremost position which she occupied because of her lack of energy in going after these emigrants. I am not saying this particularly to criticize my hon. friend the minister at all; I know he is in a difficult position. But I think we have not been showing the energy in this country in getting immigrants which we should have shown. I think particularly we are not showing energy, and have never shown energy in this country, in looking after the immigrants when they have arrived. Now, while the facts in this case may not be absolutely as reported by the press, I think the hon. member for Red Deer has done a service in bringing the matter before the House, inasmuch as it will impress upon the present government—because they are the men in power—that when immigrants come here they must be taken care of on their arrival and helped to select proper lands on which to locate. I believe that is the most important feature, perhaps, in connection with our policy—the looking after the immigrants on their arrival in Canada. I just wished to emphasize that, because although I have listened to other speakers I did not notice any of them emphasizing the point as strongly as I am attempting to do. I think it is our duty to do everything in our power to look after these people, no matter where they come from, providing we invite them to come and settle in Canada.

Mr. FIELDING: As to the comparison made between Australia and Canada, I may say that when I was in England a short time ago, I read in the public press bitter complaints of some of these persons who had been gathered up and sent out to Australia—they complained bitterly of the treatment they had received. I am not endorsing the complaints, I only mention the fact to illustrate that we cannot always satisfy immigrants. The Australian government, I am sure, has acted for the best, I have no desire to reflect upon them; but you will always find some people who discover things are not just as they expected to find them and who therefore will make complaints.

Mr. MANION: I do not doubt that at all—if I may say a word in reply,—in fact the statement is absolutely correct. No matter what class of immigrants you get you will have some who are not satisfied, you cannot hope to satisfy everybody. But the fact remains that according to the press reports in England—and I put on Hansard a statement from the London Times—Australia surpasses us to a very great extent and so do some

of the other dominions in getting immigrants from the Old Land. So that apparently we are not as successful as we might be in so far as getting immigrants are concerned.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): If I may say so, if my hon. friend will look up the statistics for this year he will find the situation is quite satisfactory.

Mr. PUTNAM: What would my hon. friend suggest this government could do which Australia is doing, of a feasible character?

Mr. MANION: Mr. Speaker, I do not know exactly what Australia is doing, but I will say this: Mr. Ormsby-Gore, one of the prominent members of the government of England, recently put on record in the English Hansard the statement that Canada was not taking advantage of the Empire Settlement organization to the extent that Australia was. I placed that statement upon the Hansard of this House, and I need not now go into the details. I read that statement in the hearing of the minister and he did not deny it, he simply said that the government were making plans to correct that situation in the near future. Having quoted that statement from Mr. Ormsby-Gore I think, perhaps, that meets the case without going into the whys and wherefores as to the facts.

Mr. PUTNAM: We have to guard ourselves in the matter of relevancy—

Mr. SPEAKER: I must draw the attention of hon. members on both sides to the fact that we are not in the committee stage. This is a motion for the adjournment of the House in order to discuss a matter of urgent public importance, and the debate must therefore be confined to the matter at issue.

Mr. G. A. BRETHEN (East Peterborough): I was a little surprised at the attitude of the minister and the manner in which he received the criticism which has been offered. If the facts as reported in the press are correct, I think it is only a matter of simple justice that the case of these men should be looked into by the Acting Minister of Immigration. If the statements are incorrect they should be denied. Some of these settlers have been placed in our neighbourhood in the province of Ontario, within the last couple of months, under the direction of the Ontario Department of Agriculture. In conversation with the farmers who are employing these men they give the very highest recommendation of the qualifications for service. One farmer in particular, only a couple of weeks ago, stated to me that the man he had employed was one of the finest hands he had ever had in his service. The only difficulty the farmers encountered was that of understanding the language of their help because they use the Gaelic. These men are doing good service and they are happy and contented.

Mr. SPEAKER: I hope the hon. gentleman will not wander from the main question.

Mr. BRETHEN: I am just coming to that, Mr. Speaker. If these men are satisfied, careful and contented and are giving good service in Ontario, then, in view of the fact that they are men of the same breed and from the same islands—practically they belong to the same party as the settlers in the West—I cannot understand, unless there is something radically wrong with the conditions, that we should find them so dissatisfied at Red Deer. I think the criticism that has been offered is well worthy of the attention of the minister. I hope either that something will be done to correct these statements if they are wrong, or else that the conditions complained of will be corrected.

Mr. M. N. CAMPBELL (Mackenzie): As a scion of one of these Scotch emigrants families that came to the Maritime provinces over a century ago, I may be pardoned for making an observation or two on this matter before the debate closes. Apparently most of the speakers are stressing the point that these emigrants are dissatisfied. They are trying to make of this a social question and not an economic one. As I understand the situation from the speech of the hon. member for Red Deer this is purely an economic question. These men are stranded in Red Deer, and they are without work, they have no opportunity of going on the land; it is not a matter of not being satisfied with the social conditions or anything of that sort. It seems to me that hon. members are approaching it entirely from the wrong angle. I think if there is anything to learn from a condition of this kind, it is that people without money should never be brought into the country, unless adequate provision has been made for settling them on the land. The Acting Minister of National Defence (Mr. Macdonald) drew an analogy between this and the condition of his ancestors and mine also, when they settled in the Maritime provinces over a century ago. There are differences and very great differences. Those people who went in there in the early days were brought there by an organization. Arrangements were made for settling them on the land. They did not have to buy the land. They were

either given it free or allowed to rent land partly prepared for them, where settlement had already been made. Those conditions do not prevail in Alberta at the present time. There is no free land there. They must buy it. Unless some provision is made under the Soldier Settlement Board plan, or some plan of that kind, people should never be brought in, unless there is work for them. I think the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Marler), speaking in the House some time ago, advised the government to adopt some such plan as that. Until such a plan is adopted, and until the government is prepared to come forward with some such policy, it is nothing short of folly to bring people in under these circumstances. I rather resent the attitude of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) toward the hon. member for Red Deer. There is a certain kind of bird which, when it is pursued and threatened with danger, sticks its head in the sand and thinks all trouble is over. That is the attitude of the minister. He is evading the issue and trying to ignore, rather than to face it.

Mr. WILLIAM IRVINE (Calgary East): As I understand the matter under discussion as introduced by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Speakman), it is that, according to report, some hundreds of Hebrideans, who were brought to this country seemingly under the joint efforts of Father Macdonell, the colonization scheme of this country and the Dominion government, are suffering and in great straits. I notice the matter has been received in this House as might have been expected, when we reflect upon the fact that the condition of these immigrants is a striking criticism of the present government's immigration policy, and also a vindication of the statement that has been
5 p.m. made from this side of the House when the policy of the government was under discussion. And now the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart) denies this report. He challenges the statement of the hon. member for Red Deer and passes it by as merely a newspaper report of some ill-advised or evil-minded individual. May I challenge that statement of the minister? May I say that some days ago I took sufficient interest in this question to wire to several sources in Alberta to acertain the truth of the matter. I wired to an official of the Alberta government and asked two questions. I asked, first, if the Alberta government had been approached to give relief to these people, and, second, if the press report could be relied upon. The reply came back that, while the government had not been appealed to by Father Macdonell or the officials of the group, yet it had been appealed to by individuals of that group, and the reply also said that the press reports were undeniably true.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): May I ask the name of the official who replied to the hon. member?

Mr. IRVINE: Hon. Alex Ross, who is Minister of Public Works and of Labour in the Alberta government. I also wired to the editor of the Morning Albertan, the paper which has conducted a special investigation into this matter, and asked if the report could be relied upon. I got a reply from him saying the situation was indeed serious, and the reports were correct. I have received information from other sources that I do not for a moment personally doubt. To say that only five men of that group of hundreds are dissatisfied is, in my opinion, to state something that is wide of the mark, and I think the minister has been misinformed in that regard. I have not been surprised, as I said, at the attitude of the government with regard to this matter. It has been that attitude which has characterized the government on several questions throughout this session and throughout last session. The hon. Minister of the Interior, as I have said, disregards this, and thinks it is merely a story. Then the Acting Minister of National Defence (Mr. Macdonald) comes along and tells us that he is related to these poor men and women in some far-off way, and that his own ancestors came from the same country some hundreds of years ago. That ought to comfort the Hebridean immigrants. He also tells them that they belong to a great race that has contributed the leading lights, politically and otherwise of this country. I have no doubt at all that will comfort them greatly. But the hon. minister brings forward no proposal that will help to meet the present situation. He brings forward no suggestion that will relieve the pressure from which these men are suffering. He simply smiles at them and says "Remember that you have come from a great country." And that reminds me also of the country they did come from. It reminds me of the sad and tragic conditions which partly led them to leave their country. I am not blaming this government entirely for the fact that all these people came over here. They came from a country that had been oppressed. They came from a little island that was bought out by Lord Leverhulme, the soap man. He bought out their island—

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think the hon. member is in order when he refers to the condition of these people prior to their coming to Canada. Whatever may have been their difficulties and unsatisfactory conditions when they were on their home island has nothing to do with the present discussion.

In calling the attention of the hon. member to this point, I may say that I do so because it is felt that we are wasting too much of the time of the House on matters which are not relevant to questions under discussion, and I think—and in all sincerity—that I express the sentiments of hon. members of the House when I say that hon. members should adhere strictly to the rule. On a motion for the adjournment of the House, to enable a member to speak to a matter of urgent public importance, the debate must be confined strictly to the matter in issue. The condition of these immigrants before they come to Canada has nothing whatever to so do with the subject under discussion.

Mr. IRVINE: I bow to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, and will leave that point. I had intended showing its bearing upon their position at the present time, but inasmuch as I cannot do so without contravening your ruling I must necessarily abandon the point. I will continue my remarks in respect to the attitude of the government towards this situation. I have referred to the treatment meted out by the Acting Minister of National Defence (Mr. Macdonald); now I will consider for a moment the consolation that has been offered by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell). In the first place he criticizes severely the hon. member for Red Deer for having brought the matter before the House; and not content with that meed of consolation, he makes an attack upon a reputable newspaper for having dared to publish the truth in this matter. The hon. gentleman referred to the Morning Albertan; but I observed that the Acting Minister of Immigration (Mr. Stewart), who knows that newspaper and its editor a good deal better than does the Minister of Agriculture, did not take the same course. That is the contribution of the Minister of Agriculture to the discussion. Then the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) informs us that he saw in a paper some time ago that some immigrants in some other country had met with some difficulty. Well, that ought to meet the situation; if it does not, I do not see where we can look for better advice.

Now, Mr. Speaker, assertions of this sort will not help matters at all. I want to congratulate the membere for Red Deer on having introduced the subject, and I only regret that he did not bring it up when we were going into Supply in order that it might have been taken a little more seriously. This is a matter which touches very closely the policy of the present administration; it reveals a weakness somewhere in their policy, if they have one. It is indeed a tragic beginning of the activities of the Immigration department, which has been subsidized by such a large sum of money from the public treasury. If the object of voting money for immigration was to bring immigrants into the country, then the direct result that has so far been attained has been simply to nullify all the immigration propaganda that could possibly be put out for some years to come. I want to ask the Acting Minister of Immigration to give some assurance to the House at this time that the condition of these people will be investigated immediately by his department, and that relief will be sent them according to their requirements.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I thought I gave that assurance. Did I not tell the members of this House that the Soldier Settlement Board had been working among them ever since they arrived? Did I not tell him as well that representatives of the church were there? Did I not state that Mr. Black, the deputy minister, had been there? If the hon. gentleman has anything further to suggest that might be done I shall be glad to hear what it is.

Mr. IRVINE: I have got some other things to suggest. But it seems to me that if all these things that the minister states have already been done, then there must be inefficiency somewhere, because the results are not yet apparent. If the gentlemen referred to by the minister had been sent out to investigate matters, it ought to have been evident before now what action had been taken, before the newspaper reports to which reference has been made were published. Let me read a short extract from the Morning Bulletin of Edmonton dealing with the subject. This is a paper which neither the Minister of Agriculture nor the Acting Minister of Immigration will question. Under the caption "Investigation Needed", it states:

> Alberta's new residents from the Hebrides Islands are said to be not altogether satisfied wih the treatment they have received, and are inclined to think that there is a difference between the conditions as represented to them and the conditions as they exist. It is not uncommon for a new comer to any strange country to find that the reality does not in all respects coincide with the impression he had formed and brought with him. All the same, these complaints should be looked into promptly and carefully by officials of the immi-

gration department, and full and ample justice done to these settlers. If things have been misrepresented to them they will have to be compensated in some way by somebody. Canada is a good enough country for anyone, without having its conditions and opportunities exaggerated in the hope of drawing immigrants; and to permit that is about the surest way to neutralize immigration effort and waste the public money spent on it. The Dominion government would not of course be a party to such misrepresentation, and it cannot afford to allow other parties to bring people here by such means.

There is a suggestion in the latter part of the editorial that the government seems to have delegated its power to other organizations and now seeks to disclaim all responsibility.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Does the hon. gentleman really imply that the government are trying to evade their responsibility? That is the practical statement that he makes. Does he mean to imply anything of the kind? Or is he making a positive statement?

Mr. IRVINE: I said that the policy of the government was such that it could enable them to escape responsibility and blame somebody else. I think I heard the minister this afternoon say that he was willing to accept all responsibility in this matter.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I am.

Mr. BUREAU: What more do you want?

Mr. IRVINE: I want a little more than the accepting of responsibility on the part of the minister; I want the carrying out of that responsibility with regard to these people who are suffering. And if the minister who has just asked me a question has anything better to offer than we have had from the Acting Minister of Immigration I am sure the House would be glad to hear him.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I emphatically deny that the people are suffering at all; I deny that a single one is suffering. I challenge the hon. gentleman to name one who has suffered up to this moment.

Mr. IRVINE: That is a very safe challenge for the minister to throw down; he can very safely dare me to name one of four hundred persons not one of whom I have ever seen and of not one of whom I have any personal knowledge.

Mr. BUREAU: It is an unsafe challenge when the man knows what he is talking about.

Mr. IRVINE: I will not accept as a challenge that which is an impossibility. But I want to state that I am just as firm in my belief that a great number of these people are suffering as the minister is convinced that they are not. I challenge him to give us the proof of his statement.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I cannot allow that statement to go unchallenged. Irresponsible statements of this character have been made in the House and I have sat in my place and disregarded them, not considering it worth my while to refute them. That day is past, however. No longer will I allow, if I can possibly prevent it, statements of the kind to be made by any hon. gentleman without contradiction. I say now that not a single member of the party in question has suffered in consequence of any laxity on the part of the government; further, I make the positive statement that none of them are suffering now. They are all comfortably housed and will be so housed until such time as they are permanently settled.

Mr. IRVINE: The minister declares that no one of these people has suffered because of any action or inaction on the part of the government. Does he say that they have not suffered at all, for any reason whatever? Am I to understand that not a single one has suffered; that the whole charge is utterly baseless; that the advice of Hon. Alex Ross of the Alberta government is not founded on anything substantial; and that the newspaper reports are all false? What evidence has the minister to give us in support of his sweeping denial?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): There is a vast difference between suffering and dissatisfaction. Surely the hon. gentleman will admit that. The hon. gentleman is attempting to convey the impression that the people are suffering. The suggestion is entirely erroneous, and not in its wildest flights of imagination has any newspaper made it.

Mr. IRVINE: If the minister will read some of the newspaper reports he will find it stated that Father Macdonell, out of his own pocket, is feeding a hundred and twenty-five of them. If that does not suggest the idea of suffering, then I do not know what the minister would regard as the meaning of that word. I am not going to engage in a debate with the hon. minister as to what he means by "suffering.' I submit that disappointment is the keenest kind of suffering.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Father Macdonell is a paid official of this government, and if he is disbursing money out of his own pocket this government will repay it. Father Macdonell is in charge of this party, and we are holding him responsible. He is acting

on behalf of the government of Canada. I do hope my hon. friend will be more careful about the statements he makes because I do not propose to let unfounded assertions go unchallenged.

Mr. IRVINE: Mr. Speaker, I am just as careful about the statements I make as is the hon. minister himself, and I am just as particular not to allow any statement of his to go unchallenged as he may be to challenge anything I say. So we might as well understand that just now.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I understand it.

Mr. IRVINE: I have as good authority for making the statements I have made as anyone can expect to have in this or any other country. If these wires to which I have referred are baseless then I must go back to those who sent them and tell them they are mistaken; also, if these newspaper reports are false, then we must advise the newspapers accordingly. But these are the authorities which I have, I have investigated them to the best of my ability, and I submit again that my statement in this regard is just as well founded as any statement which the minister has himself made.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): My hon. friend is very adroit at missing the point. He said these people were suffering. That is what I took exception to. Now he is slipping away from the suffering and dealing with dissatisfaction. I want my hon. friend to understand that he made a straight statement that these people were suffering, and I challenged that statement. I still challenge it and ask him to bring forward facts to show that anything of the kind has happened. Dissatisfaction is another matter altogether.

Mr. IRVINE: Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister himself has answered the question. He says I slip away from the point. I do not slip away from any point or any person. He says I charged that these men were suffering. Then he says they are not suffering, they are disappointed. Is not disappointment suffering? In the estimation of the minister can there be suffering more poignant than the disappointment of people who have come from their own land in response to appeals and promises, into what to them is a foreign country, only to find that they have been misinformed and befooled? Can anything be more keen than disappointment, or has the hon. minister no imagination? Can suffering not take place except someone sticks a pin into one or knocks one on the head? That is a crude concept of suffering. My conception covers a bigger field. If you prove that these people have not suffered at all from want or cold, which has not been proven, there is no doubt that they have suffered and are still suffering in the keenest way from disappointment brought about by broken promises on the part of the government made in the name of the people in a new country. I conclude, Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. IRVINE: I am very glad to notice, Mr. Speaker, that the government and its supporters have taken my remarks so keenly, because it proves to me that I am hitting the nail on the head, or to change the analogy, am getting under their skins. I wish they would be as particular in the future about their own statements and about investigating matters as I have been in this particular case. And I hope that the enthusiasm which they display against anyone who criticizes their policy will be switched into carrying their policy out in a positive manner. When that happens they will be doing a greater service to this country than they have yet accomplished, and we shall not have these people suffering as they are doing now. I say suffering, advisedly, Mr. Speaker, knowing that the mental suffering of these people is much keener than any physical suffering can possibly be. That is all I wish to say on the matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: In justice to the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Speakman) who expressed a desire to reply, I would remind him that on a substantive motion only can a reply be made. If the hon. member will refer to paragraph 263 of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms he will find the following definition of a substantive motion:

> By a substantive motion is meant a motion not incidental to a proceeding before the House, and which can be dealt with by amendment or by the distinct vote of the House.

This motion for adjournment not being a substantive motion, a reply cannot be allowed. That is why I ruled out the hon. member.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I am satisfied, Mr. Speaker.

Motion (Mr. Speakman) to adjourn withdrawn.

JUDGES ACT AMENDMENT

On the order:

That the House go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

> That it is expedient to amend section six of the Judges Act, as enacted by chapter fifty-six of the

statutes of 1920, by providing that the salaries of the judges of the Supreme Court of Ontario shall be as follows:—

	Per Annum
(a) The Chief Justice of Ontario..	$10,000
(b) The Chief Justice of the Second Divisional Court..	10,000
(c) Eight Justices of Appeal, each.. ..	9,000
(d) Nine judges of the High Court Division, each..	9,000

Provided that the judge who at present holds the office of Chief Justice of the Exchequer Division, and the judge who at present holds the office of Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, shall, each respectively, and irrespective of the Division, Appellate or High Court, to which he may be assigned, continue to receive the salary of $10,000 which he is now receiving instead of the salary which he would otherwise receive; but that upon a vacancy occurring in the office of Chief Justice of the Exchequer Division, or in the office of Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, the salary of such Chief Justice shall cease; and provided moreover that, when the two last mentioned offices shall have been abolished, the Chief Justice who may be appointed to preside over the High Court Division shall receive a salary of $10,000 per annum, and the number of salaries hereby authorized for the judges of the High Court Division shall thereupon be reduced to eight.

Sir LOMER GOUIN (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the following resolution which appears as No. 44 on the order paper may be referred to the Committee of the Whole with the preceding resolution:

(1) That it is expedient to amend section seventeen of the Judges Act, as enacted by chapter thirty-eight of the statutes of 1914, and to provide that the salaries of the judges of the Circuit Court of the district of Montreal shall be as follows:—The senior judge of the said court, $8,000 per annum, and three other judges of the said court each $7,000 per annum; and to provide that the provisions of section ten of chapter fifty-six of the statutes of 1920 shall not apply to judges of the Circuit Court;

(2) That section two of the Act to amend the Judges Act, chapter fifty-nine of the statutes of 1919, relating to the salaries of local judges in Admiralty, be repealed.

Mr. SPEAKER: By unanimous consent.

Motion agreed to and the House went into committee on the proposed resolutions, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

On the first resolution:

Sir LOMER GOUIN (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the following resolution which appears as No. 44 on the order paper may be referred to the Committee of the Whole with the preceding resolution.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It will be necessary to amend the tenth line where the word "Division" also occurs.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, wherever it appears in connection with Exchequer it is amended in the same way.

Amendment agreed to.

[Mr. Speakman.]

Mr. BUREAU: Is that for the Exchequer Court?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: No, there is no Exchequer Court. It is simply the Exchequer.

Mr. BUREAU: I have no objection.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I suppose, Mr. Chairman, that the object of this resolution is to give effect to the provincial legislation which has recently been enacted in Ontario?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: That is what I was going to explain, Mr. Chairman.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not think there is any change in the salaries; it is simply carrying out the former intention as to what shall become of the two other divisions when the chiefs of those divisions no longer serve.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: By the last amendment passed by the legislature of Ontario it is provided that there shall be two appellate divisions and a high court division. The first appellate division will be presided over by the Chief Justice of Ontario, and there will be a second chief justice of the second division. When a vacancy occurs in the Exchequer Court or Court of Common Pleas the two judges now occupying those positions are not to be replaced. There will be a Chief Justice of the High Court, with the same number of judges. The judges of the Appellate Divisions will be known as Judges of Appeal. As my hon. friend has just suggested there is no increase in the number of judges and no increase in salaries.

Mr. CHURCH: This reduction is all right as far as it goes, but it does not go far enough. The province fixes the number of judges—and the Drury-Raney government kept many judges serving on their commissions. In the first place, there is a considerable decline in the litigation in Ontario in the High Court of Justice—a decline of from 25 to 30 per cent. The jurisdiction of the county courts has been greatly increased; fully 100 per cent; work that formerly was done by the High Court of Justice has been transferred to the county courts and the latter court is supplanting the High Court. In my opinion there are too many High Court judges in Ontario. Four of these judges were away the greater part of two years serving on Ontario government commissions—one of them on a purely political commission—going into the whole question of some $326,000,000 expended by municipalities on cheap light, power and radials. Two of these judges actually left their judicial duties to work on these political commissions—timber, hydro, radials and

other political matters—contrary to the statute passed by this House some years ago. Two of them left their duties for the greater part of two years, and, in the case of the two others, for a large portion of one year and a portion of another year respectively. Some of these judges can take holidays at any time, spring, summer, autumn or winter, to say nothing of the long vacation. While there are many good men, we have not on the bench to-day, on the average in Ontario, the men of ability that we had twenty-five years ago. I would point out that when a nation abounds in physicians it grows thin in people and when a nation abounds in judges and justices of the peace, as is the case in Ontario, especially in judges who can leave their judicial duties and go, as it were, on the political bench, then it becomes scarce in politicians. Some of these commission judges "toil not neither do they spin" at purely judicial court work. Now, as to the statute that was passed by the Union government in 1920, chapter 56, setting out an array of some 26 Ontario judges, I may say that no one was appointed who was a Conservative—everybody had to be Liberal to get an appointment from the Union government. I never belonged to the Union party myself, but one of the most extravagant pieces of legislation passed by the Union government was that same Judges Act of 1920, which is cited in the resolution, chapter 56 of the Statutes of Canada, 1920. Under that act there are three or four Chief Justices, some twenty-five High Court judges for Ontario, embracing a population of 2,500,000; in other words, Ontario has more or nearly as many High Court judges as the whole of England. If the present condition continues there will hardly be a lawyer in the province who is not also a judge. That will be like the condition that prevails in the United States, where practically every lawyer is a judge or is called judge and if he is not one to-day he hopes to be one tomorrow. I hope the minister will have a further survey made of this whole matter. I suggest that he inquire into the number of hours these judges sit, the number of holidays they take, the length of time they spend in giving attention to judicial duties and to political commissions. notwithstanding the statutes of 1920 by which in consideration of a raise in salary they were not to take these commissions. There is going to be an election in Ontario in a few days and we will not need next year a lot of these commission judges at all, because when they have abandoned their commissions there will be even less or nothing left for them to do. In my opinion, Mr. Chairman, Ontario has too many judges and there should be further co-ordination of judges there and a reduction could be made and a substantial economy effected. Judges should stick to their purely judicial work and keep out of political commissions to help this party and that.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: We cannot reduce the number of judges in any province. The courts are created by the province and we provide the salaries of the judges; if any change is to be made in the number of judges, it must be done by the province. As to my hon. friend's allegation that some of the judges in Ontario have been acting on commissions connected with political matters, I do not see how that could be so, having regard to the amendment to which he has referred. It is true there was a proviso to cover investigations which had been started before the amendment was passed, but I do not see how any judge could subsequently act as my hon. friend has suggested without contravening the statute.

First resolution agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: The second resolution is as follows:

Resolved, (1) That it is expedient to amend section seventeen of the Judges Act, as enacted by chapter thirty-eight of the statutes of 1914, and to provide that the salaries of the judges of the Circuit Court of the district of Montreal shall be as follows:—The senior judge of the said court, $8,000 per annum, and three other judges of the said court each $7,000 per annum; and to provide that the provisions of section ten of chapter fifty-six of the statutes of 1920 shall not apply to judges of the Circuit Court;

(2) That section two of the act to amend the Judges Act, chapter fifty-nine of the statutes of 1919, relating to the salaries of local judges in Admiralty, be repealed.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: The Circuit Court of Montreal is a division of the Superior Court of the province of Quebec; it is a special court for the district of Montreal. The jurisdiction which is given to these four judges represents a population of nearly a million people. In the other districts the administration of justice in the circuit jurisdiction is carried out by the judges of the Superior Court. The statistics show that in the district of Montreal these four judges have to decide more cases than all the judges of the Superior Court in the other districts. Their present salary is $5,500, and that of the Chief Justice is $6,000. We propose to give an increase of $1,500 to the three puisne judges and an increase of $2,000 to the Chief Justice. When the increase was given to the judges of the Superior Court in 1910 or 1911, these circuit court judges were so much re-

garded as judges of the Superior Court that it was assumed they would get the increase, and the result was that they were forgotten. They tried to have the error corrected later on, but they only obtained an increase of some $1,500. Since that time they have been asking that they be given proper treatment, and it is only after the receipt of resolutions from the bar of the province of Quebec and from the whole population of the district of Montreal that we bring down this resolution, which is, I think, only just, providing for a fair remuneration of these judges.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I take it from what my hon. friend says that the circuit court of Montreal is somewhat similar in its jurisdiction to the county courts of Ontario.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Oh, no.

Mr. BUREAU: What is the limit in the Ontario county court?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I was going to ask my hon. friend what the difference was. When I was practising the county court limit was $500, but that has been very greatly increased. I think now they can try practically anything under certain conditions. I think that is right, Mr. Chairman? You would be familiar with it being an active practitioner in the province.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: So that to-day under certain conditions they can try suits involving any amount no matter how big.

Mr. BUREAU: All appealable?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Oh yes, and I have no doubt that the decisions of the circuit court would be appealable.

Mr. BUREAU: Not to the amount of $100.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Anything as small as that would be looked after in Ontario by the division court. In addition, the county courts in Ontario have a very large jurisdiction in criminal matters. The way matters are now conducted they have almost exclusive jurisdiction in criminal matters outside of murder and rape cases. I would ask my hon. friend if he has statistics of the business done, for example, in Toronto on the one hand by the three judges—is it not?—that are working there and by the Montreal circuit judges on the other hand, and what are the salaries of the Toronto judges?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: There is a great difference between the county court of Ontario and the circuit court of Montreal. As I have said, this is a division of the Superior Court of the province just like a division of the Supreme Court of Ontario, and if it was not for the fact that we have four judges acting as judges of the circuit court of Montreal we would have to appoint four judges of the Superior Court to do the work. My hon. friend speaks of the county court judges in Ontario.

Mr. BUREAU: The circuit court is also a court of appeal.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Yes. My hon. friend says that the county court judges of Ontario have a very large jurisdiction. But they are judges for counties or districts. In the case of the four judges of the circuit court of Montreal they have jurisdiction over certainly not less than perhaps twenty-two or twenty-three counties in the province of Quebec, and they have more cases than all the other judges of the Superior Court in the province of Quebec. There is no appeal from the judgment of this court, which means that it is a Superior Court. They have exclusive jurisdiction in matters of municipalities, municipal election petitions, school matters—

Mr. BUREAU: Fish and game laws.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Yes. There is no limit to their jurisdiction. There are cases that I could mention if necessary where the amount involved was over $200,000, from which judgment there was no appeal. Then as to the difference in qualifications between the judges in Ontario they cannot be appointed before five years' practice.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It used to be ten years when I was at the bar.

Mr. BUREAU: These younger people are moving faster than we did in our day.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: There has always been a difference between the county court judges in Ontario and the circuit court judges in Montreal. The circuit court judges in Montreal now receive $5,500, and the chief justice $6,000. In Ontario the county court judges are paid $5,000. In Montreal the judges have to give all their time to their administration, while in Ontario the judges are allowed to act as judges for the province, and most if not all of them receive an additional indemnity of $1,000 as senior judge. Our judges in Montreal are not allowed to do anything outside of the court, and that is another reason why the difference might be justified. At all events, I repeat the circuit court judges of Montreal were never treated

exactly the same as the county court judges of Ontario, and if you consider the extent of their jurisdiction I think it is only fair that we should give them this increase of indemnity.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The minister says that the difference of treatment as between the county court judges of Ontario and the circuit court judges of Montreal has always been there. I am not suggesting that the difference of treatment should cease, but if there be a change in the one why should not the same difference of treatment be maintained? I am not asking for equality.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I have already explained that there was an error in 1911 when an increase was given to the judges of the Superior Court. If you take the judges in Ontario you will see that there are fifty-two county court judges and fourteen district court judges. We have forty-eight judges of the Superior Court and the Court of King's Bench in Quebec, and four judges of the circuit court, Montreal. Altogether in Ontario you have eighty-five judges as compared with fifty-two in Quebec. Now as to the amount paid in salaries, we find that this government pays to the judges of Ontario $504,000 and to the judges of Quebec $457,500, including the increase now proposed. That seems about right in proportion to the population of the two provinces.

Mr. CHURCH: I would ask the minister to consider the case of the county court judges of Toronto and York county on a parity with this case. There was a memorandum presented to the minister's predecessor by the bar of York county and the county court judges, and I would be glad if the minister would look into it. These judges are doing much of the work of the High Court judges, much extra work is being imposed upon them by both Houses of Parliament. They are in the same category as the Montreal circuit court judges and do the same volume of work.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I will look into that petition.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: So far as the volume of work done by the judges of Toronto and Montreal is concerned, I think the minister will find that it is practically the same.

Mr. BUREAU: No.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The minister shakes his head. He has not looked into the petition yet. Perhaps he does not know how much work is being done in Toronto courts and York county. There is an extremely large amount and the duties of the judges are very, very onerous. I could not quite follow my hon. friend when he said that a mistake was made in 1911.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I should not say a mistake. The minister at that time thought that the judges of the circuit court were being treated exactly the same as the judges of the Superior Court.

Mr. BUREAU: He thought they were included in the increase.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not think they were on a parity before.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: No they were not, but he was under the impression when amending the statute to provide for an increase of indemnity for the Superior Court judges that the circuit court judges were included.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: How do their salaries now compare with the Superior Court judges in Montreal?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: The Superior Court judges receive $10,000 and the circuit court judges under this legislation will receive $7,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What about the next section, what does it mean?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: That relates to the judges of the Admiralty Court. It was provided in the statutes of 1919 that when the salaries of the judges were increased they should not be paid any salary if they acted as judges in Admiralty, but there was a proviso to the effect that those who are acting as judges in Admiralty should continue to receive it. It was represented last session that some of the judges were paid fees by litigants in virtue of a ruling of the Exchequer Court. We thought it was not proper that judges should be paid by fees—

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Quite right.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: —and we propose that they should get their $1,000 if they are judges of the Supreme Court.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: This means there is an increase of $1,000 in judicial salaries whenever the judge happens to hold an appointment in Admiralty as well?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: How many cases will that apply to?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Two cases, I understand.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Where?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: One in Halifax and one in Montreal. One is Judge Maclennan. I do not remember the name of the other, but I think it is Judge Mellish.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Are we to understand that either of these two judges, and I know they are gentlemen of legal attainments and eminence, has been in the habit of getting fees from litigants?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Are these chief justices or puisne judges?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Puisne judges.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: As a matter of fact the judges that hold these extra offices, as a general rule, have their other court duties looked after by their brethren when they are doing that particular work. Does my hon. friend think there should be any pay at all? Why should one puisne judge have a perquisite and another puisne judge none—particularly when, as I say, the almost universal rule is that the work of the regular court is not allowed to be interfered with by the business of the Admiralty Division; some other judge does it?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: As I said, there was an amendment passed in 1919 with respect to the judges in Admiralty which reads as follows:

> No salary shall be paid to any local judge in Admiralty of the Exchequer Court under the provisions of this section who is a judge of any provincial superior court, provided, that the provisions of this subsection shall not apply to any local judge in Admiralty who was or is appointed before the coming into force of this act.

In the province of Quebec we had Judge Lyman, I think—I do not remember the exact name— who was receiving an additional salary of $1,000. He died and was replaced by Judge Maclennan in 1920. Judge Maclennan, being deprived of that additional salary of $1,000, received fees under that ruling of the Exchequer Court and has been receiving them ever since. When we submitted certain amendments to the consideration of the House at the beginning of the present session seeking to amend the Admiralty Act we declared that in the future no judge should be allowed to receive fees. That bill is now before the Senate. It was represented, however, that we were not acting fairly to Judge Maclennan and the other judge I have mentioned, because they had been authorized by the previous administration to receive such fees and that if they were prohibited in the future from receiving fees they should be compensated in some other way. We cannot find any other means than the method we propose now of paying the judges of any supreme or superior court of the province this additional salary. I may say that all the judges who are acting as judges in admiralty were doing their ordinary work in a perfectly satisfactory manner. No reproach of any kind was made against them on any such ground, and I think we should allow them this additional remuneration.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend did not catch the point I was making. I understand this will apply only to two gentlemen in the case of both of whom, certainly in the case of one, the appointment took place after the passage of the act to which the minister refers so that there is no right to this extra salary under that act. There was a clear intimation from parliament that there should not be any extra fee paid for that service, therefore, if special fees are accepted, I do not care how it was done, it is acting directly against the intent of that statute. In view of the bill which is before the Senate it seems to me the matter should stand just as it is, without that increase of $1,000, unless the minister thinks the statute of 1920 was entirely wrong. If the minister thinks the policy laid down by parliament was wrong well and good, but if he believes parliament was right when it said there should not be this extra salary I do not think the mere fact that these gentlemen were enabled to get fees in some other way should influence him.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: This is special work of a judicial character. There is nothing in the amendment of 1919 which said the judges would not be allowed to receive any fees It was after the appointment of Judge Maclennan that the Exchequer Court authorized the payment of fees to judges. This was known by the Minister of Justice and it was approved by the department. This has been going on now for nearly four years, and if we say that we are going to deprive these judges of these fees and tell them that they will have to act in future without remuneration of any kind I do not see how we can justify our position. The only remedy, it seems to me, is to revert to the old system and pay them an additional salary of $1,000.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Sir Lomer Gouin thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 201, to amend the Judges Act.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

Sir LOMER GOUIN moved the second reading of the bill.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

On section 1—Salaries of judges of Supreme Court of Ontario.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I move an amendment to clause 1, which will read as follows:

Provided further that any judge who enjoys immunity from taxes or deductions by reason of the provisions of section 11 of chapter 56 of the statutes of 1920, entitled "An Act to amend the Judges Act," shall continue to enjoy that immunity, but shall not, either in respect of the judicial office which he now holds, or in respect of any judicial office to which he may be hereafter appointed, the salary of which is provided for by this section, receive any salary in addition to that which he is receiving at the time of the passing of this act, unless he elect, as he may effectively do, at or within three months after his appointment to any such latter office, wholly to waive or forego such immunity from taxes or deductions.

In 1920 an exemption was granted to the judges whose salaries were increased, and the effect of the amendment was that those who refused the increased salary would be exempt from the income tax, changing the status of the judges of the Supreme Court of Ontario. But with respect to those who are to be removed to the Appellate Division of the Supreme Court of Ontario we thought we would make it clear that this would apply. If they do not accept the increased salary they will have the benefit of the exemption.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I have not the section before me, but I will take the minister's statement. The statement I understand to be that as these may be looked upon as new appointments under the new section, the minister desires that the same safeguards should be thrown around the new judges as the gentlemen who were judges before, and who still are judges enjoying under the present legislation. In other words, the minister does not change the legislation, but makes it clear.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: It is on account of the new commission we are going to give them.

The CHAIRMAN: The word "Division," occurring after the word "Exchequer" will be struck out.

Amendment agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 3—Judges may act as arbitrators or assessors under Railway Act or public act.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: By this amendment which was referred to just now, it was provided that judges nominated by the Governor in Council under the provision mentioned in this section shall act as commissioners or arbitrators, provided this enactment shall not interfere with judges who are at present acting as commissioners or arbitrators completing the work on which they are engaged. The amendment is to the effect that the judges will be authorized to act as arbitrators in railway matters. If hon. members will look at the Railway Act of Canada and some of the provincial railway acts, they will find that judges are acting as arbitrators. Under this amendment they are no longer allowed to act in that capacity. But arbitration in railway matters of expropriation is of a judicial character, and we do not see that there could be an objection to that. There could not be any such objection raised as was formerly raised, because under the amendment the judges will not be allowed to investigate any political matters. They will only investigate matters of a judicial character. They will be permitted to act as arbitrators in railway matters, and in matters for the fixing of damages in cases where provincial governments or the federal government may be interested.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Will the minister tell me that, in so far as railway questions are concerned, and in so far as the assessment of damages under the provincial acts is concerned, the old law is to be entirely restored?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: In regard to railway matters, it is provided in the statutes of 1919 that a judge may act as arbitrator. It is the same with regard to the provinces. The judges will not be prevented by the amendment of 1921 from acting in such cases.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: This is something entirely new to me. I have not had a chance to look it up at all, but my impression was that all the amendment did before was to prevent any fees being paid.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: They are not allowed to receive any fees under this amendment.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: They get no fees under the amendment.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: No.

Mr. CHURCH: I think the principle of permitting judges to act as arbitrators in railway matters is a very bad one. As everybody knows the railways are in politics all the time, and if we have judges acting as arbitrators in railway matters, we are going to have judges in politics, more or less, also. We had an illustration of the principle of this legislation in Ontario, where judges served on arbitrations as to electric railway matters, and in assessing damages or compensation in these

matters. It was found by Sir Oliver Mowat to be a very bad principle. In arbitrations in regard to taking over electric lines, street railway plants or power and gas plants, in Ontario, experience proved that it was a very bad principle to have judges on these commissions, because appeals would have to be taken from the arbitration board in many cases on questions of fact, and also on questions of law, and some of the judges would sit in appeal in cases where they had acted as arbitrators. We have had the judges acting in 1891-2 in the matter of the old Toronto Railway Company. The railway situation being what it is in Canada, judges should stay off these railway arbitrations. These arbitration judges will be looking for passes and all kinds of favours from the railways, and in civil cases against these same railways the judges should be in a position to be impartial. This is a wrong principle, and a step in the wrong direction, and is not in the best interests of the judiciary.

Section agreed to.

On section 4—Additional $1,000 to judge of Circuit Court.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not think this section is a proper one. It merely strikes out the word "circuit."

Sir LOMER GOUIN: In 1920 an increase of $1,000 was granted to the judges of the Supreme and county courts. In giving an increase to the judges of the Supreme Court of Montreal, we struck out the word "Circuit". The circuit judges will not receive that $1,000 in the future.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It is rather difficult to follow it.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Section 10 of chapter 56 of 1920 reads:

> Every judge of every circuit, county and district court shall be paid $1,000 per annum as an addition to his present salary, etc.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Quite right; I understand it now.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

RAILWAYS AND CANALS

Railways and Canals—chargeable to Income:

Amount not exceeding $73,000,000 to meet expenditures made or indebtedness incurred (where amounts available from net operating earnings may be insufficient) by or on behalf of the Canadian National Railway Company, hereinafter called "the Company", or any Company specified in the First Schedule to the Act incorporating the Canadian National Railway Company, being chapter 13 of the Statutes of Canada, 1919, or by the company in respect of any railways, properties or works entrusted to the company from time to time under the provisions of section 11 of the said chapter 13 of the Statutes of Canada, 1919, or by or on behalf of any company specified or referred to in chapter 13 of the Statutes of Canada, 1920; or any one or more of them, on any of the following accounts:—

(a) Operating deficits whenever incurred or ascertained.

(b) Acquisition of property, materials and supplies.

(c) Interest and sinking funds on notes, securities or obligations.

(d) Principal and interest of maturing or matured loans secured or unsecured.

(e) Construction and betterments.

(f) Co-ordination or consolidation of railway lines and facilities.

(g) Guarantees of securities.

The amount herein authorized may be applied from time to time, in the discretion of the Governor in Council:—

(a) To meet expenditures made or indebtedness incurred by the company in respect of railways, properties and works entrusted to the company as aforesaid.

(b) By way of loans in cash, or by way of guarantee, or partly one way and partly the other, subject, however, as follows:—

If by way of loans, the amount or amounts advanced shall be repayable on demand, with interest at the rate fixed by the Governor in Council, from time to time, payable half-yearly, secured if and when directed by the Governor in Council by mortgage or mortgages upon such properties, in such form and containing such terms and conditions, not inconsistent herewith, as the Governor in Council may approve.

If by way of guarantee, any such guarantee may be of the principal and interest of the notes and obligations or securities of one or more of the said companies specified by the Governor in Council and may be signed by the Minister of Finance, on behalf of His Majesty, in such form and on such terms and conditions as the Governor in Council may determine to be appropriate and applicable thereto, $73,000,000.

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals): I think I have nothing to add, Mr. Chairman, to my statement which I presented a few weeks ago as to the standing and prospects of the Canadian National Railways, but I shall be glad to give hon. members any further information which they may require.

Mr. MILLAR: Does "Acquisition of property" include the hotel being acquired in Paris? Is that provided for in this vote?

Mr. GRAHAM: No.

Mr. STEVENS: What appropriation would that expenditure be taken from?

Mr. GRAHAM: I had better explain that to clear the air. The president of the Canadian National Railway Company, Sir Henry

Thornton, having resided in Paris for some time both before and after his appointment, came to the conclusion that the Canadian National Railways should have an office on one of the main streets of the French capital, as the system is practically unknown on the Continent, that is, it is not anywhere linked up with the name of Canada. That view was corroborated the other night by the hon. member for Saltcoats (Mr. Sales) when he asked me: How is it that people from the Old Land travelling in Canada never heard of the Canadian National Railways until they reached this country? He gave an instance of travelling a few weeks ago on the train and meeting people who had just come over and who had never heard of the Canadian National line. The president is very strong in the view that we ought to have some place in Paris to which every person goes and from which everybody who comes from the Continent emanates, as it were, the result being to enable the Canadian National system to secure its share of the immigration traffic as well as of the freight traffic; and I think he had this particular building in mind. However, some little time ago he received word that just the kind of building he required so far as location was concerned could be secured. He immediately wired to a gentleman in Paris to secure this building, as there were two or three other parties after it, and the Canadian National would temporarily finance it. The building was secured not in the name of the Canadian National or in the name of the government, but in the name of this gentleman, with the understanding, of course, that the Canadian National could have it, the government could have it or any other company could have it, provided that the accommodation would be afforded to the Canadian National Railway for its operations. That was done and the building was secured. A syndicate has been formed to take it over; a gentleman is leaving New York, I think on the fifteenth of June, to conclude the details. The Canadian National will thus have a home in one of the best locations in the city of Paris, where it will hereafter be on the map, without any capital expenditure on the part of the Dominion of Canada or of the Canadian National Railways.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I understand that the road is financing the purchase in the meantime. How much money is being used?

Mr. GRAHAM: I think there is no money being used. We guaranteed the bank so that this gentleman could go to the bank and finance the building. As soon as the syndicate takes over the building that guarantee will lapse.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: So the guarantee is being given to the bank?

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: For how much?

Mr. GRAHAM: About $2,000,000, I am told.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That guarantee would be given, I assume to a Canadian bank?

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then the Canadian bank would have to send that $2,000,000 over to Paris?

Mr. GRAHAM: That is not exactly the detail, I think, of the banking. The Canadian National would deposit the security here in cash or otherwise, and the bank would lend the gentleman in Paris the money.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: So that a deposit has been made with the bank of collateral of the railway sufficient to raise $2,000,000. What collateral was deposited? Where did that come from?

Mr. GRAHAM: Did I use the word "collateral?" One of the Canadian National deposits was placed in the bank, to remain there until such time as the building is taken over.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Oh, well, that is better. So that $2,000,000 in cash of the railway was applied to that purpose?

Mr. GRAHAM: To the bank.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Two million dollars cash of the railway was deposited in a bank?

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Special account, to be used for the purchase of that building?

Mr. GRAHAM: No.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Well, put it any other way you like.

Mr. GRAHAM: It is to be retained by the bank as a financial backing in connection with the loan to this man of the money on his note.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Well now, my hon. friend will agree with me that that is playing with words. What happens is this: The sum of $2,000,000 of the funds of the

Canadian National Railway is deposited in a bank for a specific purpose, namely, to enable somebody else in Paris to get $2,000,000 from that same bank. Now, is that wrong?

Mr. GRAHAM: I think that is correct.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Of course it is correct. In other words the system is paying the money to finance this deal.

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Now, let us go a little further. It has not yet been determined whether the railway keeps the property, or whether some other company gets the property, or whether some syndicate is to be allowed to have it. Am I right in so understanding the minister?

Mr. GRAHAM: No.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then what is the fact?

Mr. GRAHAM: As I said a few moments ago, the property is being taken over by a syndicate, a representative of which leaves here in two or three days for Paris to complete the arrangements.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Who composes the Syndicate?

Mr. GRAHAM: I would not care to give the names or the details until the arrangements are completed—a reputable body of men having no connection with the Canadian National Railways.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Well, Mr. Chairman, we are putting up $2,000,000 for a syndicate—

Mr. GRAHAM: No.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: We are going to use our $2,000,000 for the purpose of securing some property which Sir Henry Thornton thinks is a good one. Surely the committee has the right to know who are interested in this syndicate; surely we have a right to know with whom we are dealing. There cannot be any mystery about it: it has been in the papers. What is the mystery?

Mr. GRAHAM: No mystery.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then if there be no mystery, why cannot we get the facts?

Mr. GRAHAM: There is no mystery, but my hon. friend knows as a business man that this syndicate does not want its name to be published broadcast until the arrangements are completed. In the meantime we hold a mortgage on the property to its full value.

[Sir Henry Drayton.]

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Why should there be any secrecy about it? Is it because there is to be a difference in price?

Mr. GRAHAM: No.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is it because there is to be a commission here or a commission there?

Mr. GRAHAM: No.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: If there is nothing of the kind; if everything is open and above board, why can we not be told who the syndicate is? I should think these patriotic gentlemen ought to get the honour of having their names stated as having helped out Sir Henry Thornton.

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not think they did it for patriotism. I think they have made a good business deal.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: On what terms did they get it?

Mr. GRAHAM: They took it exactly at the cost to the gentleman in Paris—no commission.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Who is the gentlemen in Paris who is handling this $2,000,000 for us?

Mr. GRAHAM: Mr. A. Aronovici.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Who is Mr. Aronovici?

Mr. GRAHAM: He was a former agent of the Great Eastern Railway and is now agent of the Canadian National Railways for the continent.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I see. Is the syndicate composed of New York gentlemen? The minister made mention of New York.

Mr. GRAHAM: New York.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: So that a New York syndicate is going to look after this a little later, and my hon. friend, I take it from what he says, will not tell us anything more about it than that? Now I want to ask my friend if he can give me one reason why we should not get the facts. The money is paid. Mr. Aronovici in Paris has got the money. Why cannot we know for whom he has got it?

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend knows that if he were in my place he would do just as I am doing. In a transaction of this nature with a syndicate there is certain financing they have to do, and I do not think it is fair for my hon. friend to ask me, I do not think he expects me to tell him, the names

of this syndicate until such time as the arrangement is completed and everybody will know.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not follow my hon. friend. One minute apparently the syndicate is working for us, and another minute they are working for themselves. I cannot for the life of me see why this country cannot know who is looking after this deal. Two million dollars is a whole lot of money. Before we go any further, let me ask at this point from what vote was that $2,000,000 taken?

Mr. GRAHAM: It was not purchase money. It was a deposit of the Canadian National Railway Company from current funds.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I ask my friend, from what vote was that taken?

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend knows enough of the railway business to know that that can be done without being taken from any vote.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: No, indeed, I do not, Mr. Chairman, if it is done properly.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is a question of opinion of course. I say it was done properly. It was taken from the current funds temporarily only of the Canadian National Railway just as any railway company or any big concern would do. It was not taken from any special vote.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Everybody knows that the system is being run at a loss, and that there is $73,000,000 asked for this year in order to make up the loss. Everybody knows that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance is continually having to provide funds for the purpose of making up deficits. Further, everybody must know and the minister knows perfectly well that if $2,000,000 is taken for one purpose it is just so much money taken out of the treasury of Canada, and it can only be taken out of the treasury of Canada by means of a vote. It is just so much more to make good on the one hand, or else some funds provided by the Finance department have been used for the purpose of making that deposit, and it would take a pretty good accountant probably to trace it out. The fact is, this company having received cash advances, receiving now cash advances, must in effect have diverted those cash advances to the extent of $2,000,000 for this purpose, and I ask my friend where it is coming from.

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend has heard my explanation. I will give it again. One would think to hear my hon. friend that the Canadian National Railway did not collect any money, never had any money on hand. It collects over $200,000,000 outside of anything it gets from the government. Out of its revenue it temporarily placed this money in the bank, as it often leaves money in the bank, for this specific purpose. If it were permanent my hon. friend would be right, but it is only temporary and he is not right.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: This fund evidently was specially ear-marked. My hon. friend talks about a special deposit. Was that deposit made in the regular bank of the company or was it deposited in some outside bank?

Mr. GRAHAM: It was made in one of the regular banks of the company. They deal with two or three banks.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Was it the regular Grand Trunk bank? What is the regular bank now anyway?

Mr. GRAHAM: There are six.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Let us have them.

Mr. GRAHAM: Bank of Montreal, Royal Bank, Bank of Toronto, Bank of Commerce, Bank of Nova Scotia and La Banque Nationale.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: We have got quite a collection of banks now to look after our book-keeping. Which particular bank was chosen for this particular deposit?

Mr. GRAHAM: The Bank of Toronto.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Was there any overdraft made at that time in any of the banks?

Mr. GRAHAM: No.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am going to ask my friend whether it is not a fact that at the time this deposit was made there was an overdraft in one of these six banks he has mentioned.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am informed there was not.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: No overdraft. Then what was the position in so far as the Department of Finance is concerned? What vouchers has my hon. friend been putting through?

Mr. FIELDING: The Department of Finance has had no part in it whatever.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am quite sure, Mr. Chairman, it would not take that form. I quite understand the Department of Finance would have nothing to do with it. I was not asking for any voucher in connection with this, but I am asking in connection with other financial matters has the Department of Finance been making advances to make good deficits?

Mr. FIELDING: Only such advances as parliament has voted.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Quite right, and I assume the advances are still being made.

Mr. FIELDING: Out of the appropriation, yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: They are still being made. Now I am going to ask the Minister of Railways when that $2,000,000 was put up.

Mr. GRAHAM: It is difficult to say from memory just what the date was, maybe about the middle of May.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The money was deposited about the middle of May. Then I am going to ask the Minister of Finance if he has been making any advances to the system during April or May. of this current year.

Mr. FIELDING: There has been no special advance whatever in connection with this transaction. The Railway department is making its usual draft on the Finance department and so long as there is money appropriated by parliament that is all we will know about it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Are these advances still going on?

Mr. FIELDING: If we are not actually paying now, it must have been because they have failed to ask for it. They are asking us all the time and we sometimes have difficulty in providing the necessary, but we get it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: How much has my hon. friend been asked to provide that is being held up at the present time?

Mr. FIELDING: I could not say at the moment. This particular transaction has not come before my department at all. Any advances that have been made have been made in the usual routine. The Railway department asks us to give them money on account of an appropriation, and when we have it we give it to them, and when we have not we try and look it up.

[Mr. Fielding.]

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I quite understand there has been the proper routine and that this request for $2,000,000 did not come to the Finance department at all. This $2,000,000 is taken from funds which otherwise would have gone in easing the Department of Finance so, of course, my hon. friend, the Minister of Finance would not know anything about it one way or the other. I am going to ask the Minister of Railways again the names of the syndicate which gets the benefit of the financing of this deal.

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not admit that the syndicate gets any advantage. I have told my hon. friend once that it would not be fair to give that information. He would not do it himself. I know his object in pressing, but I must decline to give him the names of these gentlemen until the arrangement is completed. It would not be fair to them and it would not be fair to the transaction.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend is quite right. I endeavour to put myself in the position my hon. friend has put himself in of removing from the proper custody $2,000,000 of the public funds of this country for the purpose of a syndicate, whether they are making money out of it or not. My hon. friend said a few minutes ago that the syndicate had to make some money out of it. I ask him now for the names of the syndicate.

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend has the answer.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Very good. Then my hon. friend for reasons best known to himself, refuses to give me the information.

Mr. GRAHAM: For reasons of fairness to the men with whom the railway is dealing.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am going to put another question to my hon. friend: If the syndicate takes it, what guarantee of rent is being made by the railway to the syndicate?

Mr. GRAHAM: None whatever, except that they will rent the building on terms to be arranged, rent their portion of it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: And how much are they to rent?

Mr. GRAHAM: That is a matter of arrangement.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Am I to understand then that we put up $2,000,000 and that the syndicate is going to make money out of it?

Mr. GRAHAM: Not out of the $2,000,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Out of the property?

Mr. GRAHAM: They think they will, they think it is a good purchase.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: They are to become the owners and it is hoped that the railway will have quarters in this building, but the extent of the quarters, the amount of the room or the rent to be paid are questions still left open. Is that the position?

Mr. GRAHAM: Let me impress upon my hon. friend the fact that the Canadian National is a company incorporated to do business, a company given full authority by an act passed by his government to conduct the affairs of the system as determined by the president and the board of directors. The act was passed for the sole purpose of preventing, in fairness, all the details of transactions by that company from being made public in the Dominion of Canada. My hon. friend knows that his government passed the act for that purpose yet he is asking me a series of questions to-night that he knows would embarrass a private company. Nevertheless he does not hesitate to ask me these questions, not for the benefit of the gentlemen here but because it will be made public all through Canada and in London, Paris and New York, with the result that the men with whom we are dealing—honourable men, who have had business with the British government in an honourable way—might have their interests affected; indeed it might affect the whole transaction. The Canadian National Railway Board acted within their rights in doing what they did. My hon. friend cannot point to one illegal thing that the Canadian National Railway Board or their president have done in connection with this transaction. I ask him in all fairness not to press for details because I feel that I am in honour bound, on behalf of the president and the board of the Canadian National Railways to respect their confidence for the present with regard to a transaction which is only partially completed. When that transaction is fully completed —and that is the position taken by my hon. friend's leader—it will be right for parliament to know what has been done. I repeat there has been nothing wrong done. Everything is in the open. If any error has been committed at all, it is in the president and board of the Canadian National Railways trying to get a place they never had before, trying to get prominence for the Canadian National Railways and, in doing it, save the people of Canada the necessity of making any capital expenditure. I am speaking as the parliamentary representative of the board, not because this is my business. It is the business of the board, and they have acted in a perfectly legal manner. The board have an option on any space they want in this building at a fair rental. That is the proposition. If that is not a good transaction, then the men who have charge of the Canadian National Railways do not know what a good transaction is. I believe it is a good transaction in the interest of those railways.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I take it from what my hon. friend says that he did not know anything about this at all; he was not consulted.

Mr. GRAHAM: I did not say so.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I would like to know what the fact is. I would gather—

Mr. FIELDING: Did you not arrange to take the railways out of politics?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: There is another question. We will deal with that in a few minutes and I think we will deal with it efficiently too. Now, I am just asking this one question: Was the minister consulted before this was done?

Mr. GRAHAM: One at a time.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am just asking the one question.

Mr. GRAHAM: When you sit down I will answer it. Mr. Chairman, now my hon. friend comes round to the contention that the Canadian National Railway Board are not running the system at all but that the Minister of Railways is running it. I say that the Canadian National Railway Board acted within their legal rights. I told him the other day that the consent of the government had not been asked to this transaction; I forget whether it was my hon. friend or the leader of the Opposition who asked the question. The question was asked because the Canadian National Railway Board cannot buy property, or real estate, without an order in council. I said then, and I say now that the board had a perfect right to enter into this transaction and the matter was entered upon before the government was consulted at all.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I find it difficult to extract an answer from my hon. friend's speech. Was he consulted by the president before the latter entered into this negotiation?

Mr. GRAHAM: If I am as dense in speaking as my hon. friend is in understanding the Lord help me! I told him a moment ago, "No."

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I wanted to get an explicit answer so that there should be no doubt about it at all. We have this situation: There was absolutely no coming to the government at all one way or the other in the matter, no consent as to what may or may not be a profitable investment made out of public funds to the extent of $2,000,000. We now know the fact is that the board did not ask the government's "Yes" or "No" or anything else. Now, the Minister of Finance asks whether we tried to take this out of politics.

Mr. FIELDING: You said you had taken it out of politics.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Very good. I will take it any way my hon. friend likes. We said we had taken it out of politics.

Mr. FIELDING: Do you want to put it back now?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: If there was one thing that was always maintained by us it was this: That in connection with any matters which did not have to do with the direct administration of the company parliamentary control had to be there. It makes no difference whether the company honestly put up this two millions without any subterfuge or whether they put it up in this kind of a way. It is a matter of capital expenditure no matter for how short a period it is, and if the Minister of Finance is going to take the stand that that sort of thing can be done without his knowledge he is going to put himself in a very grave position. I do not think he approves of it; I am quite confident that on reflection he will not approve.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Does not my hon. friend think it is a good idea for the Canadian National Railways to have a continental headquarters in Paris?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It may or may not be good. It may be gross extravagance, or it may be of some use; I am not going to pass upon that question one way or the other. I can tell my hon. friend this, however: The statement made by the Minister of Railways that everything emanating from the Continent comes from Paris is entirely wrong.

Mr. GRAHAM: I did not say so.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I understood my hon. friend to say so.

Mr. GRAHAM: Not at all.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then he did not say so. My hon. friend did not say this was the place from which everybody went or came; but the great bulk of the Continent's traffic I may tell him does not originate in Paris.

Mr. GRAHAM: Most of it does, and the tourist traffic nearly all goes there.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I can well understand the desire of the Minister of Railways for tourist traffic. I suppose he is anticipating the fleets-to-be that he will have control of over the Atlantic.

Mr. GRAHAM: No, I am having trouble with the fleets-that-are.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Take that statement as a test of his sincerity on this question of tourist business. Has he one passenger boat on his list that is equipped for tourist traffic?

Mr. GRAHAM: I am sorry to report that my hon. friend, out of sixteen or seventeen steamers, did not build any capable of carrying passengers, but I do know that thousands of people cross the ocean on other steamships and have to take railway lines when they get here. They take railway lines when they are going across the continent to get to a steamship; and if, as has been the case in the past, there is nobody to say "Canadian National" to them when they are coming over, they are not likely to take the Canadian National when they get here.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Of course that all goes to show how completely the Minister of Railways has been overlooked by the president, and how absolutely he has been ignored, because if the president had taken him into his confidence—

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Does the hon. member not think—

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I will give the hon. member an opportunity to speak when I am through. If the president had taken the hon. minister into his confidence he never would have told him to make that argument about the tourist traffic.

Mr. GRAHAM: Why?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Because it would not be arranged that way. It is arranged by running arrangements with steamship lines originating the traffic, and for the purpose of doing that it is not necessary to buy large premises like this. My hon. friend from Pictou wished to ask me a question.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Does the hon. member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton) not think that the question of

settling headquarters for the Canadian National Railway on the Continent are in Sir Henry's hands? Does he blame Sir Henry Thornton if he is going to be ambitious and endeavour to earn money? Does he not think Sir Henry Thornton should have some slight ambition and some desire to build up a business on the Continent?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I will not discuss that for a moment. I am discussing so far the improper withdrawal of $2,000,000, unauthorized by the government, from the capital funds of this company.

Mr. GRAHAM: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Certainly.

Mr. GRAHAM: Did the Canadian National Railways do anything outside of their powers under the act passed by himself?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I would say so, absolutely.

Mr. GRAHAM: I would say not.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Without the slightest hesitation, I would say so. Why, Mr. Chairman, the idea of the whole act, so far as ordinary matters of business were concerned, was that there was not to be any interference. We took that stand right along. We took that stand when we were asked by hon. members opposite as to coal contracts and tie contracts.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Where did you draw the line?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I drew the line at capital expenditure, and it is very easy to draw the line between a $2,000,000 proposition and the ordinary business.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Does the hon. member say that if Sir Henry Thornton desired to build a branch line somewhere which he considered necessary for the business of the railway we should have nothing to say about it, and it should be done by the government?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I mean to say—and there is no mystery about it—that Sir Henry Thornton under the practice, under the statutes and under the votes, cannot build a single yard of new line without first getting the government's concurrence. There is nothing strange about it We were supposed to have details of appropriation in connection with all these capital account matters. If the hon. gentleman thinks Sir Henry Thornton can do as he pleases in regard to the mileage of this system, he is entirely mistaken.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): The hon. member certainly said that he had nothing to do with capital expenditure.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The hon. member can gain nothing by puting words in my mouth. Sir Henry Thornton can do nothing in the way of capital expenditure without the consent of parliament. He has to go to the government and through the government to parliament, in order to get the vote. He makes his recommendations, of course, just as any other general manager makes his recommendations, to the gentlemen who provide the funds. There can be no doubt that this is a complete departure from the former practice, and what I want to know from the minister is whether he endorses in any way the doctrine of his colleague the Acting Minister of National Defence (Mr Macdonald) and whether he thinks Sir Henry Thornton can build new lines without first coming to the government?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I never said that I thought Sir Henry Thornton could build new lines, without first coming to the government. My hon friend knows that perfectly well, and if he made the statement outside the House I would probably use language which is not parliamentary. But in the House I cannot say very much. My hon. friend took the ground that in regard to capital account the Minister of Railways was supreme under the act.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: No.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): He intimated that Sir Henry Thornton had no responsibility in regard to it. He said "We would not interfere with him in the slightest degree with regard to current expenses, but we would interfere in regard to capital account." Then he intimates that Sir Henry Thornton as president would not be responsible for capital expenditure. Does he mean to say the government can initiate these matters without the consent or recommendation of Sir Henry Thornton? My hon. friend is extremely misleading when he refers to what I said, but it is simply on a par with what he has been saying right along.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I thank my hon. friend for his clear, well-founded and beautiful statement. There is no mystery about it at all. What childishness to say the president has nothing to do with capital expenditure, when we at the same time say that he has to come to parliament to get authority for the capital expenditure? It is childish. Is it not childish to say he provides the money?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I never said that.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Would it not be childish to think so?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I never thought so.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Would it not be childish to think that the government would initiate and go on with the work apart from the man they had paid to do it? The whole fact is that the onus is on the president. The president ought to make his recommendations just like any other manager or president, he makes them to the government and he cannot act on these of his own motion in connection with capital expenditure until the government say so and until parliament provides the money. There is no mystery about that at all—not the slightest. The whole trouble, Sir, is that we have to have a smoke screen erected, just simply in some way to becloud what is a very simple and clear matter. Here is $2,000,000 taken, so far as parliament knows, merely to assist in a land speculation, out of which some unknown syndicate may or may not be making money, and we cannot even know who compose the syndicate. My hon. friend said that a fair rent was to be paid, and he is to have just as much area as he wants. What is the rent to be paid per foot?

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend is not as dense as he pretends to be; I do him the honour to believe that he understood what I said. Every man in the House knows what I said, and if there is any hon. gentleman here who should not say anything at all about one man putting words into the mouth of another it is the member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton). I never before, in the short space of thirty minutes, had what I said twisted on the one hand and remain unheeded on the other as I have just experienced in the past half hour. I told the hon. gentleman distinctly that the transaction had not yet been completed but that the Canadian National Railways, in this way, had secured a home where it was needed in the best part of Paris. I made it clear that it could secure all the space it required at what was decided upon as a fair rental.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Who is to decide what is a fair rental?

Mr. GRAHAM: I suppose that every bargain is made between two parties. If my hon. friend were going to rent floor space from me he would not ask parliament to decide what that space should be.

[Sir Henry Drayton.]

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then the bargain, I gather, is not yet made. If what the hon. gentleman says is correct, it appears that the bargain has not yet been consummated. I want to know whether or not it has been made. If it has already been made, then the rental is certain. The committee wants to know how the matter stands.

Mr. GRAHAM: There my hon. friend goes again, endeavouring to twist what I said and to interject into it something that may make it appear what it is not. I told him the details had not yet been concluded but that the Canadian National Railways would have a home at a fair rental decided upon between two men who understand the business.

Mr. STEVENS: I gather from what the minister says that the situation is somewhat in this position. The representative of the Canadian National Railways in Paris, that is to say, a regularly paid official of the railways, secured an option of space in a property in Paris. The Canadian National Railway Company has pledged itself to the vendors to the extent of $2,000,000 on behalf of an unknown syndicate, the names of whose members are not divulged to the House. This transaction, involving a committal of $2,000,000 of capital expenditure on the part of the railways, was launched without the knowledge of the government and before they were aware that it was being done. I think I am justified in assuming that Sir Henry Thornton, as President of the National Railways, undertook that transaction on his own responsibility. When it became known to the public of this country a week or two ago there certainly was reflected in the press and through other media a very severe criticism of the action in expending $2,000,000 for quarters in Paris, and then, as an afterthought, apparently, this syndicate came into existence. I do not assert that as a fact, but it undoubtedly is a fair inference to draw from the very meagre information we have been accorded. Now, the minister says that we are committed to $2,000,000; and we do not know whether this syndicate possesses the wherewithal to pay for that money for which we have stood responsible. Certainly, up to the present it has not undertaken to pay. So that we have committed ourselves to this sum of money; we have in a sense committed ourselves, as a country, to a bargain to rent space in this hotel building.

Mr. GRAHAM: Not as a country.

Mr. STEVENS: Well, the company acting on behalf of the government, because it is a

capital expenditure. We must differentiate in that regard; the expenditure is not a current one.

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not agree with the hon. member.

Mr. STEVENS: Will the minister be good enough to lay on the Table such documents as may exist, upon which this $2,000,000 was advanced? I cannot conceive that even Sir Henry Thornton would authorize an advance of such a sum of money without some form of documentary agreement or understanding. I do not wholly agree with the minister in his refusal to divulge the names of those who comprise the syndicate. This is a very different matter from divulging current detail business. Here is a syndicate of gentlemen, New Yorkers, apparently, who are securing a property in Paris, said to be of very excellent value, for $2,000,000. We, the people of Canada, are putting up the money for the time being. That is not the type of transaction that justifies secrecy or concealment, even temporarily, for the sake of confidence. Surely we ought to know who the members of this syndicate are. I say, I do not agree with the minister in his refusal to give their names; I think it would inspire a great deal more confidence in the whole transaction if they were revealed.

I would ask the minister, first, to give to the committee all the details of the arrangement upon which this advance of $2,000,000 is based, because that is a reasonable request; and I again point out that it is capital expenditure and not a matter of current business, which I fully agree with him should not necessarily be divulged. Business of a current character I do not say ought to be revealed; but this is not such business; this is a matter of capital expenditure, just as if we undertook to build a piece of railway or to construct a building in some of our holdings in the United States or in any other part of the world. It is a straight capital expenditure, and I submit that the committee is entitled to full information. Let me fortify that opinion. In the very item under discussion, the details in regard to which we shall request of the minister, there is a reference to operating deficits, acquisition of property and materials and supplies. Under that head I asked the minister a little while ago whether this matter was included, and he said it was not. But he has every detail before him which he will divulge to parliament and upon which the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) will make an advance of $73,000,000. That is where the former Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) is right in his protest, and it will not answer the question for the minister to say that the law passed under the leadership of my right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) in 1919 provided for all this. The law did not provide for this or any similar transaction at all; it provided exactly against such transactions.

9 p.m.

Referring briefly to the suggestions made by the Acting Minister of National Defence (Mr. Macdonald), I want to assure the committee that we are not seeking to interfere with the management of the railways. No; we are seeking to bring that management to account for departing from the clear intent of the law in this matter in making a capital commitment of $2,000,000 without even the knowledge of the minister. That is our point.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am glad my hon. friend puts it that way. I asked the ex-Minister of Finance distinctly, and he was careful not to say that the transaction was contrary to the act. Now, this transaction was approved in the first place by the financial department of the Canadian National Railways, and afterwards by Mr. Ruel, whose knowledge of these matters will, I think, be conceded to be equal to that of any other legal authority in this country. So it is out of the question to find fault with the president and his board of directors. They take Mr. Ruel's legal opinion, and up to date it has been found to be sound. He thoroughly approves the legality of this transaction. My hon. friend insists that we purchased the building. We did not.

Mr. STEVENS: I say the government is committed to a capital expenditure of $2,000,000 for the purchase of a building.

Mr. GRAHAM: It is not committed to a capital expenditure. It has financially backed a man who has bought this building, which is to be transferred. The Canadian National Railway simply became responsible for the financing of the project temporarily, and temporarily only.

Mr. STEVENS: Permit me to interrupt. But this commitment of $2,000,000 is on the say-so of a paid official of the National Railways—the Paris representative. Now, that man has no responsibility whatever. We might as well have had a clerk out of the department. The only difference, perhaps, would have been in their respective status, that is all.

Mr. CHURCH: Mr. Chairman, we are asked to vote $73,000,000 for this particular

item, or twice the expenditure of all Canada's estimates in 1894. When the budget was introduced by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) he told us that but for the railway deficits we could have had some reduction in taxation. These railways deficits are bearing very heavily on the people to-day, and in my opinion the vote should not be passed until it has been reported upon by the Railway Commission. A royal commission composed of Mr. A. H. Smith, Sir Henry Drayton and Mr. Acworth investigated our railways in 1917, and the most important part of their report was that in which they dealt with the subject of capital expenditure. They recommended, in effect, that before such a vote as this was passed there should be a report on it by some responsible body appointed by parliament for that particular purpose. Mr. Smith, then president of the New York Central, recommended, and Sir Henry Drayton, then chairman of our Railway Commission, agreed with him, that we should:

> Amend the regulating policy so that the Railway Commission may have jurisdiction over all railroads in the matter of maximum and minimum rates, the issuance of securities, the building of new railways, or the extension of lines, and other matters properly within the scope of governmental supervision.

The National Railway Board are committing the country to capital outlays running into millions of dollars, and we may well ask ourselves to-night: Have we responsible government in Canada? The board visited the city of Ottawa recently, looked over the terminals and then anounced that millions of dollars would be spent on their improvement. They proceeded to the city of Hamilton, where after inspecting the National Railways' facilities there they announced further expenditures of millions of dollars. Then they came to the city of Toronto and arranged to erect a sky-scraper office building. All this was done without consulting the government or parliament. Last year a vote for a similar purpose went through very easily and large sums of money were provided for the physical improvement of these railway properties, for their co-ordination, for additional rolling stock and for certain branch line construction. But after the expenditure of all that money what do we find? It was hoped some co-ordination would be effected, but very little has been done towards this end. True, the railways have not done badly during the past year, but the point is that we should scrutinize these expenditures a little more carefully at the time we vote them and not wait until recess to find out what we do about them.

[Mr. Church.]

But notwithstanding this large capital outlay what do we find in the annual report of the Canadian National Railways which was laid on the table a few weeks ago? We find that the gross earnings decreased by nearly $7,000,000, the figures for 1921 being $127,000,000 as against $120,135,000 for 1922. The operating expenses in 1921 were in round figures $143,000,000 as against $129,000,000 in 1922, or a reduction of $14,000,000—not so bad. There was also a reduction of about $7,000,000 in the operating deficit, the figures being $16,000,000 for 1921 as against $9,000,000 for 1922. These again are round figures. Some betterments were made, but they were not of a character to increase the earnings, and it would be far better for the directors to bear this in mind when making further capital outlay. The new station in Toronto is still standing idle waiting the building of the viaduct, and these increased facilities alone would, I believe, augment the earnings in that district by at least one-third. The annual National Railway report states that the decrease in passenger traffic is discouraging, particularly as the quality of the service given has improved and because the rate for passenger travel in Canada is relatively low, being generally slightly below the prevailing rates in the United States. This is not strictly accurate, for in the United States they have special holiday, week end and excursion rates, which we do not now enjoy to as great an extent. In the freight earnings there is a loss of revenue due to the Crowsnest pass agreement rates, estimated to be six and a half million dollars. The freight, passenger and express earnings were all less than in 1921. A hundred and seventy miles of new road were put into operation in the past twelve months in Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia. I do not criticize the board for that at all, I have no doubt it was necessary, but large sums of money were spent on betterments from which they do not get any revenue. The hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Ryckman) pointed out last year that $50,000 to $75,000 per day can be saved in railway expenses by up-to-date co-ordination. Have we got that co-ordination to-day? We have not. The hon. member for Saskatoon (Mr. Evans) pointed out recently that in his own city there are no signs of co-ordination, that trains are running on parallel lines so close together that they are within a stone's throw of each other. The same thing may be seen on the north shore of Lake Ontario, and the trains running between Toronto, Whitby and

Belleville could in my opinion be co-ordinated and a large saving effected.

I think the Canadian National Railway Board has altogether too much power—a power that is prejudicial to our system of responsible government. I believe that the Canadian National Railway Board should have a free hand to administer the railway system; there should be no political interference whatsoever. The government of the country has proceeded along proper lines in this respect during the last few years. The present ministry has been more than sympathetic and has been doing very good work as far as it has gone, but there has not been the co-ordination that there should be. The present head of this railway has been going up and down the country making speeches and promising sidings, lines, terminals, skyscrapers, here, there and everywhere. Now, one of the most important feeders of the National Railways should be the merchant marine, on the ocean, on the river St. Lawrence, and on the Great Lakes. What has made the Canadian Pacific the great railway it is to-day, with its large earning power per mile? It has been very largely the co-ordination which has existed between its ocean and lake services and its rail communications. So our National Railways might very well take a leaf out of its rival's book, instead of recommending the sale of that merchant marine, constituting, as it does, an important feeder to the railway line. Now, I say that something should be done to bring our National Railways up to date. I would like to mention one or two matters in connection with which economies might well be effected. I have seen members travelling on the trains, and I have seen a large number of private cars proceeding all over the country. I knew a gentleman connected with the railway offices who used to have an office position in Toronto; there are big officials of that kind who could not go as far as Hamilton without dragging a private car along the right of way, even with coal as high as from $10 to $15 a ton. And in other ways there has not been co-ordination. There have been transfers of officials from Moncton to Montreal, from one city to another, and so far as I know there has not been any economy effected by the transfer. So I say that co-ordination has not been effected and economies have not been brought about which would increase the efficiency of the system.

There is another branch of the administration of this railway system which must receive attention if success is to be attained; every employee must be satisfied, must be happy and contented. That condition does not prevail to-day on the National Railways. As I say, the minister is doing the best he can; he has done very good work, but in my opinion the principle of promotion should apply on this line as it does on the New York Central, Michigan Central, the Baltimore and Ohio, and on the Pennsylvania and Lake Shore lines. An announcement was made the other day from the general offices of the Baltimore and Ohio Railway that the principle of promotion would apply to all its employees from the very bottom of the ladder to the top, even to the presidency of that great railway. The same principle applies on the Pennsylvania lines and on the New York Central lines. But what have we in Canada? We are sending to England and to the United States for people to take high positions in connection with our railway system; although there is an alien labour law, as I understand it, on the statute book to-day, people are being brought in here to take positions that ought to go to Canadians. I say that the principle of promotion is the best principle; it is the principle which applies on all the leading railway systems of the United States and England. The leading railway officials in these countries have come from the ranks; the best men we have on our railways in this country have come from the ranks. I do hope that this principle will not be forgotten in the future.

Certain regional areas have been established by the present board of directors of the National Railway system. That was a very popular phrase with Julius Caesar—"regions Caesar never knew," and so on. It is a very high-sounding term, "regional area," but I cannot see where any needed co-ordination or economies are effected as the result of the establishment of these regional areas.

As to rates, there has been some downward trend. In that connection I wish to point out that by legislation of last session provision was made for certain additional rolling stock. During the last twelve months there have been added to the equipment 870 new freight cars, 561 additional freight cars, 26 passenger cars. With all these 1,600 new freight cars and the others that they had on hand a year ago, there are three months in the year when these cars are standing idle, although they could be transporting coal and other products from the prairie provinces to the head of the lakes and to central Canada. A rate of $9 a ton has been quoted on coal. I submit that the earnings of the road could be very largely increased and this $73,000,000 item could be very much reduced if instead

of allowing a large number of old and new cars to stand idle during three or four months of the year they were utilized to bring down the products I have named from Alberta to central Canada. During the first year or two of these operations there might be a deficit, but I am confident that as the years went on a surplus would result.

The present charges against the railways are as follows: construction, $587,000,000, equipment, $88,000,000; deficit, $122,000,000; fixed charges, $145,000,000. These figures are almost appalling. Unless new sources of revenue are devised, these enormous charges are going to mean increased taxation on the people of Canada for many years to come, under the present system of operation of our National Railways.

Now, some hon. gentlemen sitting in this chamber have blamed public ownership for these deficits. But public ownership is not responsible; it is private ownership that has been responsible for the mismanagement of our railways. Public ownership did not build the Canadian Northern. Public ownership did not build the Grand Trunk. Public ownership did not build the Grand Trunk Pacific or the National Railways. These railways were built under private auspices and we now have these appalling deficits. So I say that the members of the committee should examine very carefully this item of $73,000,000. In my opinion, many of the capital expenditures that have been made during the past twelve months might easily have waited over—many of the so-called betterments, the erection of sidings and terminals, the building of 73 new stations, and so on, many of them in districts that are not self-sustaining. The people of Ontario are behind the National Railways; they are doing everything they can to support the publicly-owned system. In the district from which I come, 326 cities in the hydro-electric movement have had for some time past a working arrangement with the National Railways, designed to promote the interests of that particular system, and they intend to continue it. Everybody wants to give the National Railways a chance. But the minister mentioned the other day one reason why the head of our National Railways system should become a member of the board of Canada Steamships. Now, it was brought out in the lake freights inquiry that the railways of Canada fixed the rates on the lakes for waterborne traffic. That is stated in the report; I need not read it. If there is one thing more than another that is going to help to eliminate the deficit on the Canadian National Railways it is the advantage that waterborne traffic will give on lake, river and ocean as a feeder of our National Railways. I am very much disappointed, as a believer in the national system, that the head of the system has joined the board of Canada Steamships, which has a monopoly on the Great Lakes to-day, as is set out in the report to which I have referred. Now, the reason the minister gave for the president of the system becoming a member of that board was that there was an exchange of traffic between the National Railways and Canada Steamships. Well, there is also an exchange of traffic with the Canadian Pacific, with the New York Central, with the Michigan Central; is it proposed to offer the same argument in that connection, namely, that for that reason Sir Henry Thornton should become a director of the Canadian Pacific, of the New York Central, of the Michigan Central? I do not think that argument could reasonably be offered. The president of the National Railways may be a many-sided man, but he cannot serve two masters; he cannot serve Canada Steamships and the National Railways as well.

The minister presented a very excellent annual statement at Easter with regard to the Canadian National Railways. I believe the day is not far distant when the onerous burden on the Finance Minister, the Minister of Railways, and the people of Canada in respect of our railways will be relieved. I believe a better day is dawning for our national system under public ownership. I believe that a united effort should be made in support of the National Railways. Municipalities and every patriotic citizen who has the welfare of this country at heart should work in harmony with the directors of the railways and the government should do all possible to see if something cannot be done to eliminate the deficits.

In my opinion this vote of $73,000,000 should be cut in two. I do not believe there is any need of spending $73,000,000 of the people's money for betterments on this railway in view of the deficits that have to be made up from year to year. I believe that if there was more co-ordination there would be less deficits. The acquisition of new property can wait till the railway is in a better position. Why should we build sky scrapers when we cannot get a proper terminal in a city of 500,000 people? I do not think the committee would be justified in voting this amount of money, a large amount of which is to be spent on betterments, construction and rolling stock. In my opinion the money on a lot of these betterments to the railway will have no earning power for many years to come. Furthermore, there is no line

in America that is spending such a large amount of money on betterments and equipment, and the National is supposed to be a new system, with new rolling stock, new stations, and so forth. I think in view of the expenditure of some $587,000,000 to date on capital, as I pointed out before, on the National Railways, we could get along for a while without new branch lines, sidings and turn-outs, and call a halt on a lot of it that is not immediately revenue producing.

I believe it was wrong on the part of the new Railway Board to countermand the no-politics order. I believe that no good will come from the revocation of that order by the chairman of the board after he had been in office only a short time and had had only a cursory look over the system. I have here the report of the Royal Commission on Railways of 1917 which recommends against the employees of the system being allowed to take part in politics. In May, 1903, there was another royal commission on transportation appointed in Canada which also recommended the same thing. They have had the same experience in the United States, and in Victoria, Australia, where the men went on strike and alienated public sympathy by their attitude in 1903. I think the no politics order was right and proper, and showed the wisdom of Mr. Hanna, and now the new directorate is turning things topsy-turvy and upsetting the no-politics order. I say that is not even in the interests of the men because under public onwership the men need never be afraid of their employers. They will be better treated than under private employers. Their employers can afford to pay because the railway is operating at cost.

In conclusion, I wish the National Railways every success. I believe that before many days are over this magnificent investment of the people of Canada will be able to pay its way. It is a magnificent system, one of the largest and one of the best conducted in the world. We had no strikes on the railway last year. The passenger service in Ontario has never been equalled. So much is that the case that the National Railway is taking business from the Canadian Pacific on all the main lines in Ontario. If we can only do something to keep down the expenses, if we can complete the deepening of the Welland canal and encourage water-borne traffic as a feeder to the Nationals, I believe that a day of prosperity lies before the National Railways.

Mr. CANNON: I listened with great interest to the remarks made by the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton). I wish to say very frankly that I was astonished to hear my hon. friend express surprise that the Canadian National Railways were administered in such a way as to take away practically all departmental responsibility. My hon. friend has been in this House for four years now, and if I am not mistaken he was present in 1919 when the legislation that exists to-day was introduced by his own friends. We pointed out at that time that the law should not be what it was. We pointed out at that time also that the law contained clauses which were a real danger to responsible government in Canada. The answer given to our arguments was not the answer which my hon. friend is receiving tonight. It was the usual answer given by the Tory government of that time—closure. That is the only satisfaction we got. The law was put into force, the railways were administered under it, and I really do not understand my hon. friend tonight when he grieves that the Minister of Railways has not got anything more to do with their management than the law enables him to have. I will refer my hon. friend to the debates which took place during 1921 when he was sitting to the right of Mr. Speaker and supporting the government led by the present leader of the Opposition. Dr. Reid who has now gone to the Senate was then Minister of Railways, and I asked the Minister of Railways at that time about the administration of the railways and how things were managed. My hon. friend was Minister of Finance in the House at that time, and although I have read the reports in Hansard very carefully I can find nowhere that he protested in the way he is protesting tonight. For instance at page 1663 of the Hansard of 1921, Dr. Reid made the following statement to the House in the presence of my hon. friend:

> None of the officials or the minister has anything to do with the expenditure. That is left entirely to the management.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Hear, hear. I still agree.

Mr. CANNON: So if the then Minister of Railways could make a statement of that kind in the House of Commons when my hon. friend was Minister of Finance, how can he get up tonight and sincerely express surprise when the present Minister of Railways takes exactly the same position that my hon. friend's friend took two years ago? On the same page of Hansard the Minister of Railways of that day said:

> We have a Board of Management operating the Canadian National railways. They were placed in charge, and have been operating the railway. I have not in any way interfered with them. I feel that if the operation of the Canadian National railways is

to be made a success, as I hope it will, there must be no interference by the Minister of Railways or any other member of the government. That is the position I take.

That was the position taken by the then Minister of Railways in the presence of my hon. friend who was then Minister of Finance, and who in accordance with constitutional usage was responsible as a member of the cabinet for what the Minister of Railways was saying in the House.

To sum up, I say that the attitude taken by the government to-night is the only attitude that can be taken in view of the law which was passed by the former government and which was supported by my hon. friends who now sit to the left of the Speaker. We cannot take any other position. I would not go as far as to say that I approve of this situation. I would not go as far as to say that it is a situation that is very favourable to the people of Canada, and to their representatives in parliament. But we have to follow the law which was passed by the former government, and passed under closure notwithstanding the representations which were made by the members of the then opposition. When my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Finance goes further and asks for information concerning this famous Paris syndicate his memory must be very short. The members of the opposition at that time got up and asked for information. That information was refused by the government in which my hon. friend was Minister of Finance, and refused for the reason that it was not in the public interest that it should be given.

In this country, Mr. Chairman, especially when a man occupies the very exalted position which is occupied by the ex-Minister of Finance is it possible to maintain that a statesman or a public man, who wishes the welfare of his country and that only, can take one attitude when he is a minister and change that attitude when he quits office? Either my hon. friend was right when he was Minister of Finance and supported the measures which I have just mentioned, or he was not. I think he was sincere at that time and if he was, he certainly cannot maintain the attitude which he has assumed to-night; he cannot ask us to believe that he is as sincere to-night as he was then. If he is sincere to-night was he sincere two years ago? I doubt it.

We had to adopt a situation which is not the product of our own policy. We fought the policy of the former government but the law which they introduced and passed is now in force. The railways are now owned by the public. They have to be managed and administered, and they are managed and administered in accordance with the provisions of the law passed by the Borden and the Meighen governments. My hon. friend was a framer of those laws. He was one of the ministers who supported those laws in parliament; and to-day, now that he is leading the opposition in the absence of his right hon. leader, I do not think that he will increase his prestige throughout the country in any way by creating difficulties for the Minister of Railways, when he knows that the minister is simply doing what the law allows him to do and nothing else. It would be detrimental to the public interest to give the information for which my hon. friend is asking. He knows that quite well.

In conclusion I simply wish to say that I have not changed my attitude in regard to this matter. I fought those laws when they were introduced into parliament, and I hope that sooner or later some means will be found whereby the representatives of the people will be given a stronger control over the administration of our railways. That can only be done by changing the laws that are now on our statute books. I wish to express the hope that the government will satisfy the people that the bonuses voted to the former officials, and to some of the present officials, will be thoroughly investigated, and that these gentlemen will not be allowed, when we have an enormous deficit like we had last year, to receive the large amounts which they voted to themselves. The people of Canada are called upon to pay taxes, and very heavy taxes, to meet our railway deficit. We are called upon to economize in practically every branch of our railway administration. Let the railways themselves give an example of economy. I have a hope, and a firm hope, that the government will see to it that these bonuses are refunded so that the people will know that if our railways are costing us a large sum of money, we at least are doing what we can to curb extravagance.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think my hon. friend from Dorchester (Mr. Cannon) is quite right in one respect. He has a right to expect sincerity and consistency on the part of our public men. He has charged me with inconsistency and lack of sincerity to-night, but I am going to show him that I am both consistent and sincere. I do not want to see the tu quoque argument which is always used by my hon. friends across the aisle when they say "Did you not do this and did you not do that?" I

am not going to refer to what they said when they were in opposition, or remind the House that they made a complete right about face when they got into power. Two wrongs do not make a right. My hon. friend has a right to expect consistency and sincerity somewhere in the House, but he will not find it in the gentlemen around him.

In the first place I am going to take up what was said by the Acting Minister of National Defence. He made a point which would be a perfectly good one if it were well founded—that was as to the right of the railway management to spend public moneys, that they were responsible for the expenditure and could undertake the obligation. The trouble is the hon. gentleman was quite wrong. The statute shows absolutely the contrary of what he was alleging. I may say that I have not had the same opportunity of studying this statute that other hon. gentlemen have had; it was passed before I entered the House. However, I will take my share of the responsibility although I was not here when this legislation was enacted. Now, the question of new lines is dealt with by section 23 of the Act to Incorporate the National Railway Company which provides:

> With the approval of the Governor in Council and upon any location sanctioned by the Minister of Railways and Canals—

The committee will see two checks there. The first is that the minister has to pass upon this capital expenditure, and afterwards the Governor in Council has to do the same thing.

> —the company may from time to time construct and operate railway lines, branches and extensions, or railway facilities or properties of any description in respect to the construction whereof respectively, parliament may hereafter authorize the necessary expenditure, or the guarantee of an issue of the company's securities. A copy of any plan or profile made in respect of any completed railway shall be deposited with the Board of Railway Commissioners of Canada.

Hon. gentlemen will see that we have here a thorough and most complete check, the check of parliament. These lines can only be built either by money voted by parliament, or else guaranteed by parliament, so that we have a complete check through parliament, the department, and the Governor in Council on these capital expenditures. The thing is so clear I am not quite sure that the Acting Minister of National Defence, seeing the necessity of a smoke screen of some kind, did not utter the first thing that came into his head. He really could not have considered the submission he was making. That is all I wish to refer to, because the thing is very clear.

Now I invite the attention of the hon. member for Dorchester to my next point. The position of the directors of this road is the same as the position of the directors of an ordinary railway company. I think my hon. friend will agree with that. It has not advanced beyond that point. Then, Mr. Chairman, I want to point out that there is a substitution of the shareholders under the act for the Governor in Council. The people of Canada are the shareholders, represented by the Governor in Council, in so far as powers under the act to be exercised by shareholders are concerned. My hon. friend will find that section 9 of the act of 1919, chapter 13, makes that absolutely clear. It reads:

> When, under the provisions of the Railway Act or any other statute or law, the approval, sanction or confirmation by shareholders is required, such approval, sanction or confirmation may be given by the Governor in Council.

So that the committee will see that what has been done under this act is very plain. The directors have the right to carry on business just exactly in the same way as the directors of any other railway company have, and for the shareholders their powers, votes and meetings is substituted the action or the consideration of the Governor in Council. The thing is perfectly clear, therefore. I need not elaborate the point with my hon. friend for Dorchester. He would not for one moment contend, I take it, under the provisions of the Railway Act, that directors can enter new fields, and hazard the capital of the company in new ventures, without the assent of the shareholders. I think we would all have to admit that. Then if that be the case, the position is the same, so far as this board is concerned. They cannot enter new fields and they cannot risk the country's money without the government, acting for the shareholders, assenting. I take it we can have no dispute down to that point. So that the whole result is that these directors have no greater powers than any other directors. They are just in the same position.

Mr. GRAHAM: They have just as much power.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Just as much, but no more, and if my friend will consult the legal members around him, I think they will agree that that is absolutely correct. The proposition then is that these directors can do the same as any other directors. They can carry on the ordinary every day business of the company without submitting it to the shareholders for approval, but if they desire to go into new fields to make capital expenditures, they have to come, as provided by

section 7 of the act, to the Governor in Council for approval. I take it that is absolutely clear. I want to be entirely consistent and I think I am. Again, speaking particularly to my hon. friend the hon. member for Dorchester, the position that was taken in 1920, I think he will find—and if it was not taken, then it was wrong—was in regard, to the expenditure of funds in the ordinary carrying out of the business of the corporation on the one hand, or, on the other hand, the expenditure of funds which had been authorized as capital expenditure by this parliament.

Mr. CANNON: In the Debates of 1921, page 1662, Dr. Reid, the Minister of Railways, stated:

> They can expend all the earnings without any certificate from the Railway department, but they cannot get any money from the Finance department until they get a certificate from the Railway department that the work is necessary. Then the money is provided as the work proceeds.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I agree with my hon. friend and he is going to agree with me, because he is not going to say that that application of moneys received can be for anything outside the powers of the directorate under the Railway Act. In other words, the directors' trust, in running the business and getting in the receipts, is to apply the receipts and moneys they take in, to the discharge of their current obligations arising out of the carrying on of the business. I think my hon. friend will agree with that. I entirely agree with what was said, and I think he will agree with me that that is the legal result of what was said, because we had to look at the act. Now the position here is entirely different. Here we have a new field and a new expenditure entirely, and an expenditure for a new purpose admittedly. The Canadian National never entered the continental field at any time. They had no offices over there of any kind. I am not saying this for the purpose of trying the matter out. No one would call to order directors who entered into a lease for the purpose of trying the matter out with small commitments—commitments that should be made out of the year's business. That would be all right, but that is not what we have. We have an entry into a new field, plus the application of the moneys which ought, under the act, to have been applied in the discharge of the regular obligations of the company, to a purpose entirely new and outside the former operations of the company. That would not be illegal if you had the shareholders say so—I admit that. But in order to make it legal the shareholders say so, endorsement will have to be given, and the shareholder in this case happens to be the Governor in Council. I hope my hon. friend will not accuse me of inconsistency. My argument may be weak, but I do not believe that he thinks so. He has followed me closely, and I think he agrees with me. But be it strong or weak, it is sincere. I sincerely believe it is absolutely illegal for any director to switch the capital funds of the company, that it is illegal to undertake any new and further obligations outside of the ambit of the present operations, and I think my hon. friend will say I am, at least, sincere.

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend is giving me the exact concrete form of the thing I would like to have said, but I could not have said it as well. He argues this board has the same power, say, as the board of the Canadian Pacific Railway—to get down to a concrete case. I wish to ask this question: If the Canadian Pacific Railway wanted to buy a property in Paris, and put up the president of the railroad or someone else to buy it, in order that they might get the use of it, would they call the shareholders together and get their consent to it? No. Because that would make it public, and you could not buy it then, except at a price and a half. What they would do in nine cases out of ten would be that the president himself would get an option on the property, and would have a perfect right to put up financial security for the property, and have it ratified by the shareholders afterwards.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: There is no question that it would be necessary to have it ratified by the shareholders. In the meantime, the president would be taking a chance. He is doing something he has no legal right to do at all.

Mr. GRAHAM: The only practical way to do it.

Mr. LEWIS: Reverting to the Paris incident, I would like to ask the minister whether the Canadian National Railway, in putting up this loan of $2,000,000, is receiving any interest on the loan?

Mr. GRAHAM: Surely.

Mr. LEWIS: In what sense are they receiving interest on the loan?

Mr. GRAHAM: The money is in the bank, and the bank allows interest on any deposit.

Mr. LEWIS: With reference to subsection (e) of item 139, "construction and betterments," have the officials of the National Railways presented any programme with respect to branch lines at the present time? Has any

schedule been brought down contemplating the construction of such lines in the near future?

Mr. GRAHAM: There is nothing in this vote for branch lines except perhaps for minor ones. I stated a few days ago that the board had recommended a programme of branch lines, which I hope to introduce by way of resolution in a very few days.

Mr. LEWIS: The subsection to which I have just referred, "construction and betterments," is included in the vote, and I thought the minister could tell us whether any branch lines were being considered. There is another question I desire to have answered. Will the Canadian National officials who will be engaged in this building in Paris also act in the capacity of immigration officers?

Mr. GRAHAM: The Canadian National officials, like the officials of the Canadian Pacific Railway, will co-operate with the Immigration department in the interests of immigration.

Mr. LEWIS: Does the immigration which at present comes from that part of Europe demand such a large expenditure as is provided for in this loan, and that offices shall be established in Paris?

Mr. GRAHAM: The hon. gentleman seems to think that the Canadian National Railways are going to occupy the whole of the building.

Mr. LEWIS: Not at all.

Mr. GRAHAM: The railways will use only a part of it. As I pointed out some time ago, the Canadian National system wants to get its share of all the business which there is, or which can be created. That is not being done at present, because there are no headquarters in Paris. It is believed that traffic can be secured by an aggressive policy in Paris which will add greatly to the income of the railways.

Mr. LEWIS: I can readily understand that if the Canadian National Railways are ever to be put upon a paying basis there is only one way in which this can be brought about, and that is by service to the public. Naturally, we should expect that if we are to have service the population ought to be increased. But at the same time I would impress upon the minister the importance of having branch lines and feeders to the main trunk lines. We have sufficient trunk lines now; in fact, I think we have too many; and the only way in which the railways can be made to pay at all is to give them something to do. There are places in the West that are thirty or forty miles from any railway, and as a result the farmers do not produce as much as they would if they were in the vicinity of a railway line. Some of these people have been promised railways for a number of years. They went into these remote districts on the strength of such promises, and because those pledges are not being honoured many of these people are leaving. It does seem to me that if the government is going to shoulder a loan of $2,000,000, it would be much better, in the interests of the Canadian people and of the Canadian National Railways, to expend the money on branch lines to serve such places as are badly in need of them. I certainly hope that when the schedule is brought down to parliament it will include a number of branch lines and feeders for the main trunk lines; I am convinced that it is absolutely necessary to provide these lines if the railways are to pay. In the vicinity of Swift Current we have certain lines that are almost completed, just about twenty-five miles or so remaining to be done. But because of this gap it is necessary to send grain and coal over some hundreds of miles to connect up with the main lines. As a business proposition, therefore, and as an investment that would prove beneficial to the public well-being as well as in the interests of the National lines, I would urge that all such gaps be closed up and that the branch lines be completed as soon as possible.

Mr. STEVENS: A short while ago I asked the minister a question or two and he was rescued from his dilemma by the intervention of some other observations. I inquired what objection he had to informing the committee of the nature of the agreement, or the conditions of the agreement, entered into between the company and the syndicate in New York on whose behalf the $2,000,000 is advanced. I should really like the minister to give us that information. I would also ask him to state in what way he considers anyone could be injured or any interests be jeopardized by disclosing the personnel of the syndicate. I would call his attention, too, to the answer he returned to my hon. friend from Swift Current (Mr. Lewis) on the question of interest. The interest, he says, is being paid on the $2,000,000 by the bank. But is not the syndicate charging interest at a much higher rate for the $2,000,000 advanced in Paris? And who absorbs that difference?

Mr. GRAHAM: That is very easy; I can answer a plain question without any frills. The bank is paying interest, and the difference between that interest and the interest that

will be charged the party in whose name the building was purchased will have to be absorbed.

Mr. STEVENS: That is only one of my questions.

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend puts his questions so delicately that one would almost imagine he was innocent.

Mr. STEVENS: So I am.

Mr. GRAHAM: But if I answered the delicate question he asks, he would have all the information which I am bound in honour not to divulge.

Mr. STEVENS: That is just what we want. Will the minister give the reasons why he cannot answer the question?

Mr. GRAHAM: If I gave the reasons I should simply be answering the question.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: No.

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend is not so innocent as the Minister of Finance.

Mr. FIELDING: The ex-Minister.

Mr. GRAHAM: The ex-Minister, I mean; the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) is innocent.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Do not believe him.

Mr. GRAHAM: When my hon. friend says: I do not ask that you give me the agreement, but I want you to tell me what your reasons are for not being able to give it to me. —when he says that, he is simply asking in a subtle way for the information which he knows I cannot give him. If I stated the reasons it would only be answering the entire question, and my hon. friend knows that. There are reasons which I believe, and which the Canadian National Company believes, are valid why, in the public interest, the information should not be divulged at the present time. But parliament will be entitled to all the information when the transaction is completed.

10 p.m.

An hon. MEMBER: When it is too late.

Mr. STEVENS: Surely the minister cannot be serious in taking that stand.

Mr. GRAHAM: He is.

Mr. STEVENS: Then I suppose I must accept his answer. In that event I think we are justified in expressing an opinion in the absence of definite information.

Mr. GRAHAM: Surely.

[Mr. Graham.]

Mr. STEVENS: I think I have already suggested that Sir Henry Thornton, as the head of the National Railways, stepped beyond his reasonable authority and exceeded his rights in committing the Canadian people to an expenditure—committing them, I repeat, to an expenditure—of $2,000,000 without placing in the hands of the minister, to be placed before parliament, one word of the agreement upon which such advance was made. In the second place I say that if Sir Henry Thornton's conception of his duty as president of this great system is that he is justified in placing $2,000,000 in the hands of an employee of the Canadian National Railways in Paris to purchase a hotel for a syndicate in New York, then again I say Sir Henry Thornton's idea of his duties is such as will not increase my confidence in him. It is beyond me to understand that a transaction of this magnitude—not the purchase of a private car or some little matter of that kind involving a few thousand dollars, but the purchase of a central site in Paris—was entered into and the money deposited in the bank without informing the minister, that such a step was being taken. To me it is inconceivable that a man of the standing of Sir Henry Thornton should take such a position unless he has got an altogether distorted idea of his importance and his position in this country as head of the National Railways. That is my opinion, and in the absence of definite information from the minister I think I am justified in expressing that opinion in stronger terms than perhaps would be necessary if we had all the information before the committee.

I intimated a little while ago, and I repeat it now, that it would appear to me that after a test of public opinion was made by the rather flamboyant announcement—characteristic of the gentleman's attitude since he has had this exalted position—that he, Sir Henry Thornton, had bought a hotel in Paris, which was blazoned all over the country, and the reflection of an adverse public opinion through the press and other mediums, that as a result this syndicate is a second thought, is only now being arranged, and is not a bona fide syndicate capable of carrying through this transaction. That is my candid opinion, and again I say I am justified in expressing that opinion in the absence of one iota of evidence that these gentlemen are competent, both so far as business ability and financial responsibility are concerned, to carry through a $2,000,000 purchase. If the Canadian National Railways desire to improve their position on the Continent, they could very well be satisfied with ordinary rented quar-

ters in Paris, Brussels, Rotterdam, Antwerp and other cities and do their business in a fairly satisfactory manner without an extravagant expenditure.

There is another item which I do not wish to involve with this one, but I will just mention it. We are told that this $73,000,000 vote is necessary for the carrying on of the railways. We know branch lines are needed, and we know that there is a curtailment of expenditure in this direction. Yet here is a sum of $2,000,000, segregated for goodness knows how long, to finance a private undisclosed syndicate; here is a million and a quarter dollars—and I want the committee to listen to this—for the purchase of one of the most expensive sites in Toronto at the corner of King and Yonge from the owners, a chartered bank—a corner that I am informed was purchased by that bank about eighteen months previously for approximately $700,000. Now, I have this to say to the minister, and I ask him to pass it on to Sir Henry Thornton: If Sir Henry Thornton's idea of his responsibility to this country, his $50,000 position, is that he can, without consultation with or notification to the government, purchase for $2,000,000 a hotel in Paris through an official, and purchase a property at the corner of King and Yonge streets, Toronto, for a million and a quarter dollars—giving to the bank a profit of $550,000 in a few months—then I say Sir Henry Thornton's idea of managing the affairs of the National Railways is a great disappointment to me, and until these matters are fully and completely explained I shall lack very great confidence in the future of the National Railways under the control of Sir Henry Thornton.

Mr. BAXTER: Mention has been made of branch lines and it has been stated that we would be informed later on as to the appropriations to be made for their construction or completion. Would the minister tell me what there is that differentiates the buying of a hotel or the acquisition of a corner block in Toronto from the completion or construction of a branch railway? Why is it that the minister gets information and the government passes upon the construction of branch railways and submits the matter to parliament, and yet if it is a building in the centre of Paris or of Toronto the minister and the government are not permitted to know anything about it? I want to find some clear line of policy, some separation of the subjects, so that I and other members will know when they come up what are within the domain of the railway authorities alone and are secrets to the minister and the government, and what class of subjects the government, the minister and parliament are to be consulted about before they are undertaken.

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend has been led astray by some statement he has heard to-night about the Toronto property.

Mr. BAXTER: I shall be very glad to be put right.

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend from Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) got extravagant in his statements, to put it mildly.

Mr. STEVENS: I was provoked to it by the absolute silence of the minister with regard to any real information.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am going to give my hon. friend some information about the Toronto building. This building was bought in the usual way, being expropriated by order in council with the approval of the government. Sir Henry Thornton did not buy the property. As to its value, I think at least 80 per cent of the members of this House would have thought it very foolish if we had allowed ourselves to be driven from a building that had been occupied for twenty-five years as a Grand Trunk ticket office. The rental charged the Grand Trunk will fully pay the interest on the investment, and we retain in Toronto a corner which many people would have been delighted to see us driven from. It is the best corner in Toronto; it is the place to which people have been accustomed to go to buy tickets for the Grand Trunk Railway, and to have allowed ourselves to be removed from it would have resulted in the loss, I think, of hundreds of thousands of dollars every year in the way of passenger traffic. That corner is a good buy, notwithstanding what my hon. friend says. The Exchequer Court passed on the price. My hon. friend referred to $700,000; I think it was $850,000, if I remember correctly. But the one property was sold because it was what one might call almost a forced sale; that is the reason why it was sold at a comparatively low price. As hon. members know, on corner lots in Toronto the prices are advancing. The Imperial Bank refused $1,000,000 two or three months before for that property. We endeavoured to get it but we could not get it. We offered them a million, offered them $1,100,000; endeavoured to get it without forced proceedings, as I might call them. Then the government by order in council expropriated the property and the matter went before the Exchequer Court.

They claimed $1,350,000 and the Exchequer Court confirmed the price tentatively arranged between the parties at $1,200,000. If it were not for detaining the committee I would read the judgment which would give the figures, and I am sure every hon. member would be convinced that the Canadian National Railways through the Canadian government have made a deal which is a bargain and which is clearly in the interests of the railway system.

Now, as to the Paris building, the Canadian National could not purchase it. But my hon. friend compares us to branch lines. Now, the places for the branch lines will stay there; they are not liable to leave; no one is liable to take possession of the property. When the opportunity came to get a good location in the city of Paris, rightly or wrongly the president took advantage of the situation as I have outlined. We hope that before the House meets again the country will have been convinced that this is a good proposition; the Canadian National Railways, being relieved of all financial responsibility, will have a home and a place to do business in one of the best locations in the city of Paris.

Mr. BAXTER: It is not a question whether this is a good buy or a bad buy; that is not involved in it. What is involved in it is that it is a purchase or an arrangement made, if I understand the minister aright, without any consultation with the minister or without the minister being informed that such a proceeding was in contemplation. Of course, if we are coming to that, all possible sense of responsibility is gone. A few years ago—I was not in this House—some hon. members who are not now sitting where they were then criticized very severely the attitude of the then government because the railway transactions were not apparently to be submitted to the House until after they were concluded. Well, if that was a good principle then it ought to remain a good principle in the minds of those who first laid it down. I can well understand that one cannot go that whole length, and I would not press the minister to do it, but I suggest that the money of the people should not be spent without even a single minister of the Crown having the slightest intimation of what is projected by this body which has been organized to manage National Railways. It does not appear that even a single director of the company had any knowledge of the matter, outside of the president. I want to know if I am right in that; I am inferring it from the discussion that has taken place here. If I am right—well, there will be an imperial Caesar set up before whom we must all bow the knee.

Mr. GRAHAM: I have not any information as to whether or not it was before the directors; I did not make inquiries. I know that a number of directors were conversant with it; the solicitor, who is a director, advised that the transaction was legal in every respect.

Mr. BOYS: Is there a written agreement between the syndicate and the owner or owners of the Paris site?

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not know.

Mr. BOYS: It was really bought, I understood, for the purposes of the National Railways. If that is so, surely there would be a written agreement, and then if the National Railways are to be in a position to get the benefit of it there would have to be at least a trust agreement between the syndicate and the National Railways. If there is not, and the syndicate have a written agreement to control the situation they could hold up the National Railways in the ultimate purchase by them. Now, that is a very undesirable situation. I understood the minister to say that this building had been bought for the National Railways. If that is so and there is absolutely nothing in writing that the minister knows of, either with the owners in Paris or with the syndicate in New York, surely the National Railways are in great jeopardy—that is all I can say—if this is a very valuable site which they want to get.

Mr. GRAHAM: I think my hon. friend will find that the interests of the Canadian National Railways are fully protected by the London office.

Mr. BOYS: I am not saying they are not, but I am asking the minister to let us know that they are.

Mr. GRAHAM: So far as my hon. friend's question regarding the agreement is concerned, that is but another way of getting the information that I say it would not be fair to give.

Mr. BOYS: I have carefully refrained from asking the minister for the terms of the agreement or even for the names of the members of the syndicate. But surely this committee can be told—

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not know that there is an agreement.

Mr. BOYS: If that is so, what right has the minister to say that this is for the National

Railways? If there is no agreement; if there is nothing in writing—and we know that land cannot be bought without something in writing—why does the minister say in this House that there is an agreement or an arrangement, or that the National Railways may even ultimately become the owners of this property?

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not know how many cross examinations a man would be subject to in an ordinary trial—I mean by so many. But as a matter of fact I have the utmost confidence in the solicitor of the National Railways. This transaction in all its bearings has his approval and is subject to his guidance. He advises me that the Canadian National Railways are protected; I did not ask how. I am not the solicitor of the company.

Mr. STEVENS: Will the minister answer one more question? Does he personally know the names of the syndicate he wishes to keep secret and will he assure the committee that he has personal confidence in them and a knowledge of their financial responsibility?

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not know them personally; I will go so far as to say that I do not know their names, although I have heard the chairman's name. But I am assured that they are men of responsibility who are able to carry out any contract that they make.

Mr. STEVENS: The minister does not even know their names?

Mr. GRAHAM: There are many responsible men's names I do not know.

Mr. STEVENS: Will the minister kindly answer that? He does not even know their names?

Mr. GRAHAM: I said so; I have told my hon. friend that.

Mr. MANION: How much rent were we paying in Paris for our offices prior to the taking over of this building?

Mr. GRAHAM: We had no railway offices in Paris; we were not represented there. That was one of the difficulties.

Mr. MANION: Have we any of the merchant marine running between Canada and France at the present time?

Mr. GRAHAM: We have arrangements with the Cunard Line and the White Star, but no arrangement with the merchant marine at the present time. That is as to freight, of course. There is no passenger arrangement.

Mr. MANION: Would the minister tell the committee in a few words what the reason was for having this Paris office just at this time? What business had increased so much that we must immediately take over this office in Paris?

Mr. GRAHAM: We want to get the business. We have not had it, and in order to get it we must have some means of getting it. The Canadian National Railways president believes this is the best method, to get a place on the front street in the city of Paris in order to increase the business of the railway. I may as well say frankly to the House that the Canadian National Railways is a great undertaking that the government has entered upon for the time being, during which I am the buffer between the board and parliament, and there is a constant propaganda going on against everything connected with the railways. The president of a private company would not be questioned by his shareholders if he had undertaken a transaction such as we have been discussing to-night by the hour.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Oh, yes.

Mr. GRAHAM: Not at all. My hon. friend knows it. The president of a private company makes arrangements far in excess of the expenditure in this case, even if it were an expenditure, and completes the transaction before it is ever submitted to the shareholders for approval.

Mr. STEVENS: Not if he was asking his shareholders for $73,000,000 at the same time. If the company was paying a dividend of 10 per cent he would probably do it, but if he was asking for $73,000,000 to make up a deficit he would be subjected to an even more critical examination by the shareholders than the minister has been to-night.

Mr. GRAHAM: The shareholders of a private company are not in session for six months at a time, or it would never be possible to run the company.

Mr. RYCKMAN: But in this case there is only one important shareholder, and the minister could not mention any company president where the company is controlled by one shareholder who would make an expenditure of this kind without consulting that shareholder.

Mr GRAHAM: I understand that, but my hon. friend could not have listened to me. I know as a matter of fact, and so does my hon. friend if he has had any experience with these large transportation corporations, that the executive proceed to purchase properties without consulting the shareholders. Perhaps they may be wrong in that, but they do it. My hon. friend from Vancouver Centre (Mr

Stevens) says that it would be all right if the company had a surplus, but that makes no difference as to the principle.

Mr. STEVENS: It does in practice.

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend from West York and my hon. friend from Vancouver Centre had better get together because my hon. friend from West York said that this company had the same rights and privileges as a private company.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Just the same. It is illegal in both cases.

Mr. GRAHAM: The practice of the private company is for the executive to make the best bargain it can for a certain thing, and the shareholders invariably approve his action if they have confidence in the directorate. If they have not, of course, it is another matter. If that were not the practice, suppose, for instance, that the Canadian Pacific had it in their mind to buy a building and called the shareholders together to discuss it, they could not buy that building at any reasonable price. Up would go the price at once. So these things are done quietly through some other party. All large companies do it that way, buy buildings, right of way and everything else through some other party, and after it is all through their action is approved of. That is the practice, whether it is legal or not.

My hon. friend from Fort William asked a very proper question as to the necessity for buying this building in Paris and why it was necessary to buy it without delay. I have explained the necessity for having some headquarters in Paris. It is considered essential to the success of the Canadian National Railway, unless we are to throw up our hands and say we will not do any business with that part of the world. As to the necessity of getting this particular building which the Canadian National president wanted to get, there were two or three other parties after the property, and consequently he closed immediately.

Mr. MANION: The question I asked in regard to the boats and the business and the necessity for buying the building in Paris so hurriedly has really been answered by the minister and his answer is just as I expected. I have under my hand the Canada Year Book and I was noting our exports and imports to France as compared with other countries and also our immigration from France as compared with other countries. The statement was made in regard to the buying of this building at Paris by Sir Henry Thornton that its basement was to be used for moving pictures to encourage immigration from France to Canada. It struck me at that time that we had never had a large immigration from France. In the first place France does not encourage emigration, and in the second place Canada has not apparently attracted the French people of recent years. I made it my business while we were discussing this to look up the statistics of immigration to Canada from other countries, and I find a number of countries from which we get a very much larger immigration than France. So if there is any reason for having this large building in Paris from the immigration standpoint, and that was the point emphasized in the press, there is a very much greater reason for having such a building in some of these other countries. The figures here are from 1909 to 1915, and I find that the immigration from Scotland before the war, and it is perhaps better to take those figures than the figures of to-day, was between five and ten times greater than the immigration from France. The immigration from Austria was more before the war than the immigration from France, the same is true of Germany, and in a greater degree still of Russia; it is true of Italy, and from little Sweden even if we received as many immigrants as from France. Then in regard to imports and exports the same holds true, although the figures vary for the different countries. Switzerland exports to Canada much more heavily than France, and the other countries I mentioned receive a much greater amount of imports from Canada than France. Therefore it appears to me that it would be necessary in some of these other countries from which we get a greater number of people and with which we do a greater trade than with France to have some building of that sort. It may be answered that Sir Henry Thornton should be more familiar with the matter than I am, and of course he is, but it struck me in looking over these figures that we are doing more business with some of these other countries and receiving a much larger immigration from them. I just wished to point that out. Certainly it would appear to the ordinary observer that this is a case of policy. It is not a case of ordinary expenditure. I admit that we have no right to interfere, I do not think the government should interfere in the ordinary management of the railways, and I believe that all members in this corner of the House will take that view, but in the ordinary expenditure of capital, and this is an ordinary expenditure of capital, it is a question of policy, and before a question of policy

should be carried out it would appear to the ordinary observer at least that the government should take more part than they admit having taken in this particular case, where it appears that action was taken first and the government consulted second. That would be the impression anyone would get, and I think the minister admits it. It does appear to me that this was not altogether a wise move to take looking at it from the superficial observer's standpoint.

In closing, I hope the minister will be correct for the sake of Canada and the sake of the railway that next year he will be able to give us more details and be able to prove to the House the wisdom of this purchase, which the people of Canada are now inclined to doubt.

Mr. LEWIS: There is another matter coming under the head of what I would call extraordinary expenditure. In the press some days ago it was stated that the Canadian Pacific in conjunction with the Canadian National Railways were granting $100,000 yearly for a period of five years to the Canada Colonization scheme. Now in view of the very long discussion we had on immigration when those estimates were before the House does the minister approve of this plan? Is it true that the Canadian National Railways have made such a grant? So far as I am concerned I am not against any company bringing people into this country, but I was wondering whether the minister or the department approved of this grant for that purpose.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am not sure that it has been discussed so far as the Canadian National Railways are concerned. I want to say again that the Canadian National Railway Board run their business under the provisions of the act, I do not think they have entered into the arrangement as yet, but if they had done so it would certainly be after full consideration, in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway—these being the two greatest transportation companies—and for the purpose of bringing settlers into Canada. Speaking from the Canadian National standpoint—yes, speaking from the national standpoint—I think the salvation of Canada is to get more people of the right kind into this country. I think that is true, and anything that would tend to that end would, I think, have the approval of parliament. As to the particulars in this case I am not conversant with them to a greater extent than I have already informed my hon. friend.

Mr. LEWIS: You say then that you think it would be a profitable arrangement for this country?

Mr. GRAHAM: If properly administered I would think so.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I have been waiting for a couple of hours now in the hope that I and the committee might obtain some definite information in regard to the question of the purchase of the hotel site in Paris for the National Railway system, and I am sorry to say that after having listened for that period of time I know as little about the subject now as I did when the discussion started. There is this to be said, however, that I think the minister himself knows very little about the transaction. No member of the government knows more than the Minister of Railways about this matter, and if his information upon it is nil the information of the government is likewise nil, and up to the present time the information of the committee is nil also. Now what is the position? I may say it is a serious one. I realize that the Minister of Railways has for two hours to-night treated the matter with the greatest jocularity. It may be his natural good humour but he has certainly tried rather to make a joke of the idea—

Mr. GRAHAM: Not at all.

Mr. GUTHRIE:—that the House or the country is entitled to any information in regard to this subject upon which there is considerable public discussion, perhaps some little public misapprehension, and perhaps some little public curiosity because of the payment of $2,000,000 of the money of the people of this country in the manner in which it has been done in this instance, from the facts disclosed. The whole of the circumstances regarding the withdrawal of that money from the treasury of the National Railway Company are so shrouded in mystery as to raise some curiosity and anxiety in the public mind; and I think that the government and the minister would do well to reconsider the position they have taken upon this question to-night. I do not suppose the public will be satisfied with the statement made by the minister; I believe that from one end of Canada to the other it will be found that there is a reasonable and a general demand that fuller information than we have as yet received be given, and be given now and not postponed until it is too late for any purpose. If a system is growing up under the act or under the railway practice of this country whereby the president of a railway system—even

a man with Sir Henry Thornton's standing—can withdraw $2,000,000 from its treasury and place that money in the hands of one of his officials to be transferred to some banking institution in order that a New York syndicate may be enabled to carry out its financing, the sooner we know the particulars and details of that transaction the better for Canada. Why one has only to state the facts to show how reprehensible the practice is. Think of it. Here is a minister of the Crown standing up in the committee and stating that he does not even know the names of the men who compose the syndicate. Yet the president of the Canadian National Railways has drawn $2,000,000 out of the treasury of that company to back that syndicate. What is the inference? What is the fact? The syndicate has an interest in this matter. We do not know who they are. They could not raise the $2,000,000 from the banks themselves, otherwise they would have got it, and there would have been no occasion for Sir Henry Thornton to interfere with the Canadian National Railway money. Had the syndicate been of the standing which the minister seems to think they are they could have financed this thing through the bank themselves. What an anomaly it is, what a strange thing it is, what a mysterious thing it is, that this syndicate of New Yorkers should get Sir Henry Thornton to go to the treasury of the Canadian National Railways for $2,000,000 to pay to a bank—I do not know whether it is a New York bank or a Canadian bank, I do not know what bank it is—and pull the chestnuts out of the fire for them.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is not the situation at all.

Mr. GUTHRIE: That is the way I gleaned the facts from the discussion that has taken place to-night.

Mr. GRAHAM: You have been listening to the speeches of the gentlemen beside you, not to mine.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I have been listening to the speeches made in this committee, and if I am wrong in what I say the minister should be the last one to complain, because he has given us no facts whatever upon which to base a correct statement. Is it the law, or is it the practice to-day, that Sir Henry Thornton is entitled to use that amount of money to purchase a site in Paris, or in London, or anywhere else? If he can do that, if that is good practice, if that system is to be permitted, to-morrow he can take $10,000,000 out of the company's treasury and finance a New York corporation in the purchase of a building on Wall street. It would be possible for him to take another $10,000,000 and spend it in New York. Why, it is in the power of the president to ruin the country, absolutely to ruin it, carrying the principle to its logical conclusion. I submit the principle is wrong. I submit the principle is illegal. I submit the practice ought not to exist; and if the minister, or the government, or parliament, has any control the system will be put an end to at the earliest possible moment.

Is it any wonder that the people and the press of Canada are a little curious upon this question? A capital expenditure of $2,000,000 by the National Railway Board, with a huge annual deficit, is something to stagger the public of any country. Now we have this $2,000,000 added to that deficit, then another million and a quarter is taken for the purpose of purchasing a block on a street corner in the city of Toronto which, with all deference, I submit was not an immediately necessary expenditure at all, thus adding still more to our deficit. Is it any wonder, in view of these facts, that the people are curious, that they desire more definite information than they have been able to get.

I have never, in all my experience, seen a minister of the Crown stand up in this House and try to justify an expenditure of $2,000,000 and make the statement practically, "I know nothing about it. I know there is a syndicate, but I do not even know their names. I know the money was taken out of the National Railway treasury to assist the syndicate in the financing of this purchase." That is the position of the minister to-night, and that absolute non-disclosure of material facts, that refusal to give us agreements or information —without advancing any real reason for such refusal except the statement that it will be detrimental to the interests of the National Railways—is a bold, bald statement. It is not a reason, it is an ipse dixit of the minister. Of course, we may not be able to get anything more, but I think he might take us into his confidence and say what it is would be so detrimental to the public interest if he gave us a reasonable disclosure of the leading facts in regard to this transaction.

One effect of such a statement would be to restore some public confidence in the road and in its management. An immediate effect would be to allay a great deal of public curiosity. It will not go down with the people, and will not satisfy the House, to say that Gerald Ruel, counsel for the railroad, advised Sir Henry Thornton, and Sir Henry Thornton advised me, and all I, as Minister

of Railways, have to do is to sit here and answer questions and pay the bill. That is not satisfactory to me, and I question if it is satisfactory to any member of the committee of this House.

Mr. GRAHAM: If my hon. friend would read over some of the debates in the House when he was minister, and would read the discussion on some of the estimates, he would probably agree that if there ever was in any government, a minister who gave no information to the House it was my hon. friend. If he will look over the estimates he will see that when he was asked in regard to the very large expenditure for the Air Force, he said "I do not know the particulars, but I am very sure that every cent is right."

Mr. GUTHRIE: I do not suppose I was pressed for particulars, but in this case the minister was pressed for particulars.

Mr. GRAHAM: He was pressed for particulars and that was his answer. He would not have given that answer if he had not been pressed. I am pointing out his weakness and his great indignation. I understand it all. I do not get annoyed. I am not jocular over this, but I refuse to allow my hon. friend to accomplish his purpose and make me angry. He cannot do that. He has tried it for fifteen or twenty minutes and cannot do it. He has tried by, I will not say wilful misrepresentation, but he has said that I have not given the facts to the House. I have given the history of the transaction, but I have been asked to give documents which the hon. member behind my hon. friend says it would be wrong to produce. I have been asked to give the names of the syndicate. I assure him that I do not know the personnel of the syndicate, but I am assured by the Canadian National officials that they are a responsible body of men. The hon. member would seem to think that I was president of the Canadian National, but I am not. He helped draft the act which gave them great power. Now I refuse to be put in the place of the president and officials of the Canadian National. They are not here to defend themselves. I am advised by the Canadian National Railways of their proceedings. I gave that information to the House. They have the authority under the act to carry out those proceedings. I said that Mr. Ruel had advised the president that his proceedings were perfectly in order. He is so advised by Mr. Ruel, notwithstanding my hon. friend's indignation, which is only assumed. I would take Mr. Ruel's advice on these railway matters as quickly as I would take his advice, and so would the president. He is paid to give that advice. So far as Mr. Ruel's advice is concerned, anything that was done by the president was within the four corners of the act. What better advice could the president get, and what better advice could I get? Not here, that I see. I cannot see anything here that I would take in preference to his advice. My hon. friend says I said the building was purchased for a syndicate. I did not say anything of the kind, and if I were inclined to get angry, one thing that would make me angry would be the statement that I said such a thing. I did not say a lot of things that he mentioned, but I did say a lot of things he has not mentioned. Hansard will show all that. I have given a straightforward statement of the transaction, as given me by the board of directors. I might not have done all these things, if I had been president, but I am not president. The president did these things and Mr. Ruel, his adviser, said these things were done legally. I am not arguing, and I have not argued, that I would have done these things in this way, or that my hon. friend would have done these things; but I did say the president got legal advice, and I trust the arrangement will be beneficial to the Canadian National.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: If the minister's interpretation of the act is correct, it seems to me that we are drifting into a most extraordinary and dangerous situation in Canada. I suppose very few of us have realized the implications of the Railway Act. Probably because of the unfortunate experience of the past years, we have been so much afraid of having politics brought into our railways that we have gone to the other extreme. The Canadian people have been willing to grant a good deal of power to outside commissions or boards in the hope that these outside commissions or boards would be able to carry on the affairs of the country more efficiently when freed from the nagging of individual members of the House. At the same time, we must not lose sight of the fact that the Canadian people, through their representatives in this House, are responsible for the expenditures of public money. That is the big thing. If we are to erect a board or commission that is practically free from effective criticism, then we have come to a very dangerous pass in our history. The people of this country—at least I can speak for the people of western Canada—have been tremendously interested in this Canadian National Railway system and the whole scheme of public ownership. Yet we are beginning to discover that, after all, the only

thing that is national in this railway is the name, and, perhaps, I should add, the deficits. The bondholders are very largely the financial beneficiaries of this road. They seem to be secure. The losses are borne by the people of Canada. We must remember too that in its organization the railways do not come at all closely under the direction of our Canadian people. The management is not at all democratic in its character.

I should like to mention in passing the position that has been taken again and again by Labour, that the employees should be directly represented on these public boards. I believe that the Liberal party gave assurances that the employees would be represented on the board of management. The employees are not represented. Years have passed, and we see no indication—

Mr. GRAHAM: I think the hon. member will recollect that the Prime Minister's suggestion was that Labour would be represented. Labour is represented by one of the ablest labour men on this continent—Tom Moore. He was one of the first men put on the board.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I think I remember when that matter was up for discussion some little time ago, that the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) pointed out very clearly that the promise was that the employees would be represented, and I submit that the appointment of a particular labour man, however estimable he may be, does not in any way make him in the sense in which we understand it in democratic countries a representative of Labour. The claim is, and has been throughout, that the employees themselves, those who work on the road would have some share in the management of the affairs of the road. That is not the case to-day. Further there seems to be no effective way in which the people of this country through their representatives can control the policies of this board. I think we had it some time ago from the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) that if there came a time of strain, undoubtedly the policies of the board would have to be regulated by the people of this country. I suggest that when these enormous deficits are piling up and the people are being asked to meet them, the time has already come when we should have a larger voice in the determination of the policies of the railroads.

It is all very well to say that we should keep clear of politics in regard to these matters. Yet I submit that after all politics is simply the business of the country, and a great corporation of this kind cannot possibly carry on its affairs without being in touch with the politics or with the business of the country at a score of different points. We find that already the president of this railway has been associated with the presidents of other railways in what might very well be termed a transportation trust—a serious thing when we consider that the primary object of having a Canadian National road is that we may serve the people. This great trust or monopoly is operating, not primarily in the interests of the people but above all things in the interests of the corporations. We are told again and again that our Canadian National Railways constitute an independent corporation which should be able to carry on business in its own way. I submit that if we allow this enterprise to be carried on in such a way we shall be no better off than we should be if the Canadian National Railways were a private concern. Here, for instance, is a question that arises in connection with this particular transaction involving $2,000,000. We are informed that it is desirable that we should encourage tourist traffic. I want to speak in behalf of a great many people of this country and to declare that there are other things a great deal more important to Canada than the encouragement of tourist traffic. There are a great many more important matters that require our consideration. I will not say that possibly tourist traffic might not be advantageous to the railways as a side-line. That might be the case. But I do say that if we intend to enter upon a new policy, or develop a policy, in that direction, we should not do so without that policy being decided upon in this House. That is the point that should be emphasized.

Mr. McBRIDE: Could the hon. member tell me of one practical railwayman in this House who could advise along those lines?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: There is something a great deal more needed to-day than the advice of practical railway men; and I am not decrying for a moment the advice that they can give. But when we are asked to vote tens of millions of dollars of a deficit, then I say that the people who are being asked to supply that money, are essentially the people who should decide the policies. It is all very well to have experts come in and advise upon certain policies and carry them out; but there are larger affairs that ought to be determined by the people, and by the people alone. I might suggest to the hon. gentleman who asked me the question that there are no practical engineers in this

House; at least I presume not. If we required a bridge built we would need an expert to advise us on the matter; but there is the fundamental question as to whether or not we want the bridge built. We are in the position of those who have to decide, since presumably we are speaking on behalf of the people, and are voting these moneys for them.

The same thing is true with regard to the immigration policy. We are placed in a very absurd position indeed in this respect. We spend days and even weeks discussing the immigration policy of Canada, discussing the question whether or not we shall have more immigrants come into the country, and then we find that we are paying tens, almost hundreds of millions of dollars to a corporation which is running things for its own ends, by its own methods, with the object of bringing people into the country. It is preposterous that, should we decide that we do not want immigrants to come into Canada, a corporation independent of parliament can institute a policy that will bring us immigrants by tens or hundreds of thousands. I repeat, it is an absurd situation. This is manifest surely in the response of the Minister of Railways to the hon. member for Swift Current (Mr. Lewis) with regard to this item of $500,000 which is to be granted during five years—at least the suggestion was that it should be granted for five years—to the Canadian Colonization Company. We have held up this House for hours discussing items of less than $100,000; and yet here is a matter involving, over five years, an expenditure of $500,000, to promote a definite immigration policy, to be paid to a certain colonization company which has been more or less discredited in the country. But we, the people of Canada, who are indirectly to pay that $500,000 are to have no voice in the matter whatever. The situation is simply intolerable.

Now, I am not going to criticize Sir Henry Thornton concerning the many speeches he has made throughout the country. But I would point out that whilst the reason for having an independent board is essentially that the railways should be kept out of politics, there is a very real danger that Sir Henry Thornton may assume, in the political life of the country, a position that is not accorded to any man elected to represent the people on the floor of this House. Sir Henry Thornton can go about the country advocating immigration and whatever else he likes, and he says he is doing it for business reasons. But these policies which he is advocating may be essentially public policies. Sir Henry Thornton is not responsible for these utterances to any group of people in this country. I suppose he is here on a contract for a term of years; but he is not subject to the scrutiny that is exercised over one of the ministers of the Crown. Again I say that we are allowing things to drift into a very serious situation if we permit an organization to grow up which is not at all responsible to the people of the country.

A similar situation prevails in connection with the shipping corporations throughout the country. Our merchant marine has become part of the railway system or at least is connected with it. We are allowing our president of this great railway company to act on shipping boards and possibly join with our other corporations that are keeping up freight rates, and having no small share in determining the commercial and financial policies of the people. I submit that these are powers that should not be granted to any one man. I know that under the rules and regulations of this House we are comparatively helpless. Apparently about the only thing we can do is 11 p.m. to protest. The government can carry these estimates and not give any information; it can invest in real estate in Paris this year or, if it chooses, in Berlin next year; it can invest in real estate in various countries of the world with which our railways may have some connection. And seemingly the people's representatives are to have no information whatever concerning these things. It can encourage an immigration policy from southeastern Europe or from China. What chance have we of effective protest? After all is done the railway board presents a bill to us, and without scrutiny, without even knowing the items, we are required to pay the account. For one I protest against any arrangement of that kind being continued in this country.

Mr. BAXTER: Is the arrangement with reference to the Paris building completed, or is it yet possible for the government to withdraw from it?

Mr. GRAHAM: I have not any doubt in the world that the syndicate will take over this property and rent it to some person else if it is so desired.

Mr. BAXTER: But is the arrangement with the syndicate completed?

Mr. GRAHAM: I have pointed out two or three times to-night that while completion of the arrangement was in progress it would not be fair to place the details before the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Louder.

Mr. GRAHAM: I really enjoy being cross-questioned by so many eminent jurists, not being one myself, as they present the subject from different angles. My hon. friend asks me if the arrangement is completed. I say the arrangement is not completed, and that is the reason I gave for not endeavouring to get particulars to place before the committee. It would not be fair to do so under the agreement as I understand it.

Mr. BAXTER: I know the minister is doing the best he can, but I am under the impression that there is an understanding or agreement between the National Railways and the syndicate, and that this syndicate makes an arrangement with somebody else. I want to know whether the arrangement between the National Railways and the syndicate has been signed, sealed and delivered; in other words, is that part of the arrangement completed?

Mr. GRAHAM: I would not say it was completed.

Mr. BAXTER: Can we stop it then?

Mr. GRAHAM: When the details are placed before the House next session my hon. friend will see some of the difficulties I labour under at the present time in trying to give him the detailed information he wants. The syndicate is taking over the property and we will be relieved of all liability. We need not rent a foot of space unless we want to.

Mr. HANSON: But we will rent space at a sufficient rate to pay the syndicate pretty well for what it pays for the building?

Mr. GRAHAM: That is a question for future consideration. I am told the building is all leased now at a fair profit. I would not mind being in the syndicate.

Mr. HANSON: I would not mind either with the government backing it.

Mr. BAXTER: I do not want to torture the minister at all—

Mr. GRAHAM: No, it is all right.

Mr. BAXTER: —but I should like to know whether there is something yet for the syndicate to do which, if not done, will cause the whole transaction to fall through.

Mr. GRAHAM: I imagine that if the Canadian National Railways wanted to get out of this arrangement—

Mr. STEVENS: Mess.

Mr. GRAHAM: It is not a mess at all.

Mr. STEVENS: It surely is.

Mr. GRAHAM: It depends again on which angle you view it from.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: All round.

Mr. GRAHAM: I believe in the judgment of the board. There is no arrangement which could not be abrogated, I suppose, if so desired, but I think you will find that if the transaction goes through as outlined at the present time it will be a good bargain. Sir Henry Thornton will be able to get the space in Paris that he has been trying to secure for some months.

Mr. BAXTER: I thank the minister for his endeavours to let me have such crumbs as fall from the railway turntable, for that is about the best I think he can do. I really cannot tell whether there is any particular part of this arrangement that can be considered as completed. I do not want the minister to tell me the details of something that would interfere with good bargaining on behalf of this country. I will go a little further. I had occasion since the session opened to put a question on the order paper. The minister very fairly told me that while it was not expedient to give the information to the public, he was willing to give it privately to members of parliament, and I was one of those who shared in the reception of that information, with which I was perfectly satisfied. I think the course he took on that occasion was correct, but that was with reference to what might have been termed a rumour. Now to-night this matter comes before us in what strikes me as a most extraordinary way. There is not a point on which the minister dare commit himself definitely, and what information he does possess he is unable to reveal. Yet he is actually asking for a large sum of money. Now, we all appreciate the immense difficulty of running this railway system as a public enterprise and at the same time giving detailed information to parliament and to the country in advance of the completion of various transactions. That is something that obviously cannot be done unless we are to pay through the nose time and again for what we want, and I do not wish any word of mine to interfere with any reasonable policy which will avoid that. But there is a body that lies between the management of the Canadian National Railways and the general public, a body that I think ought to be informed as to all the essential parts of every such transaction. That body is the government of Canada, which, whether we support it or not, has been chosen by the people to be their stewards until they make a change. Now, if we are going to set

up a power in Canada that will be greater than the government, that will have its secrets from the government, and to which the government must go with bated breath truckling for a little necessary information, then I say something is growing up too big for Canada itself. The minister apparently had not been entrusted with knowledge of this project before an irrevocable step was taken by the head of the railway system. Do not think, Mr. Chairman, that I purpose to-night to abuse or even to criticize Sir Henry Thornton. I do not think the time has come for that. I think what we have to do as a nation is to give Sir Henry Thornton a reasonable opportunity to make good or to make bad with the railway system, and until a sufficient lengtht of time has elapsed I do not think there ought to be either approbation or disapprobation of his conduct. I am prepared, so far as that is concerned, to wait. But that does not prevent me from saying that if Sir Henry Thornton, or whoever else may occupy this position, were the best possible man obtainable,—and he may be that—yet there should be no power in his hands to carry through a transaction such as the one that has been spoken of to-night without the knowledge even of the minister who is responsible to parliament and to the country therefor. He ought at least to be consulted; he ought at least to have an opportunity of laying the matter before his colleagues. If that is not done, responsible government becomes very largely a farce. Most of the time we spend in this parliament is devoted to criticism of estimates, the voting of supply, and very often on trivial, minor matters hours and days of the time of this House are taken up; yet when we come to a matter of this magnitude we are expected to pass it through, even with a confession from the government itself that it does not know the details of the transaction. That does not commend itself to me as a good thing.

I want to refer to another aspect of the case. The president of the road is surrounded by a body of advisers. I do not criticize Mr. Ruel; I have the same respect for his opinion in matters of law, and very largely for his opinion in matters of general railway administration, that my hon. friend the minister has. I think Sir Henry Thornton has a good adviser in Mr. Ruel. But Mr. Ruel's opinion in this matter cannot go a step further than to say that certain documents are in proper form or that the transaction is within the legal scope of the act constituting the Canadian National Railway Board. That does not pass upon the question whether or not it is advisable to do the thing that is proposed. There is no power I know of that can take even as good and as capable a man as Mr. Ruel and substitute him for the elected representatives of this country or for the government that is responsible to all the people. There are, I believe, some excellent men on the board—the Deputy Minister of Railways; Mr. Ruel, and there may be others; I do not profess to know them all. But I do know that part of the board is made up by place men, men who are worn out in the political field and who do not bring a single atom of utility to the deliberations of that board. I do not know; I am not sure that Sir Henry Thornton has even discussed the matter with them—the minister cannot tell us. But if he has, the matter does not, even at that, stand on a sufficiently strong foundation for me or, I think, for the people of this country. I am not reflecting on individual gentlemen any more than is necessary. But take the action of the shareholders of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company; look at the group of men with whom they surround their president for the administration of the affairs of that corporation. Contrast them with the group of men that are given to Sir Henry Thornton as his advisers, or—shall I say—abettors. The contrast is quite enough to ban the government enterprise now and eternally—

Mr. LAPOINTE: Hear, hear,—I am quite willing to accept that. The word of a man is not to be valued simply on the basis of the millions he possesses.

Mr. HANSON: No, but by the business ability he displays.

Mr. BAXTER: A $2,000 a year man does not make a railway man.

Mr. LAPOINTE: A $2,000 a year man is often better than a $10,000 a year man.

Mr. BAXTER: If there is to be a discussion of how much men get per year, I am not taking any part in it. My point is that the Canadian Pacific Railway bring men from the highest positions in the financial and commercial world to the assistance of their president, and that the—

Mr. LAPOINTE: That is Tory doctrine—millions.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Fudge.

Mr. BAXTER: Well, we come, then, pretty nearly to the parting of the ways.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Hear, hear.

Mr. BAXTER: Personally I have never been able to have faith in the wisdom of public ownership and public administration of a railway system, and I have not got it now. The very existence of such circumstances as we are discussing to-night is enough, I think, to revolt the strongest advocate of public ownership from the doctrine that he has been prone to profess. When I am told that it is within the four corners of the act that the president of the railway may make a bargain behind the back of the government and of the people of Canada, then I say that a system which, even though it may be technically lawful, permits a total disregard of the opinion of the people themselves and of the government of Canada is not a system that in the end will produce beneficial results. You may for a time under exceptional men and in exceptional circumstances get some benefit, but you will not in the long run. I will be asked, perhaps, what stand my party is taking in this matter.

Mr. DUFF: That is important.

Mr. BAXTER: My party took the stand in days of great national stress that it was right that these roads should be taken over by the people. I was not a member of parliament and was not associated with that programme; I have not associated myself with it since. I do not see, from what has come upon the horizon to-night, that the people are likely to meet with anything but disappointment and practical ruin if they permit the national roads to be managed in the way that is indicated by the minister to-night. And the minister cannot help himself, according to what he tells us; he absolutely must impose secrecy upon himself; he must keep from the people the knowledge that the people ought to have. If the transactions that are spoken of to-night are completed transactions, then there can be no reason why we should not have the details given to the committee. If they are not completed transactions, then there must be an opportunity to withdraw from them; and how can we decide whether we ought to withdraw from them or go ahead with them unless we get the necessary information? If a secret committee of parliament, even, representative of all parties and of all shades of opinion, were invited to discuss these matters, it might be something better than the absolute lack of confidence with which we are confronted to-night. But even that would at best be little better than locking the door after the steed was stolen, when we are told that we have been committed to something and that the minister does not know whether or not we can get out of it because he does not know what the thing is, and the president of the road does not tell him. That is what we get down to. The minister is not to blame for it, to this extent: When he was informed that such a thing was in contemplation, he ought to have taken this stand: If you propose to exercise your full rights, your technical rights, under the law; if you propose to administer this road in major matters, in matters of great policy, involving a serious increase in the capital debt, without giving any information to the government, then it is time for us to select a board that will be more responsible to the opinion of the government and the opinion of the people.

Mr. FORKE: Mr. Chairman, the remarks of the last speaker (Mr. Baxter) lead me to think that it might be advisable to get a farmer on that railway board so that things might be properly managed. I have listened very patiently to-night to a great deal of eloquence to see if we could get some information in connection with this very mysterious deal that has taken place over in Paris. I am inclined to think, Mr. Chairman, that something has got out a little too early and that that is all there is to it. I do not think the trouble with the minister is lack of knowledge; no doubt he has information that perhaps it may not be exactly to the public interest to disclose. It is rather unfortunate that such a thing should happen; perhaps it would have been better had this discussion not taken place before completion of the transaction and the laying of the information on the Table of the House so that we should know all about it.

I do not like some of the criticisms that have been levelled at Sir Henry Thornton. He has undertaken a great work, and I think perhaps it would help him to feel that he has the confidence of the public. There is something in human nature that makes a man generally try to live up to his reputation, and the very fact that we expect him to do well, that he knows we place our confidence in him will be an incentive to him to go on and make a success of the Canadian National railway. I believe it is going to be a success. I make a guess that next year if we have reasonable crops in the West we will have four or five times the surplus over operating expenses that we had this year. I am not a prophet nor perhaps a great business expert, but I have that faith in the management and the way things are shaping at the present time.

In connection with the renting of what we may call expensive buildings in some of the principal cities where traffic might originate,

although I am in favour of economy I believe that a great institution like the Canadian National railway cannot afford to have a shabby place in any of these great centres.

An hon. MEMBER: What about Toronto?

Mr. FORKE: Take the city of Toronto. Would you like to see the Canadian National Railways, office there located on some back street, or on the back street in any other great city? I would be even more ambitious than that yet.

There is another question that looms up in my mind. It has been before the House, and it is perhaps looking a little too far ahead, but this is perhaps a good time to mention it. We have been trying to work up a trade in exporting cattle to Great Britain. I am going to express the opinion that just so long as we trust to the shipping companies to export our cattle the trade will not be a very great success, because the shipping companies are so few and they amalgamate so easily that I believe the rates will be fixed at such a point that only a few cattle will cross and perhaps the trade will be killed altogether. I think the day is not far distant when it may be necessary to take the merchant marine out into real deep water and sink them. I believe it will be possible in the not distant future for the Canadian National Railways to have a line of steamships just as the Canadian Pacific has to-day.

Mr. DUFF: Proper steamships.

Mr. FORKE: Proper steamships that will carry cattle. I would not say go into the business of having any big steamship line, but they could rent or build just sufficient to demonstrate to the people of this country at what rate cattle could be carried across the ocean at a profitable figure. Otherwise I do not believe the trade of shipping cattle to the Old Country will ever amount to anything. That may seem rather ambitious to suggest of an organization that has a large deficit every year, but I believe in having courage and I believe this is a time for courage. The only way we can make the railways pay is by making them a going concern with ocean traffic and business offices everywhere where trade could originate.

Coming back to the commencement of my remarks I would be rather sorry for the Minister of Railways were he not built exactly as he is, but I see that he is standing up fairly well under the ordeal. I know there is a suspicious look about this $2,000,000 transaction about which we can get no information, but I am inclined to think that the real trouble is that it has got on the boards a little too early and the minister cannot divulge all he knows. We will simply have to preserve our souls in patience and make up our minds that the government is going to get in great trouble when we get the facts if everything is not all right.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I was pleased to hear the minister make the statement that the rents from the Yonge street building recently acquired will cover the investment. I was going to ask the minister, does he hope to carry this item to-night?

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is his idea—that the committee sit till what hour?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Four o'clock.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am not trying to bulldoze the committee at all. I had hoped to get this item through to-night. I was going to take up the merchant marine, but the leader of the Opposition was going away and asked me to keep some railway item, which I intended to do, on which he could discuss the subject. This is an item of some magnitude, and I thought perhaps we could get it through to-night and reserve some other item on which there could be a general discussion.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: If my hon. friend did that he would, I think, be doing something that never has been done in this House before. This is the main item on which the great bulk of the discussions necessarily takes place. There are a great many other items that could have been brought on. We have all the items, for instance, from 116 to 122 inclusive, and then we have the items from 123 to 140 with some omissions.

Mr. GRAHAM: Some are through.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not think my hon. friend had any very great hopes than the item would go through to-night.

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes I had.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I can tell him it will not. We can put in the time just as well as he can.

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend is talking as if I had made a threat. He must be bad natured to-night.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The Minister of Marine and Fisheries said four o'clock, and I did not hear any contradiction from my genial friend.

Mr. GRAHAM: We are trying to make some progress. If we are going to get through any time this summer we shall have to work a little later than we have been doing. But I am not trying to force the committee to do anything.

Mr. STEVENS: Why not bring on any one of these dozen smaller items? We could have passed a string of them. There are fifteen items here more or less unimportant, but this is the $73,000,000 item.

Mr. GRAHAM: They are all important, but I am not going to quarrel with my hon. friend.

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend cannot quarrel with me.

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend from West York said that this item had never been put through before so quickly. It was put through in thirty mitutes last year.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Last year we were told that the government did not know anything about the business. We agreed. We were very sympathetic. We gave them no trouble at all. But now they are supposed to know something about it and we are finding out things we never knew anything about before.

Mr. GRAHAM: I would point out that last year they were my hon. friend's own estimates, or practically his own, and he had such confidence in them that he did not wish to have any light thrown on them, and so did not ask any questions. I think we might discuss this item a little longer to see if there is any further information that my hon friends want and then we could go on with some of the other items.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: If we are going on with anything else I think we should go on with it now. We sat last night till three o'clock.

Mr. GRAHAM: Do not blame me for that.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not know. I think we should blame the government for it altogether.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Blame it for everything.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I should like to know whether we are going on with this item or going to take up some of the other items, or whether we are going to adjourn.

The CHAIRMAN: There are other members to speak on this vote.

[Sir Henry Drayton.]

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Does the government desire that we should go on with this vote to-night?

Mr. GRAHAM: Go on for a little while, it is only 11.30.

Mr. STEVENS: Why not let this stand and call some other item?

Mr. GRAHAM: I am not objecting to that, but we want to make some progress, that is all.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think you would make progress by taking up another item. I would like definitely to know what the government's idea is? My view is that we will make more progress by letting this item stand. The minister will find he will make more progress by letting this item stand.

Mr. LAPOINTE: That is a threat.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: No, it is not a threat. It is a mere statement of fact because we might get some information in the meantime from the minister. For example, the minister might wish to bring down the extract from the minutes of the meeting of the directors. We might even find out whether the matter had even gone as far as that. If I remember rightly the minister told us that he could not say that anybody knew anything about it except the president and the solicitor; he did not know that it had come before the board even. Perhaps we could find out about that. Then I had a very disquieting statement made to me to-day with reference to Toronto. Perhaps we could find out if that is true or not. That statement is to this effect: That the company were buying not only the corner of King and Yonge streets but they were also buying the Home bank and had already been committed to that purchase. I do not know whether there is a word of truth in this statement or not but I would like the minister to find out.

Mr. GRAHAM: I can tell my hon. friend now.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That there is not a word of truth in it?

Mr. GRAHAM: In the first place the government expropriated the corner. If there was going to be a large building erected there in the years to come that might influence the policy decided upon, but there is no question about that now. The whole thing is the result of propaganda. Not a day passes but we are called upon to deny some rumour. I believe a paid propaganda is being carried on. Some rumour is spread in a corner one day, in another corner another day, and in

another corner another day, in order to discredit the Canadian National Railways and its management. There is a studied effort in this direction. I have had questions asked me in this House that I have traced back to this propaganda. Now I want to be fair. I am standing up for the Canadian National Railways. They have been placed under government control and I believe we can make them a success. But we cannot make them a success if, on a rumour of some kind, hon. gentlemen are going to start out and make unjustifiable statements. Stories of this kind spread like a fire. They get into the press first and then we are asked about them. A denial is given but the first report is never overtaken. That happens every day in the week.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend would find it a great deal easier to make progress if this matter had been done legally and properly.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): What about the rumours?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: If the action taken had been legal and proper my hon. friend's position would not be nearly so difficult.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am speaking about the situation in Toronto.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am referring to the Paris matter.

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend asked me a question about Toronto and said he had heard disquieting rumours about what had been done there. That statement goes on Hansard and is circulated throughout the country, and there is not one word of truth in it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Nevertheless I am still going to ask my hon. friend to look into the matter. I am going to ask him to find out whether an offer was not made to the bank directorate, and whether a bank director was not engaged in negotiations. It may be that there is nothing in the rumour; but when we find that the country can be committed to a $2,000,000 proposition without the slightest notice or warning it is just as well to find out if there is anything in it.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): You have got a suspicious mind.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Now then I assume—

Mr. LAPOINTE: It pays to advertise.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I assume I may thank my hon. friend for his kind remark.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Hear, hear.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It is a splendid advertisement. I do not know that I can improve the model my hon. friend has set up.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Oh no, you are better at that yourself.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It would be a task entirely beyond me. Nevertheless I thank my hon. friend for his admonition. Now, Mr. Chairman, I suppose we can take it for granted that the minister is not going to tell us anything more about the Paris purchase. Can he tell us, though, whether the deed has yet been taken for that property, whether the two millions has yet been paid to the original owner?

Mr. GRAHAM: I am not sure about that. I am informed it has been done through the London office.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: So the money is gone and we have the property.

Mr. GRAHAM: No.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend says no. We cannot eat our cake and have it. If the money has been paid it must be gone.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): You do not want the company to have any property in Paris?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Can the minister tell me from whom the property was purchased?

Mr. LAPOINTE: From the owners.

Mr. GRAHAM: I suppose it would be the company. I do not know the name of the company.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: You could not tell us as to that? Is that the whole price? Was everything paid in cash?

Mr. GRAHAM: A little under $2,000,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Was it all paid in cash? I see. So there is no balance left at all. Well, Mr. Chairman, if the minister will not tell us anything about it I shall not tell him what attitude we will take in connection with it. I want full particulars of item (a) "Operating deficits whenever incurred or ascertained." What is the amount put in under that item?

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend has a perfect right to this information. I do not like his threats, though.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: There are no threats.

Mr. GRAHAM: There were absolute threats, but we cannot do business in that way. You cannot make any headway and we cannot do any business.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I offered to take some other item.

Mr. GRAHAM: You did not give me a chance to accept, you kept on talking instead of sitting down. The operating deficit for the Canadian Government Railways themselves—I think we are providing liberally for these but we have to make provision for all eventualities—is $3,000,000; for the Canadian Northern, $2,500,000; for the Grand Trunk Railway nothing; for the Grand Trunk Pacific $4,500,000, totalling $10,000,000.

Mr. CALDWELL: Before we leave this vote there is a condition to which I would like to draw attention in connection with the St. John and Quebec railway which the Dominion government is operating at the present time. As you possibly know we had floods in New Brunswick this spring. In April a bridge was washed away on the St. John and Quebec railway just above Woodstock. There were several washouts on the Canadian Pacific railway which runs up through nearly the same territory, at the same time. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company, however, were able to restore their service within a week anyway. The Canadian National railway bridge is still down. I understand there was a lapse of thirty days from the time the bridge went out before operations were begun to replace it. The latest information I have is that they expect it will be the first of July before they will have that road in operation.

An hon. MEMBER: Where is the bridge to which you refer?

Mr. CALDWELL: It is a bridge across the Meduxnakeag just above Woodstock. This creates a very serious situation on that road just north of Woodstock where it runs through the potato belt so-called. The potato shippers, who have warehouses on every siding along that road north of Woodstock, bought large quantities of potatoes and stored them there expecting to ship them out but potatoes being a perishable article they cannot wait until the first of July when this road will be completed. The growers have been under the necessity of hiring trucks and trucking those potatoes to the shipper at some point. In addition to that the farmers nearly all have more or less potatoes, some quite large quantities, on their hands under the best of conditions for shipping. We had sworn evidence before a parliamentary committee this year that the farmers in New Brunswick had got less than 50 per cent of the actual cost of marketing their potato crop last year, and they are still marketing them at that loss. Now they are in the position of having no railway facilities in the best potato producing section of New Brunswick. With large quantities on their hands their potatoes will be an absolute loss by the first of July when this road is to be completed. I have it on very good authority—in fact I was talking to a gentleman this very evening in the House who had just come up from there—that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company had trains running over that road in at least a week, but it was thirty days before the Canadian National Company commenced operations on this bridge. If a permanent bridge could not have been put up a temporary structure might have been erected to meet the emergency. I believe the trains could have been running on that road long before this had the proper measures been taken.

Then I see this vote covers the deficits where they are ascertained. I imagine the minister has ascertained the operating deficit on the St. John and Quebec Railway. There has been a deficit every year since it has been operated, due to no fault of the railway, but owing to the fact that it has never been completed from Grand Falls and made a through route, as first intended. The operating deficit is due to two or three facts: one is that it is a branch line, when it should be a through line, and another, the fact that it has not been completed. I want to acknowledge my gratitude to the minister for extending the time for the completion of the road and for paying the Dominion subsidy for the balance of the construction of the road. But I do not think it is going far enough. I think it would pay the Dominion government to complete the road, link up with the Canadian National at Grand Falls, and turn it into a revenue producer, instead of a producer of deficits. That is another reason for the deficit, and this condition should have been remedied.

On the road north of Woodstock there is a great deal of local traffic. There are several mills on that line of road, as well as a large amount of farm produce. I know one saw and lath mill owner who has been unable to procure cars for years when he needed them. He has applied for cars, and was told there were none to be had. He has

put on teams, hauled the stuff ten or twelve miles to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and loaded it in Canadian National cars on the Canadian Pacific track. These cars could have been switched with proper management to the Canadian National and the Canadian National would have got the freight. The result has been that the profit has been eaten up by the Canadian Pacific Railway, when the stuff was hauled in Canadian National cars but carried on the Canadian Pacific road. The management said that they could not get the cars. The same thing occurred in regard to potatoes and hay, farmers hauling their produce alongside the St. John and Quebec road, and loading on the Canadian Pacific siding in Canadian National cars, having been told by the management that they could not provide Canadian National cars for their own road.

There is still another condition. This road is not built to its northern extremity and connected with the Transcontinental. Neither is it built into the port of St. John. It runs for the last ten miles to St. John down the west side of the river. Potatoes and hay shipped to St. John for export are loaded on the boats at West St. John, but owing to the fact that no sidings were provided at West St. John for switching cars of freight for the docks to be loaded on the boats, it is taken to East St. John across the bridge at the Reversible Falls. I believe there is a toll on that bridge of 1½ cents per 100 pounds. This toll has to be paid both ways. It goes to the yard in East St. John in the first place, and later, owing to the fact that the Canadian National Railways have no facilities for switching at West St. John, they pay the Canadian Pacific 3 cents a hundred for switching the cars back to the port of West St. John. Then they pay the Canadian Pacific Railway 3 cents terminal charges, because the Canadian Pacific does the switching and unloading.

I want to cite a concrete instance. Let us take a car of potatoes from Woodstock. The freight is 16½ cents per 100 pounds from Woodstock to St. John. Out of that 16½ cents freight from Woodstock to St. John, you have to pay the bridge toll of 1½ cents a hundred each way, making a total of 3 cents for switching, and then there is 3 cents for terminal charges. That brings the charges up to 9 cents, to be taken out of the 16½, which leaves the St. John and Quebec Railway 7½ cents, although they do all the hauling, except the switching on to the dock. They pay over to the Canadian Pacific 9 cents a hundred out of the 16½ cents on every car of potatoes which goes to West St. John for shipment. These are things which should be remedied and could be remedied. I hope the minister will bring this matter to the attention of the management of the road.

We will admit they have taken this road out of politics. A private citizen cannot go to the management of the road and get them to do anything. For instance, a mill man who could not get cars on the St. John and Quebec Railway, on going to the Canadian National management, was curtly informed that there were no cars, although at the time Canadian National cars were being loaded on the Canadian Pacific track. I hope this matter will be brought to the attention of the management, and some effort made to have the bridge replaced north of Woodstock, so that the farmers and shippers who have potatoes that are perishable in storage may be able to get them shipped out before they are spoiled, because they will not be worth shipping by the 1st of July.

Mr. GRAHAM: I will bring the remarks of my hon. friend to the attention of the management to-morrow.

Mr. BAXTER: Perhaps the minister can give me an answer now in reference to the train shed at St. John. Does he know whether the president or board of directors or somebody has arranged for the building of a new station there?

Mr. GRAHAM: No, it is not provided for in this estimate, I am afraid.

Mr. HANSON: Is there any provision for renewing the bridge at Fredericton? The minister may not know, but that bridge was built in 1887 by the late Senator Temple, and it is now considered too light for the class of locomotives that have to go over it, with the result that all the trains passing over that now have to be hauled by small engines. Large engines cannot go over the bridge across the river. The matter has been under consideration, and we have been waiting for more than three years. Could the minister say whether a new bridge is contemplated there?

Mr. GRAHAM: There is no provision in the estimates for that.

Mr. BAXTER: If the minister does not want us to continue with this general item, I will not press it now. I can ask the question again.

The CHAIRMAN: This is a general item, 139 under which all those items may be discussed.

Mr. BAXTER: Will that new station be dealt with in the Supplementary Estimates,

or has the railway board decided that during the coming year nothing will be done? Will it be built out of revenue or will anything be done?

Mr. GRAHAM: No doubt in the world the board recognizes the urgency or necessity, but in regard to much of this work we have to make selections, and I am told that they are going to impose on the people of St. John for another year. They have not put anything in the estimates for that station.

Mr. BAXTER: Does the minister realize what it means, not only to the people of St. John, who, of course, use the railway station to some extent, or rather who suffer for the want of a railway station, but to the whole passenger traffic coming from St. John? It means people have to get on or off the train in what was a train-shed, but what is now simply out of doors, in all kinds of weather. Such a condition does not exist in any city or town, I think, of one-quarter the size of St. John throughout the Dominion of Canada, and it is even more disgraceful than the filthy station that people have to put up with in the city of Toronto, when there is a good station alongside; and I must say I do not know why it is not being used.

Item stands.

To provide for the purchase of branch lines—Moncton and Buctouche Railway—Revote..	$70,000
Interest estimated, from date of taking possession to March 31, 1924, not exceeding (including Revote—$21,125).. ..	23,625
	$93,625

Mr. GRAHAM: This is an old item that has been voted year after year. The railways have not been able to get title to the property.

Mr. HANSON: I want to tell the minister that if the company will get down to brass tacks and pay their liabilities they will get the title to the right-of-way. Under the provincial legislation they do not own the right-of-way. This railway company never had title to the right-of-way, by deed or grant of any kind. Enabling legislation was passed by the provincial government providing that on certain proof being submitted to the Lieutenant Governor in Council a vesting order should be passed. This road is head over heels in debt to legitimate creditors, but it has absolutely refused to make any effort to pay them, with the result that the provincial government of New Brunswick, very properly, and at the instance of residents of the province to whom the company is indebted, has refused to make this vesting order. The minister will never get title to the right-of-way until he obtains that vesting order, and that order will not be got until he brings pressure to bear upon the management of the Moncton and Buctouche railway to pay their creditors. I can frankly say that I am interested in one of these claims for an estate which has been waiting patiently for a long time to get the money that is due it. We do not seem to be able to make any progress in the matter, and I would ask the minister, as in days gone by I have asked the deputy minister, to interest himself and to tell these people to clean up their liabilities so that these claimants may be able to get their money. There will be very little coming to the owners of the road and the matter should be attended to.

Item agreed to.

To pay claim of Fortin & Moffatt (National Transcontinental Railway), $5,390.

Mr. GRAHAM: This is an old claim. Settlement was agreed to by the late Mr. Cochrane, but at that time the men would not take the amount offered. They have visited me once or twice and I have informed them that I am prepared to give them this amount in settlement of the claim of $29,000. If they do not accept this in full they will get nothing.

Item agreed to.

St. Anne's lock: highway bridge at Isle Perrot, $100,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: This is a grant for a bridge, part of which has been paid.

Mr. BAXTER: I do not want to say much, but is this bridge more important than some cover for the people who are using trains in the city of St. John?

Mr. HANSON: Where is the bridge?

Mr. GRAHAM: At Isle Perrot.

Mr. HANSON: Where is that?

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend behind me (Mr. Lavigueur) can inform the hon. gentleman. This is for the construction of a bridge between the island and the mainland. The federal government has made a contribution, part of which has been paid.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: Before the item is carried I want to make one or two observations. I see that the government is subscribing $400,000 for the construction of a bridge at Isle Perrot. I may point out that a bridge is projected on the island of Orleans, Quebec, and we shall look to the government for a contribution to that undertaking. I think the provincial government of Quebec

is well disposed to build a bridge which will cost probably about $800,000, or, say, a million, to provide communication with the mainland for a population of six very important agricultural parishes on the island of Orleans. I have no objection to this item being passed, but I wish to have it understood now that at the next session of parliament I shall call upon the government for a subscription towards the construction of that bridge.

Mr. HANSON: I am not objecting to the item, but I want to know on what principle the government could contribute to a bridge wholly within the province of Quebec. If they adopted that principle I am sure they would be invited to contribute to many other similar undertakings. I am pleading at present with the Minister of Public Works for a contribution towards an international bridge which is of great importance to the country from the standpoint of international obligations. Only a modest sum of $17,500 is involved, and I hope to see provision for it in the Estimates, so that our friends in the state of Maine will not be able to regard us as pikers. This particular bridge, I understand, is wholly within the province of Quebec.

12 m.

Mr. VIEN: Which one?

Mr. HANSON: This one.

Mr. VIEN: Do I understand that the hon. member is referring to the bridge between Vaudreuil and Isle Perrot? So far as I know, this is being built by subsidy from the provincial government and by federal subscription. Is the bridge which the hon. gentleman refers to a construction under the highways grant?

Mr. HANSON: No, this is a special vote.

Mr. GRAHAM: If my hon. friend will allow me I will inform him. The federal government is assisting to build the bridge over its own canal.

Item agreed to.

St. Lawrence ship canal—surveys and investigations, $50,000.

Mr. HANSON: What is being done there?

Mr. GRAHAM: This work has been carried on continuously. The time will come when the data from these surveys will be essential. The work is done without any great blare of trumpets, but thoroughly, nevertheless.

Item agreed to.

Hudson Bay Railway—Port Nelson terminals, $40,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: This is for the care of the terminals already constructed.

Mr. KNOX: Will provision be made to meet the undertaking given to the House some time ago in regard to bringing the line into a proper state of repair? Will that be provided for?

Mr. HANSON: Before Christmas?

Mr. GRAHAM: The minister cannot make any provision. He can make suggestions to his colleagues who can submit recommendations to parliament. I had in mind asking for an appropriation for that purpose.

Mr. SALES: Are we to understand that the minister has made up his mind to ask his colleagues for that appropriation? May we have his assurance to that effect?

Mr. GRAHAM: As a member of the government I do not like to make definite pledges, but I will do like the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), I will ask my hon. friend to "wait and see." I think he will not be disappointed.

Item agreed to.

Trent canal improvements, $255,000.

Mr. KNOX: What returns are we receiving from this canal?

Mr. GRAHAM: I would not suggest that we get any straight returns. The only return is in the development of one of the most beautiful sections of Ontario. If my hon. friend ever wants to take a trip for his health I would recommend him to go along the Trent Valley canal which will take him through a very beautiful country and he will find hospitality all along the route.

Mr. HANSON: But it is of no practical utility.

Mr. GRAHAM: I would not say so. I think a tourist traffic can be developed there as well as a traffic for light draft freight boats We do get a return in the shape of rent for power development.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My recollection is that this is merely maintenance work.

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes, dams and that sort of thing.

Mr. KNOX: We have been voting very large sums of money annually for this canal, and I was wondering if there was any traffic to warrant the building of the locks and the continuance of this heavy expenditure.

Mr. GRAHAM: We are living in hopes that there will be greater traffic. But if we do not maintain the works great flood damage will result.

Mr. BOYS: Is the Atherley bridge appropriation in this item?

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes.

Mr. BOYS: Is there any chance to get the minister to do what the deputation, representatives I think of all parties in this House, impressed upon him, namely, to take over this bridge, the counties concerned contributing $15,000 each. With the $25,000 contribution from the government there is only another $2,000 or $3,000 required to meet the total cost of the bridge, $58,000. Cannot the minister see his way clear to go this little extra distance? This bridge is over the canal system, and I think the request is reasonable. Many other bridges on the canal have been taken over. There is no politics in this proposal, and it is an absolutely fair one. As a last effort I would suggest that the minister make up the extra $2,000 or $3,000. Even if the counties were called upon to make a little more generous contribution I think they might be inclined to do so if the minister will take the bridge over.

Mr. GRAHAM: I have discussed it with my officials, and I am advised that the taking over of the bridges along the Trent canal is becoming such a problem that I hesitate to go as far as I am requested in regard to this bridge. However, I will discuss it again with the officials. The time will probably come when we will take over most of the bridges, but I should not like to hold out too much hope at the present time.

Mr. BOYS: I thought the minister might go the extra distance. I think it has been done in other cases.

Mr. GRAHAM: We will look into the matter.

Mr. BOYS: The bridge should be constructed without delay, and if the department is going to take in hand the construction under departmental specifications, it might as well take the bridge over. On the other hand, if the department is only going to make a contribution, that is a different proposition, and the difficulty is if it is to be further looked into the construction of the bridge will be held up for another year. If I thought for one minute the minister would seriously look into it further I would be glad to get the members from the other ridings together—they represent all parties in this House—and have them spend a few minutes with him. I feel the claim is so absolutely righteous and fair that it ought to be allowed, and I so addressed myself to the minister when we saw him. Indeed, I thought we had impressed him and that he would accede to our request.

[Mr. Boys.]

Mr. GRAHAM: I almost yielded.

Mr. BOYS: I think you did at the time, and it was the suavity the minister is so famous for which accounted for the absence of further discussion. If the minister will reconsider it I would ask him to let this item stand.

Mr. GRAHAM: You had better let it go through, otherwise there will be no appropriation.

Mr. BOYS: Then there is still hope?

Mr. GRAHAM: We will look further into the matter.

Item agreed to.

Surveys and Inspections, Railways: including salaries and expenses of experts employed temporarily, $55,000.

Mr. BAXTER: Are there any surveys for new branch lines?

Mr. GRAHAM: This is rather departmental. We have a lot of that special work and send men out to do it.

Mr. BAXTER: Is there any large survey in contemplation for branch lines anywhere?

Mr. GRAHAM: If there be any surveys they will be rather under a vote for that special purpose.

Item agreed to.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Fielding the House adjourned at 12.10 a.m. (Friday).

Friday, June 8, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

SOLDIERS' CIVIL RE-ESTABLISHMENT

Hon. H. S. BELAND (Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment) moved that the House go into committee at the next sitting to consider the following proposed resolution:

That it is expedient to amend The Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment Act, and to provide:—

1. That the power to make regulations for the constitution of medical boards, including appeal boards, with such powers as may be deemed expedient, be repealed, and provision be made to give the minister power, with the approval of the Governor in Council, to make regulations for appeals from decisions as to the right of ex-members of the Forces to treatment with pay and allowances, and for that purpose to

designate the Review and Appeal Tribunals to be constituted under the proposed amendments to the Pension Act.

2. That the Governor in Council may, on the recommendation of the minister, appoint an ex-member of the Forces to be an Official Soldiers' Adviser in each unit or district of the department, at such salary or remuneration as may be decided in each case, with prescribed duties.

3. That the minister shall have power to appoint a person or persons to hear and receive evidence on oath in respect of any matter pertaining to the department or procedure of the department.

He said: Mr. Speaker, His Excellency the Governor General having been informed of the subject matter of this resolution has given his consent and commends it to the favourable consideration of the House.

Motion agreed to.

WOMEN AND COUNCIL OF HEALTH

On the Orders of the Day:

Miss AGNES C. MACPHAIL (Southeast Grey): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the government if two women have been appointed to the Dominion Council of Health to replace Mrs. Tood, of Orillia, and Miss H. Reid, of Montreal; and, if not, why?

Hon. Mr. BELAND: Did the hon. lady ask whether two women had been appointed?

Miss MACPHAIL: Two women.

Mr. BELAND: I understand that only one has been appointed.

PRIVILEGE—Mr. IRVINE

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. WILLIAM IRVINE (Calgary East): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of privilege. Yesterday afternoon, when we were discussing the situation of certain Hebridean immigrants, the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart) challenged the facts which I then presented. I have here a telegram from Mr. W. McD. Davidson, who is editor of the Calgary Albertan—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. On a question of privilege or any other question of a similar nature no writing or communication from the outside can be read to contradict statements made by members of the House in the course of a debate.

Mr. IRVINE: Then, Mr. Speaker, may I refer to this communication without quoting it?

Mr. SPEAKER: What cannot be done directly cannot be done indirectly. On any day, except Friday of course—because to-day the Speaker leaves the chair without any motion being put—when the House goes into Committee of Supply the hon. member has his remedy.

ADULTERATION OF CANADIAN GRAIN

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. E. J. GARLAND (Bow River): Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Robb) if it is correct that last summer he held a quiet inquiry into the operations of an organization, or alleged organization, engaged at American ports in the business of adulterating Canadian grain for export. If so, what were the results of the inquiry, and when may we expect a report thereon to be tabled?

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Trade and Commerce): I never heard of such an organization until to-day.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): No inquiries, then were held last summer by the minister or by his department as to such adulteration?

Mr. ROBB: I am not sure what my hon. friend refers to. If he would be more specific I might be able to give him the information he desires.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Perhaps I can put my question directly. Were any inquiries made by the minister or his department last summer into the adulteration of Canadian grain at American ports?

Mr. ROBB: Mr. Speaker, last year we had a complaint from the London Corn Exchange that Canadian grain reaching London was not up to standard. I met the members in their exchange hall, London, and the chairman made it clear that they had no complaints against Canadian grain reaching England from Canadian ports; their complaints were against Canadian grain reaching England through certain United States ports. We instructed the Board of Grain Commissioners —one of the inspectors went along with them —to make an actual survey of the conditions there affecting the receiving and the loading of grain going out to those ports. The chairman of the board and the chief grain inspector have gone over with the idea that they will reach there about the time the first ships arrive from Canada and from the United States. They will make inquiries and observations with a view to giving the government information regarding the condition of the grain that reaches the other side.

Mr. GARDINER: I understood the minister to say that they had asked the Board of Grain Commissioners to make inquiry in United States ports. What we desire to know is what was the result of that inquiry.

Mr. ROBB: Well, offhand, the information that was brought back to us confirmed our own view, namely, that we have no control in the United States over grain, once it is cleared from Buffalo. It is true the grain goes through the United States in bond, but that is for the protection of the people of the United States themselves. So it comes down to this—if grain is shipped to Liverpool direct from Canada and then from Liverpool to France and the complaint comes to us from France that it is not up to standard, we have no control over it because it had reached the Liverpool port—beyond our country.

Mr. GARDINER: I quite understand we have no control—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. GARDINER: All right, Mr. Speaker; I will put the question directly. Will the minister tell us just exactly what they found with regard to the adulteration of Canadian grain in American ports? That is the point we want to get at; we want to know just exactly—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order; I did not stop the hon. member at first because I thought he was putting another question. But assuredly no debate can arise on a question put to a minister of the Crown before the Orders of the Day are called.

Mr. GARDINER: If I have transgressed the rules of the House, Sir, I desire to apologize. I was putting a question to the minister and I wanted to get the reply.

Mr. SPEAKER: I know the hon. gentleman was proceeding in good faith, but I must see that the rules of the House are observed.

SUPPLY

RAILWAYS AND CANALS

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

Railways and Canals—chargeable to income:

Amount not exceeding $73,000,000 to meet expenditures made or indebtedness incurred (where amounts available from net operating earnings may be insufficient) by or on behalf of the Canadian National Railway Company, hereinafter called "the company", or any company specified in the First Schedule to the act incorporating the Canadian National Railway Company, being chapter 13 of the Statutes of Canada, 1919, or by the company in respect of any railways, properties or works entrusted to the company from time to time under the provisions of section 11 of the said chapter 13 of the Statutes of Canada, 1919, or by or on behalf of any company specified or referred to in chapter 13 of the Statutes of Canada, 1920; or any one or more of them, on any of the following accounts:—

(a) Operating deficits whenever incurred or ascertained.

(b) Acquisition of property, materials and supplies.

(c) Interest and sinking funds on notes, securities or obligations.

(d) Principal and interest of maturing or matured loans secured or unsecured.

(e) Construction and betterments.

(f) Co-ordination or consolidation of railway lines and facilities.

(g) Guarantees of securities.

The amount herein authorized may be applied from time to time, in the discretion of the Governor in Council:—

(a) To meet expenditures made or indebtedness incurred by the Company in respect of railways, properties and works entrusted to the company as aforesaid.

(b) By way of loans in cash, or by way of guarantee, or partly one way and partly the other, subject, however, as follows:—

If by way of loans, the amount or amounts advanced shall be repayable on demand, with interest at the rate fixed by the Governor in Council, from time to time, payable half-yearly, secured if and when directed by the Governor in Council by mortgage or mortgages upon such properties in such form and containing such terms and conditions, not inconsistent herewith, as the Governor in Council may approve.

If by way of guarantee, any such guarantee may be of the principal and interest of the notes and obligations or securities of one or more of the said companies specified by the Governor in Council, and may be signed by the Minister of Finance, on behalf of His Majesty, in such form and on such terms and conditions as the Governor in Council may determine to be appropriate and applicable thereto, $73,000,000.

Mr. SHAW: In connection with the matter under discussion last night, the purchase of the two-million-dollar hotel in Paris, I would like to ask the minister whether or not the board of directors of the Canadian National Railway Company have approved of the purchase as made.

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals): Some two months ago the question of getting proper quarters in Paris, I am informed, was discussed at a meeting of the board, and approved. I do not think this special transaction has yet been brought before the board for approval.

Mr. IRVINE: Will the minister give the committee an idea of the service to be rendered to the Canadian National, or to the Canadian nation for that matter, by this purchase?

Mr. GRAHAM: The only answer I can give to my hon. friend is that the Canadian National has had no headquarters in Paris and it is the judgment of the Canadian National Company that such headquarters are greatly needed for the good of the Canadian National system.

Mr. IRVINE: Has the Canadian National similar headquarters in the other European headquarters—Rome, Berlin, Stockholm? If not, why purchase one in Paris and not in the others?

Mr. GRAHAM: The Canadian Pacific Railway have headquarters in Paris. I do not know about the others. Paris is considered a very central point of European trade. It is, in a way, the hub of the wheel.

Mr. IRVINE: There is this great difference between the Canadian Pacific and the Canadian National: the Canadian Pacific has steamship lines across the ocean and I understand also has railroad systems on the Continent. I could understand that they would require headquarters of this character. But I cannot see how the Canadian National would require them.

Mr. GRAHAM: I have never heard of the Canadian Pacific having railway lines on the Continent. They have their own steamship lines; and the Canadian National has connection with the Cunard and White Star lines.

Mr. IRVINE: Then, do I understand that this purchase in Paris is merely "Keeping up with the Joneses," so to speak? Is that the service that is expected by it?

Mr. CAMPBELL: How is this figure of $73,000,000 made up? I understand that about $58,000,000 is required to cover the deficit. Is this for the deficit on last year's operating?

Mr. GRAHAM: I regret I was unable to hear the last part of my hon. friend's remark, but I understand that he is asking how the $73,000,000 is made up. I will give the totals: For the Canadian Government Railways, $5,772,941; Canadian Northern, $36,906,826.64; Grand Trunk, $20,000,000; Grand Trunk Pacific, $10,320,232.36; operating deficit, estimate for next year—which we think is very liberal, but provision must be made—$10,000,000; interest and other sundry charges, $22,821,260.34; refunding and sinking funds, $8,184,699.33; capital betterment and equipment, $31,994,040.33;—making a total of $73,000,000.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Have the department taken into consideration the matter of adjusting the capitalization of these railways? The Canadian Government railways, of course, have no capitalization, but the others have. Has the idea of writing off or readjusting the value to bring it down to the actual value been considered at all?

Mr. GRAHAM: That suggestion has been made in several quarters. I think the former leader of the Progressive party urged it very strongly. It would not in any way reduce the liability of the country. If you owe so much money you would still owe it whether you write down the capitalization or not. But it is a matter for investigation. This has to be borne in mind, however,—as my hon. friend has pointed out, there is quite a proportion of the Canadian National system now known as the Government Railways, the capitalization of which is not considered in the indebtedness of the railway, so if the Canadian National system outside of the Government Railways is over-capitalized as some contend, you have to offset that in making your calculations. The amount of capital invested in the Government Railways is about $440,000,000, if I remember correctly.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I have compiled some figures that are rather illuminating. The Canadian National—and when I say the Canadian National in this case I am including the Grand Trunk but excluding the Canadian Government railways—had net earnings last year of $193,171,000, and against that interest or fixed charges of $62,454,000; while the Canadian Pacific, with earnings nearly as high, $186,665,000, has fixed charges of only $13,348,000. Taking our roads separately I find that the Canadian Northern for 1922 had gross earnings of only $1.85 for every dollar of fixed charges; the Grand Trunk Pacific had $2.17 earnings for every dollar of fixed charges; the Canadian Government railways had $1.79 of earnings for every dollar of capitalization; and the Grand Trunk had $6.95 of earnings for every dollar of fixed charges. And the Canadian Pacific had a revenue of $13.98 for every dollar of fixed charges. I might say in connection with the Canadian Government Railways that I arrived at the fixed charges by computing 5½ per cent interest on the investment of $414,000,000. I should like to quote at this point from an editorial in the Manitoba Free Press regarding the capitalization of the railways. It says:

> The time has now come to consider seriously the proposition which has been frequently advanced during the past two or three years, to cut down the capitalization of the system to a point where it will represent the actual value of the road. . . It will not be denied that the capitalization of the Canadian National railway is far in excess of the physical value of the road. In this huge mountain of debt are embedded all the railway blunders of Canada since the first railway was built.

Further on it makes this reference to the effect on the operations of the road:

Of the operators of the Canadian National railway miracles should not be demanded. They cannot be expected to make surpluses sufficient to pay interest charges upon the present combined capitalization of the system. Faced with the certainty that every year there will be a huge deficit the directors of the system will inevitably get into the frame of mind which finds expression in the phrase: "What's the use?" If there's bound to be a deficit anyway, why worry whether it is ten or twenty million dollars.

But, given a just valuation of the road, the directors can be told that they must meet the fixed charges or make way for others who can. They will have a target to aim at and they will be expected to hit it. This will be much more exhilarating and inspiring than shooting arrows into a box.

We have plenty of precedent for such action. The whole capitalization of the Canadian Government railways—that is, what are called in the statement the Canadian Government railways, the Intercolonial, the Transcontinental and the Prince Edward Island railway—has been wiped off and charged up to the public debt. I notice also that an item of $2,394,000 spent on the Canadian Pacific between Ottawa and Quebec was transferred to the public debt in 1898. I think the minister would do well to give this matter serious consideration.

Mr. GRAHAM: It is a large question, of course. I imagine that the government, if it thought wise, could perhaps deal with the securities held by itself, although that would not relieve the financial obligation of the country at all, but the securities in the hands of the public would have to remain and the liability be held sacred.

Mr. SHAW: After listening to the minister last night and to the discussion which then took place I have been trying to ascertain the situation in connection with this Paris transaction. I presume the minister will not deny that there must be somewhere in the statutes authority conferred upon the president or the board of directors of the Canadian National Railways to enter into a transaction of this character? I should like him, in the first place, to refer me to the section in the act which confers authority upon the president of the railway or upon the board of directors; secondly, I would like to know exactly what the position is in regard to that $2,000,000 transaction. Is it out of the control now of the National Railways and out of the control of Sir Henry Thornton? Has the money been paid over? What is the situation?

Mr. GRAHAM: I explained that fully last night, but I will explain it again. The building was required, so the president of the board considered. In his judgment the transaction would have to take place very quickly or the opportunity would be lost. The Canadian National Railways financed this gentleman in Paris to get possession of the building. The money was deposited in the Bank of Toronto, just as money in like cases has been deposited by other governments for other purposes; and that deposit in the Bank of Toronto allowed the man in Paris to finance the building. In other words, the Canadian National for the time being financed the transaction in order to get control of this building. And they took a mortgage, I am told, in the London office, to protect themselves.

Mr. SHAW: A mortgage from whom?

Mr. GRAHAM: I have mentioned that three or four times already. I do not think my hon. friend can pronounce the name when I say it—Aronovici.

Mr. SHAW: I confess that I find difficulty in understanding the situation. Why take a mortgage? Why should not the title have been taken in the name of the Canadian National Railways? Why take a mortgage in favour of the Canadian National Railways?

Mr. GRAHAM: I see what my hon. friend is at now. As I understand it, the board did not intend to retain possession of this building. However, I see what my hon. friend is after. He will pardon me, I hope, if I cannot grasp these legal niceties as quickly as legal gentlemen can. But if that had been done I know he would probably have risen immediately and said there had been a violation of the act of 1919 in that the Canadan National is not empowered to build or extend lines or to make any extended capital expenditure without an order in council. The property was not bought in the name of the Canadian National Railways, but in the name of this gentleman whose name I have tried to pronounce, who was financed, temporarily only, by the Governor in Council.

Mr. SHAW: Then I take it, from what the minister says, that the title to the property does stand in the name of Aronovici, and the mortgage is with the Canadian National Railways?

Mr. GRAHAM: That is as I understand it.

Mr. SHAW: For the full amount of the sum advanced?

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes.

Mr. SHAW: I would like to ask the minister if he can point to the section of the act which authorizes a transaction of this character?

Mr. GRAHAM: The act is negative and positive in different places.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, no.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is absolutely right. My hon. friends know that the act gives certain powers and declines to give other powers. Will my hon. friend tell me of any section in the act which enjoins the president from doing anything of this kind?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I had not the advantage of being here last night, but I have read Hansard since and I must commence by saying that there was revealed last night the most extraordinary transaction, I think, ever disclosed in this parliament. I have difficulty in finding words to describe the conduct of the board. In so far as the minister is concerned his responsibility apparently arose after the transaction was complete, and his error consists in condoning the transaction and expressing approval of it in this House. A knowledge of—I had almost said of law—but a knowledge of the plain, simple facts connected with, or rather which constituted, the basis adopted by this parliament for the control of our National railways is necessary to comprehend the seriousness of what has been done. When this country found itself compelled to take over large railways—railways which could not stand up unless they were taken over—we had to find some way, some system, whereby we could at once get operation on business lines unaffected and uninterfered with by political considerations, and at the same time keep in the hands of the representatives of the people that fundamental control of general policy and of expenditure that necessarily the people of Canada would insist on where their own money is involved. Now the method adopted was this—and it is the very kernel, it is the very essence of the whole National Railway Act —that is so far as operation, ordinary operation, is concerned the board of directors elected by the Governor in Council should be in exactly the same position as any other board of directors elected by their shareholders, but there the control of the board of directors ended. In so far as policy and in so far as capital investment were concerned the board of directors could recommend and could do no more. The line was drawn between capital investment and operation. It is not a legal nicety; no one can escape the issue by merely hiding behind a lack of knowledge of law; it is as plain and naked a principle as anybody has ever seen. Let me repeat. As read in part by the member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton) last night the National Railway Act provides that neither the board of directors nor the manager has any power to expend or pledge the money of this country for capital investment, save with the antecedent authorization of the Governor in Council. And the Governor in Council had its powers only when the money for the express purpose had been voted by this House.

What has happened? The manager of the Canadian National Railways desired to buy with the money of our railways, which means the money of this country, an hotel in Paris —to be converted I presume into some immense structure there—in order that Canada may get "on the main street" of Paris, to use the graphic language of the Minister of Railways. I do not know at what stage the device was adopted, but I have a suspicion that the circuitous plan finally used was not the original intent of Sir Henry Thornton and the management. I fancy it was when the fundamental legal position came before their eyes in its full strength that this device was adopted; to call it a subterfuge is to honour it. They buy the property in the name of one Aronovici who is their own servant in Paris. The minister says they could not buy it as a capital expenditure and take the title to the company; to do so is against the law. The right to do so has been denied by this parliament. But the minister thinks it is all right for them to buy it with the company's money in the name of Aronovici, and the minister passes his blessing on the conduct of Sir Henry Thornton adopting a subterfuge of that sort. I do not admit for a moment they had a right to buy this property in the name of Aronovici or of anyone else, and I question very much if they had the legal opinion of any lawyer of repute that such a thing could without a previous vote of parliament be done. But with or without a lawyer's opinion the people of this country will not stand for subterfuge of that sort to get round the provisions of an act of parliament. The parties go to the Bank of Toronto, they take the money of the people of this country and lodge it in the bank; and then the bank sends that money over to Aronovici to buy an hotel in Paris. What have they for it? They have not anything save the Paris hotel. They buy the property and then they set to work to get some syndicate to take it over—I mean the board, I mean Sir Henry Thornton—and so far as we are informed we do not know up to this hour in parliament whether there

is any syndicate bound to take it over or not. If there is we do not know who compose the syndicate.

Now, what is the position? We have $2,000,000 of capital expenditure invested in a Paris hotel, not only against the intent but against the plainest wording of an act of parliament, an act as plain as this or any other parliament ever enacted—money taken from the purposes to which it was applied by a statute of parliament, misappropriated from these purposes and invested in a Paris hotel: Or; without the knowledge of the government we have money loaned on the credit of a syndicate we do not know, money of the Canadian people loaned to a syndicate whose names we are denied. Which is the better of the two horns of the dilemma? This thing is a scandal, this is an outrage, and when this became known to the minister Sir Henry Thornton should have been called to book at once. When the minister comes to this House and says that the thing is all right because the property is bought in the name of Aronovici instead of in the name of the Canadian National Railways I do not think he does justice to himself. I venture to say, because I have a profound respect for the Minister of Railways, that when Sir Henry Thornton first disclosed to him what he had done his language to that gentleman was not like what it has been in this House. But he had not the courage to do to Sir Henry Thornton what he should have done, and to reprimand his conduct now before this House. What right, I want to know, has he to put his hand into the treasury of Canada and apply $2,000,000 to get the National Railways "on the main street" of Paris? No one can argue for a moment that it is in accordance with the intent of that act. It is diametrically opposed to the law, and everybody knows it, to invest capital money without the consent of the government and without previous appropriation by this House. But first, had we not better get on the main street of Canada before we get on the main street of Paris? Where are we to-day? We have the property. We have it in our own name in this shape: Mr. Aronovici has the title and has mortgaged the property to us. As everybody knows, this course is merely a substitute for having it in the name of the Canadian National Railways. We hold the property to-day, a property that is a capital investment in Paris; and all we have is a hope, annexed to which there is not a line, so far as this House has been informed, that some time some people over in New York will take it off our hands. Who the people in New York are we do not know, and I think the minister said last night he did not know himself. That is the position Canada is in. And the minister thinks it is all right.

Is Sir Henry Thornton to have power to repeat this performance? If he has power to go into the treasury to the extent of $2,000,000, he has power to go into the treasury to the extent of $20,000,000. He can pledge this country in Paris, Berlin, South America, or anywhere he pleases, for the whole of the moneys at the disposal of the Canadian National Railways in capital account, as long as he does it by the circuitous sinuosity he adopted in this case, and the minister will think it is all right. The minister should have denounced it and he should have dealt with Sir Henry Thornton on the spot. No board of directors, no matter who they are, has power to do any such thing, nor should be given such power, nor should be condoned for doing it. The country has not very much confidence in the board of directors, if they have any. The proportion of them who should have been appointed is small. The country has welcomed and has given a fair opportunity to Sir Henry Thornton. But the confidence of the country in Sir Henry Thornton will not last much longer after they know of this transaction; and furthermore the country's confidence in the minister will be seriously shattered when it finds he condoned a transaction of this kind on the floor of this House.

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not know that I can add anything to what I have said. I think I said last night that if I had been doing it, probably I would not have done it that way. However, the question turns largely on the legality of the transaction, and I gave as an authority the adviser of the president, Mr. Ruel. We all have a high opinion of him. And his reply to me, when asked if this was a legal transaction, was that it certainly was. As to the advisability of it, I said before that I would not have done it that way. But I am convinced that the necessity of getting headquarters in Paris is very essential, in order that we may get our share of the traffic. My right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) says we are not on the main street in Canada. Well, there was quite a criticism because we insisted on staying on the main street in Toronto. But the way to get on the main street in Canada is not altogether through our own people or their products. One way is to get more people, and the other way is to get the traffic of other lines as much as possible. My own view is, disregarding for the moment the discussion of how this property was obtained, that it is absolutely essential that, in the

centres where traffic is to be obtained, the Canadian National must have a prominent place. It must have a place in the centre of the business district where the people will recognize not only Canada but the Canadian National Railways. I can refer my hon. friend to a case, not on all fours with this, because the government did it. I refer to the letting of the contract of the new Halifax harbour works, which to my mind was all wrong—but that is only a matter of opinion. If the right hon. gentleman will look up the facts in that case he will find that there was no appropriation by parliament and no money. The government borrowed and placed in the bank $300,000, and sent agents to buy up certain properties, to establish the value. Well, it was the government that was doing it. They had no order in council authorizing it to be done, so I am informed. It was done, as to the details, just as this transaction was done. However, that is not important. That is the way they raised the money. I want to point out something my right hon. friend has said himself. I want parliament to thoroughly understand that I do not approve, or would not approve, of any transaction about which there was the least shade of dishonesty or departure from rectitude, I would not care with whom I might have to disagree. But in this case there is no evidence of such a thing. There was the desire on the part of the Canadian National to obtain a certain property which other people were endeavouring to obtain. Perhaps my right hon. friend knows who they are. Sir Henry Thornton might have been impetuous in his anxiety to get this property on which he had his eye for something else. But outside of that, there is nothing in the transaction at all to point to anything in the least wrong. The Canadian National Railways Act of 1919 gave the Canadian National board pretty wide powers. My right hon. friend rightly says that the Board of Directors of the Canadian National, including its president, was given the same powers as are given to the directorate and president of a private company.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Over operation.

Mr. GRAHAM: He did not say that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, that is what I said distinctly.

Mr. GRAHAM: Well, I will leave it that way, but I think it goes further. I am going to put him on the same plane. It was argued last night—and I think rightly so—that the president of a private company ought to have the approval of the shareholders for a transaction of this kind. That was argued by two or three of my hon. friends on the other side of the House. The practice is, as everybody knows, that the president of a large private corporation or some person acting for and with him, exercises very extensive powers, and while he proceeds in a case of this kind, to purchase property, he would purchase it first, and ask for the approval afterwards, because if he did not do that, the price would be greatly enhanced when he came to purchase the building in the name of a big company, and I imagine the same thing would happen in this case. I admit frankly to my mind capital expenditure, if this were held to be a purchase by the Canadian National, could not be made except by the consent of the shareholders, the shareholders being the Governor in Council in this case. The practice—and I suppose Sir Henry Thornton followed the practice that he followed when he was with the great English company—is for the executive in such cases as this to make their arrangements first, depending on the approval of the shareholders. But I want to quote my right hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, with reference to a position he took a few days ago, not on this question, but on the powers of the board. I know my hon. friend will say that that applied to operation only. That may technically be correct.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Absolutely.

Mr. GRAHAM: I would rather say "technically."

Mr. MEIGHEN: Read section 11.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am going to read the speech of my right hon. friend—it overrides section 11, maybe—to point out to the members of this committee that I would take it from his words uttered there and, I think, correctly that even in this transaction Sir Henry Thornton was not going very far afield from the principle laid down,—with the fact that the minister was not in a position to give details, being advised by the president that this would not be in the interest of the Canadian National at the present time. I think this was confirmed by my right hon. friend's words uttered the other day, although he will still insist that they meant only matters of operation.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What date was that?

Mr. GRAHAM: Page 2473 of revised Hansard, May 4. I think I was engaged in the discussion myself and my right hon. friend as well. In reply to something that I had remarked, my right hon. friend said.

Nothing could be a greater contrast than the position of the minister to that of his friends when they were on this side of the House. I wish to take exactly the same position that I took then: I do not believe in details of management being revealable every day or discussable in the House of Commons, and never did. At the same time I realize, as I realized when in power, that there are some matters in connection with which the details might be brought before the House at the proper time—when that might be done without interfering with the actual day to day management, and when all the doings of the company could be scrutinized by hon. members.

The question arises: Was this a part of the management of the Canadian National system open for discussion? I submit, taking the broad meaning of my right hon. friend's words, it would come within that category.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is the hon. member seriously intimating that this is ordinary everyday, day to day management of a railway?

Mr. GRAHAM: My right hon. friend went further.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is what my hon. friend read.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am going to read more.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It will be just as good.

Mr. GRAHAM: If everything is done legally, nothing out of the ordinary, everything within the four corners of the act, then I think anything that would enhance the value of the line as regards earning power might be considered as part of the management of the railway. My right hon. friend continued:

While management is on and while they are hiring this man and firing that man—

I think he is using my words there.

—buying coal here and refusing to buy it there, we admitted and argued strenuously that it was impossible to have these things subjected to daily scrutiny, but we always said that the time came when the House had a right to inquire into everything in management, and we asked that committee to ascertain when that time came and how these matters could be brought before the House.

That has reference to the argument under the late government for a committee to which these things might be referred. The committee would have to be very small if all the information would not get out. I have great faith in human nature, but I never knew a committee of any proportions that did not have on it someone who had a friend to tell the information to quietly, and one might almost as well have the information on the records of this House. My right hon. friend said further:

But we went this far ourselves: That this was the place where railway expenditures should be made known, but made known at a time when they would not harass the management of the system. Consequently the committee was appointed.

I read these things just to point out to my right hon. friend that less than a week ago he took the ground that as regards details—he did not say details, but as regards the management of a railway, and information concerning it, there was a time to give out the information, and that was when this would not embarrass the management of the road. I do not think I can add anything further to what I have said. My right hon. friend asked me a question, and I think I can go this far with him. I shall be perfectly frank with him. If Sir Henry Thornton or the board could exercise this authority in large degree whenever he saw fit to do so, I think, without saying any more, I should be accurate in the remark that it is not likely to be exercised again.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I feel a measure of satisfaction in that there is a note of repentance evident now in the speech of the minister. I must congratulate him on the selection he made of an extract from my own speech made on the 4th May.

Mr. GRAHAM: I beg pardon; I thought it was the 4th June.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The 4th May. It would be just the same as if it were the 4th May, 1919; he would not find an iota of difference. I could not, if I had it to do again, express my meaning a particle more clearly and in a way more applicable to this case than I expressed it in the extract read by the minister. Certainly! In matters of management! under section 11, the term "management" is defined in the clearest possible way and the board has authority as regards matters affected by section 11, matters of day to day management and operation. I used the term specifically—why, I even went further in what the minister quoted—I described what day to day management implied; I gave instances: the buying of coal, hiring of men, firing of men. All those things I did not think should come before parliament—things of that character as they were going on. But I added later on there would come time even for that.

4 p.m.

How does that kind of thing affect a transaction of this sort? They are as remote from it as the stars are from this earth; they have nothing in common with it. Section 23 provides that the directors shall have nothing to do in the way of final authority save by direction of the Governor in Council and after a vote of this House with new invest-

ment or construction and manifestly one such thing, is to buy a hotel in Paris. You could not imagine a more outstanding instance. What I find fault with the minister for is that he approved in this House what was done and gave carte blanche to Sir Henry Thornton. No general manager is entitled to confidence who would be guilty of an action of this sort. I do not say yet that he is guilty of wrongful intent. The route he pursued showed that he was not acting in accordance with the law. Think of Sir Henry Thornton taking upon himself the duty of manager of this system and not knowing the simple truth that as regards capital investment he had to come to the Governor in Council for authority and that the money for the purpose must previously have been voted by parliament. Nothing will convince any hon. member who is sincere that Sir Henry Thornton does not know as well as any living man that he has to have that prior authority, and that the Governor in Council has to have the prior vote of Parliament. But he goes to work and he takes the money of the Canadian National railway, which money was put there by the Minister of Finance for purposes voted by this parliament last session, and he sends $2,000,000 of it through the agent of the Bank of Toronto to Paris to buy a hotel. This is what he has done, and this is what he is accountable for to this country. We are going to have to pay for this transaction. The prospect of escape looks very dark to me; but escape or no escape, the thing is wrong and should have been denounced by the government.

But how are we going to escape? By taking enough space in this building and paying enough rental to make it worth while for an unknown syndicate in New York to take it off our hands. We have an option. We have financed—the word is hardly appropriate—we have bought it and we hope to sell it. We hope to get rid of it to some people, we do not know to whom, but we have got to pay the $2,000,000. The money is already gone. Still we are told we have an option from this unknown syndicate giving us the right to use as much space as we like on fair terms. What a gallant option: You can depend upon it that the syndicate will take this Paris property off our hands only when we take up enough space and pay enough rental to make it a good investment for the syndicate. To do so is equivalent to keeping the property. There is where we have been landed by Sir Henry Thornton. I think the minister should go further and state to this House that the opinion of this House regarding the transaction shall be made known to Sir Henry Thornton by himself. And, further, if as we are told it is the opinion of any legal adviser of the Canadian National Railway board that this transaction was right I want to assert that no legal adviser can say it was right, no man with a conscience can say so; he may possibly say it was technically lawful, but it passes my ingenuity to see how he can say even that; but if he or anyone does say it was right—let the government come to this House this session with an amendment that will make such a thing unlawful for all time to come. Do not understand me to suggest that it is necessary, I do not believe it is necessary; the intent and letter of the law is to me as plain as the sun in the heavens. If any general manager who in the responsible position that Sir Henry Thornton is in has no more conception of his duty than to enter into a transaction like that, well, for my part the measure of confidence I have had in him is destroyed.

Mr. LEWIS: Will the minister tell us whether headquarters could have been secured in this Paris building without purchasing it, or whether any effort was made to this end?

Mr. GRAHAM: That is a detail with which I am not conversant.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Mr. Chairman, if we are to go through this four-hour stunt again for the purpose of giving the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) a chance to express himself, I presume there is no harm in the rest of us who do not pretend to know very much about railway management expressing our opinion on the question. The leader of the Opposition pretends that he is desirous of being fair to Sir Henry Thornton, that he wants to maintain the confidence of the country in the integrity of the Canadian National Railways board. I would remind my hon. friend that the first reception he gave Sir Henry Thornton, before Sir Henry had had an opportunity to get his shoulder in the collar on the job at all, was an attack upon the newly-appointed president of the Canadian National Railways during a by-election in Lanark last fall. So pronounced was this attack that the hon. gentleman's own party press found it necessary to remind him that it was a very unwise proceeding on his part. My right hon. friend will remember what appeared in his own journals.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There was some misinformation given the Journal. I would not

wonder if it was given by the minister himself. I was suspicious at the time that such was the fact. What I stated in Lanark was a perfectly correct statement of the truth, and apparently the electors of Lanark thought so.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I am recalling the incident merely to refresh the hon. gentleman's memory, to remind him that he was not fair to Sir Henry Thornton on that date and has never been fair to him since.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What did I say?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: What is he saying now? What is the purpose of his attacks on Sir Henry Thornton? Is it not to destroy the confidence that Sir Henry Thornton himself has won during the time he has been with us? Is it not an attempt to create suspicion in the minds of the public with regard to the administration of this road? In a word, the hon. gentleman is fearful that Sir Henry Thornton is going to make a better job of the management of our National Railways than did his predecessor. That is what is the matter with my right hon. friend.

An hon. MEMBER: That is true.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Of couse it is true, everybody knows it. I have been watching my right hon. friend's antics in respect to our National Railway system, his solicitous regard for its success; but every time there is any evidence of the system doing better than formerly, well, he is pretty nearly prepared to take some kind of a cat-fit over it. Oh, we know the game of politics, some of us. We do not pretend to be able to play the game very low-down; no, but we can see the kind of people who are playing it.

Let us have a word or two about the propriety of this transaction. We are discussing this expenditure, it is said, after it has been made. Does not that occur constantly in parliamentary practice? Is not every Governor General's warrant expended before it is discussed in this House? Certainly that is so. Unless we can give a certain latitude to the president of this railway system so as to put him on a parity with the president of any other railway system dealing with similar transactions, then we are not going to make a success of our national railways. The president must have some discretionary power or he will not be able to make the system go. If we are going to knock or pull down every day what our president does in the exercise of his discretion, how long are we going to keep a good man in this job? No competent man is going to remain there if he has not the right to use his discretion. The head of every great organization is given a free hand. He must be able to exercise his judgment and close out a transaction when it is to the interest of his organization to do so, and afterwards discuss it with his board of directors or his shareholders. In this case the people of Canada are the shareholders. It has not been shown that the accommodation was not required in Paris. The whole discussion has revolved around the question as to whether Sir Henry Thornton had a right to do this thing or not. Well, if he has no right to use his discretion, if he must wait for all the red tape to be cut before he can close out a proposition of this kind, then we are not going to make a success of our National Railways, because that principle will be carried all down the line and you will not be able to keep competent and resourceful men in the employ of the National Railway system. I know the technical argument is on the side of my hon. friend, but I take the ground that everybody exercising authority in any position, from Sir Henry Thornton down to the most humble employee, unless he has freedom of action at critical times is going to miss many an opportunity of serving the interests of his organization. This principle applies to government just exactly the same. The man who has to go through all the rigmarole of the red tape, without being allowed to exercise any initiative of his own, would not, it seems to me, be living up to the requirements of a young country like this, which desires, especially at critical times, quick action on the part of its servants.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Would the minister inform the House whether parliament was in session at the time this transaction was under consideration?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I am not discussing whether parliament was in session when the transaction was put through. The Minister of Railways is more familiar with these details than I am.

Mr. GRAHAM: Parliament was in session.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: After getting what we believe to be the best available man on this or any other continent for the management of our National Railway system, are we going to shackle him so that he cannot exercise any initiative, judgment or discretion in matters of this kind? If that is so, we may as well all throw up our hands, because you cannot run our National Railways in competition with the other big railway system under such an administration.

Then the question naturally arises, how much latitude are you going to give the president of your railway system? You will have to depend on his judgment. Why did we

search the four corners of the earth for Sir Henry Thornton if it was not that we could secure a man whose judgment, we could be confident, would be exercised in the best interests of our railway system in just such cases as the one under discussion. I am not entering into the merits or the demerits of this case, I do not know the situation in Paris, and I do not know the requirements of our railway in that respect. Therefore I cannot discuss the merits. I am discussing the wisdom and propriety of giving the head of our National Railway system discretionary power, and I say that unless you give him such power you might as well despair of trying to operate the system successfully.

I have had some experience in handling departments—in a small way, of course, compared with a matter of this kind; and I say that the man who cannot be given discretionary power and who cannot be relied upon as having good judgment should not be left on the job. It is a mighty small piece of business to take the technical attitude that my hon. friend takes, to advertise it all over the country, to try to destroy the confidence of the country in the National Railway system itself and in Sir Henry Thornton. And all this is done under the pretence that it is for the good of the National Railways! No, Mr. Chairman, the first thought of my hon. friend is to make political capital. Perhaps the Minister of Railways is not without some fault in this matter because of the attitude of the Liberals on a former occasion toward the National Railways. You will remember, Mr. Chairman—you were in the House too—that in 1921 and prior to that, when the question of bringing down information not dissimilar to this was before the House, the Liberals were not sparing of the government of that day, headed by my right hon. friend, in regard to the failure to bring down certain information connected with the National Railways, and in their criticism of Mr. Hanna. But they had this justification, that was a railway board, that was a government, whose passing was long overdue. The Opposition of that day were justified in making the exposures they did in that connection, as subsequent events demonstrated. It is perfectly natural for my hon. friends opposite to retaliate now; I am not objecting to that. I was not here at the time, but I can understand the desire to take advantage of a technical situation like this. I do not ask for quarter on behalf of my colleague at all; let them go to it. But do not imagine that we do not understand the situation. We do understand it, and we will have to see to it that the country understands it. Hon. gentlemen opposite are trying to square accounts, that is all. Now, we are all desirous of making a success of the Canadian National Railways, are we not? I think we are; I think my right hon. friend, when he forgets politics, if he ever does, is desirous that it should be a success. Why, he is at least the godfather of it himself, if nothing more. And I am sure that most of our Progressive friends are in principle desirous that the National Railways should succeed. Long before the national system was inaugurated they went on record as being friendly to and believing in national railways, and I take it for granted, without discussing it with them at all, that that is their present attitude. I have no doubt that they are ready to forgive much, to overlook much if necessary, in order to give the National Railways a fair trial. Are we not all committed to that idea of giving the system a fair trial? Now, here we have a stranger within our borders. It is true that in Great Britain the railways were operated as a national enterprise, but he has had long experience in connection with the private operation of railways. He has only recently got on the job here—last December—and naturally he will be desirous of using the same discretionary powers that he exercised in the administration of other lines. He recognizes that he has a big competitor; he has to measure up to a high standard, and it is the most natural thing in the world that he should endeavour to make good. All I can say is that if this discretionary power is not to be exercised we cannot keep in our employ the kind of men that we believe Sir Henry Thornton to be; they will not stay with us. As long as I am convinced that he is rightly using this discretionary power and that he is justified in what he does in that connection I am going to stand behind him, because I want to see the national system made the success that I believe it can be made. The development of the next ten years in Canada will be wrapped up with the progress of the Canadian National lines; are we going to jeopardize the success of that development over a matter of this kind? The transaction is not yet completed; it will be time enough to denounce the government or to denounce Sir Henry Thornton when we know how this thing ultimately turns out. We believe it will turn out exactly as the Minister of Railways has predicted. If it does, then what difference does it make whether the transaction is done this or that or the other way? The other day we were discussing some question that did not in-

volve anything more serious than whether a member should come in at one door or at the other door; as long as he got in, what was the difference? Time will demonstrate whether or not the exercise of this discretionary power has been overdone; what position are we in to say whether or not it has now been exercised wrongly? If the attitude of the right hon. leader of the Opposition is to be adopted; if, as he says, the head of the railways should have no discretionary authority—all right; good-bye National Railways.

Mr. BOYS: Nobody says it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Whatever may be said for the advocate that Sir Henry Thornton has on the legality of this transaction, the minister is certainly to be congratulated on the advocate that he has in parliament. The illuminating address of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) had at least this merit: It was not so long as the last one; also it was equally pregnant. His argument is that unless we allow the manager of the National Railways to dig into the treasury without the knowledge of the government or the authority of parliament, you cannot get a manager worth while. I venture to suggest to the Prime Minister, if he is here, that he keep a close watch on the Minister of Agriculture; a minister who pronounces these sentiments and apparently believes them is a very dangerous man to have in charge of funds. There is a measure of discretion, of course, given to all the directors, but it is given in the law, not by ministers on the floor of the House. Apologies do not create an authority. The measure of discretion is fixed there, and it is a very wide discretion; it is a discretion against which we heard bitter complaints in this House two and three years ago. The manager of the National Railways has no more right to flout the law than a clerk in a bank or anybody else—or the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Where has he flouted the law?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Where has he flouted the law? It is only about two minutes since the minister admitted it.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I did not admit anything of the kind.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The discretion, let me impress on the minister, is fixed in the law, fixed so clearly that no one in the world could honestly evade it or transgress it. It is argued that a manager of a railroad, with a statute which compels him to get the authority of this government for capital investments, can nevertheless go four thousand miles to Paris and plant $2,000,000 of the money of the people of this country—and that is an exercise of discretion! That is only a technical offence! Similarly, a customs officer who believed there should be a good building in his town for customs purposes would be quite right to take the money in his possession and go out and buy a building; he would only be technically wrong; whether or not he should be censured would depend on how the matter turned out later; and it would be quite proper and worthy of the commendation of the minister in the House provided only that the building had been bought in the name of somebody else. Such is the argument that the government has presented; I do not know how it could be plainer to hon. members. Now, it is the duty of the government to deal with the man who is guilty.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Marcil, Bonaventure): Shall the item carry?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It does seem ridiculous to hear hon. gentlemen say "Carried." I want to say one word to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. If he thinks that by idle threats he is going to prevent proper and legitimate criticism of the board he is wrong. He is not, by what he says, nor is the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) by mysterious statements as to a hidden propaganda going to gag anybody over here. We have always taken the same position—always. No party is more interested in getting a proper result in connection with the administration of these railways than we are. We believe that that success can only be got if we are able to hold in the management the confidence of parliament and of the people of this country, and we believe that the ordinary citizen of this country, and the ordinary member of parliament, does not like a law breaker. We believe that the ordinary man in the street believes that the sections of the acts of this parliament are not made to be played with or evaded even by the Minister of Agriculture or with his benediction. That is what we think; and we think that if there is one way of ruining this whole undertaking it is by irregularities and illegalities, it is by removing public moneys from the public treasury, it is by making investments which cannot for some time at least—and, I think, for a long time,—be revenue producing while at the same time we have our own people and our own lands without proper railroad facilities. I would have thought that the minister (Mr. Motherwell), if he were actuated by anything except his political bias, would have been just a little anxious for some branch lines that are required

to-day in Saskatchewan and that could have been built with that $2,000,000. But apparently he is quite content that the moneys should be misappropriated and misapplied. The hon. gentleman has already managed to make one split in his party. I admit he is an authority on the smoke screen. His devious actions in connection with the oleomargarine question, the substitution of bills and the like show what a past master he is. He managed to make a split in his party there, and he is going to make another one here in a minute or two. Why, he gets up, and against the law and against the statutes and against all principles of company administration, he takes a stand diametrically opposed to the stand taken by his colleague the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham). He shakes his head. Did he or did he not commend this action of Sir Henry Thornton? He knows he did. And did not the Minister of Railways just a short few minutes ago apologize for it and suggest that he did not think this transaction or anything of this kind would ever be repeated? Why, the Minister of Railways knows it is all wrong. He has told Sir Henry Thornton that it cannot be done again. He has already dealt with it to the extent of telling Sir Henry Thornton that his action was wrong and that it cannot be repeated. But, of course, my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture takes the opposite view,—it is quite all right that statutes can be broken; it is quite all right that current funds of the country can be switched. Well, I do not know. I hope that the cabinet split will not go any further and that my hon. friend the Minister of Railways will be able to get a little bit of reason across to my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture after the House adjourns. I take it that the law is of consequence notwithstanding anything the Minister of Agriculture has said.

Now my hon. friend the Minister of Railways says there is no suggestion of dishonesty. How can we make any suggestion of dishonesty? Why ought we to make any suggestion of dishonesty? If we were actuated by the motives ascribed to us by the hon. Minister of Agriculture we would say the whole of this is a crooked deal, that is what we would do.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: My hon. friend's leader said it was a scandal.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: So it is a scandal to break the law. Is it not a scandal for people in high places to pay no regard to statutory obligations of this country? What does my hon. friend say to that?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I say my hon. friend is making a scandal of it, that is all.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: There is nothing that can be made out of this by anybody except what is in it now. But I say that if we were here for the purpose of injuring Sir Henry Thornton we would to-day be saying that there was dishonesty, but we are not. It is an easy thing to say there is dishonesty where you cannot get facts, where you cannot get explanations. where you cannot get figures except one blanket amount, and where you cannot get even the names of the people you are dealing with. The government invited all these charges. We are not making them. We want a success made of the system. We are not making these charges and I ask my friend the Minister of Railways in all seriousness why he would expect us to make a charge of dishonesty? Why did he say that we are not suggesting dishonesty?

Mr. GRAHAM: The reason I did so—my hon. friend did not make the remark, but one hon. gentleman behind him shouted "Rake-off!"—which would mean dishonesty.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I did not hear it, I did not know anything about that. But I just want to point out this to my hon. friend, that if anyone is injured in connection with the whole of this matter—and I am going to assume the greatest amount of good faith on the part of Sir Henry Thornton until I am shown the contrary—if anybody is injured, if there are charges of rake-offs or that sort of thing made, if the people believe there are secret commissions, that there is something wrong behind all this, who is to blame? My hon. friend and nobody else. He will not give us the information. It well may be that in the absence of information some people will draw certain conclusions. I say, Mr. Chairman, we are unable to get anything that would lead us to any logical conclusion in this matter. We cannot find out, for example, if the syndicate goes through—and my hon. friend hopes it will—how much we are to pay in rent, how big will be the rent guarantee, for what term or anything else. When you do not know any of these things you cannot say one way or the other whether there is indeed a rake-off or not. But I want to point out to my hon. friend that if that impression goes abroad there is no one as much responsible for it as Sir Henry Thornton himself and the government for not giving us the facts.

My hon. friend the Minister of Railways said that other people were trying to get the

property, people we would know about. Now I want to say at once that I do not know anything about anybody else wanting this property or anything about the property. I have not the faintest idea of anybody wanting to get it. I did not know that there was any wild rush at present for real estate in Paris. I did not know that values were advancing by leaps and bounds. I did not know of any wild rush or of any desire on the part of anybody to acquire this property, so, if my friend has any idea of that kind he has it; I have not. I do not suppose, though my hon. friend really knows very much about it. I do not suppose he knows how old the hotel is or whether it is a first-, second- or third-class place. I have been told that once upon a time it was a good place, forty years ago, but that now it is a third-rate place. I do not know anything about it, not in the slightest. I do not know of anyone who was trying to get possession of this property in opposition to and in competition with the Canadian National Railways.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we might just as well be frank about the whole thing. Just see where this matter now stands. We have now got the frank admission of the Minister of Railways—it was a reluctant admission, and it took a long time to get it—that the Canadian National Railways, as a matter of law, could not buy this property. They were not content to stand in a legal position, not content to take the chance of going to the minister—I do not know whether they thought that would be dangerous, that he would turn the proposition down absolutely—they were not content to take the chance of going to the Governor in Council, but devised a scheme whereby the law could be evaded. We have got that admitted. There is no question about it. The Minister of Railways frankly and properly admitted that the Canadian National Railways could not buy that property as a matter of law—there is the admission. And in order to get round the statute, in order to get round the legal position, the name of a clerk is used and the obligation of that clerk is taken. But the money is paid just the same. There is no difference in the real, essential elements of the transaction, not the slightest. The law is broken, public funds are applied in a way in which they cannot be legally applied. And the only man to justify the transaction is the Minister of Agriculture, and I do not think he will, long. My hon. friend who knows about the matter instead of justifying the transaction has reprobated it, and has told the president that this thing cannot happen again. Well, Mr. Chairman, I do not think the matter should rest here. The government now know that by a process of manipulation, which has been condemned by the responsible minister, two million dollars of the money of this country has been applied in an illegal investment. What do they propose to do about it? Are they going to content themselves with just simply warning the president that the law of the country must be observed, or are they going to take steps to see that that money is recovered at the earliest possible date? Are they going to take steps to see that the property is unloaded and the money got back? What do they intend to do? Are they going to do what I have suggested? Or are they going to be parties to rendering it absolutely possible that the whole of this scheme shall be carried out to an easy fulfilment? Are they going to see that such leases are given and such covenants made that anybody will be very glad to take the property off their hands and accept those leases and covenants? They can get rid of the property easily enough if they are willing to pay enough rent, if they are willing to make heavy enough commitments. But what position is to be taken, and what guarantee will the government give that this thing shall not happen again? What is the policy of the government having regard to the rights of the board of directors to denude itself of money on one hand and of property on the other? I repeat, what is their policy? What are they going to do to see that in the future this sort of thing is made entirely impossible? What check will they enforce and what control are they going to take?

Mr. IRVINE: I want to take a very few minutes of the committee's time to enter what you might call a protest against the passing of this item, on two grounds. First, I do not believe that we have had sufficient assurance that the service which may be expected from this investment is commensurate with the investment itself; and second, I am quite convinced that there has been a serious irregularity in the purchase. I want to say, first of all, Mr. Chairman, that I do not entertain even the hint of a suspicion as regards the Minister of Railways. I am taking the precaution of saying this because of the outburst of the Minister of Agriculture who—in a long speech, as unconvincing as usual, may I say?—declared that those who are opposing this item are doing it for political reasons. The minister himself was the first, in my opinion, to introduce that phase into the discussion. He made a political attack in which, of course, I am not interested at all. I have no means of entering into the mind of the leader of the Opposition

(Mr. Meighen) so as to know what prompts him in making his protest, but I imagine if he had any idea to hinder the operations of the National Railways under the present government the best thing he could have done would have been to sit quiet and allow this thing to go unchallenged. Because, if such transactions are allowed as a general principle, I think the downfall of the National Railways is absolutely sure. So that I should say the leader of the Opposition was doing the very best service he could both to this administration and to the National Railways by pointing out the principle that has been violated in this particular regard.

Now, first I say that it has not been shown that sufficient service will be given for the investment made. Two million dollars is quite a lot of money to be invested in a hotel in Paris. It has been advanced by the Minister of Railways that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have a head office there, and since that is the case he thinks it imperative that the Canadian National Railways should also have a head office in Paris.

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend asked the question. Did he expect me to say, "No," when I ought to say, "Yes?"

Mr. IRVINE: I certainly would not have expected anything of the kind.

Mr. GRAHAM: I did not refer to the Canadian Pacific Company, it was my hon. friend who did so.

Mr. IRVINE: I am quite satisfied with my hon. friend's answer so far as that is concerned. I am trying to get at the justification for this investment and I asked the minister a question. In giving his answer—which is the only answer that has been given to that phase of the question—he stated that the reason for the purchase of this hotel, which is to be used partly as headquarters for the Canadian National Railways, is that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have headquarters in Paris. But the Canadian Pacific Railway Company are in an entirely different position from the Canadian National Railways. They have steamship lines crossing all oceans, and therefore it is necessary for that company to have such headquarters in Paris. Let me put the point this way. I cannot conceive of the Canadian Pacific Railway, as it is managed, getting headquarters in some capital in Europe on the same grounds that the Canadian National Railways are seeking to get headquarters in the capital of Continental Europe. I imagine the former company would require much more solid business reasons for purchasing headquarters at a cost of $2,000,000 than have been advanced by the minister in this instance. So I want to register my humble protest. I do not think the investment is a good one. My ideas of an investment, of course, are not worth very much, nevertheless I would expect the minister to give us some more substantial reasons than he has yet given, demonstrating that the investment is worth while from the point of view of service in connection with the Canadian National Railways.

The irregularity of the transaction has been very ably and convincingly set forth. While I am not a lawyer, yet I certainly was able to follow the reasoning, and I am able to say that it has not been answered, nor has any attempt been made to answer it. The best answer that was given, in my opinion, was presented by the Minister of Railways, when he said that the time element entered into it, that it was justified on that ground and that somebody might have "got wise" that the Canadian National was thinking of making this purchase and transfer, and that, therefore, it was necessary to do it speedily. Suppose we look at it from that point of view, I submit that it were better for the Canadian National to even miss what might be a good deal than to break a principle, the breaking of which might spoil it ultimately. It has not been shown that the enterprise itself is a good one. It has not been shown that the investment is sound, nor that the service would come to the national railways by this purchase. Therefore, with all these things in doubt, I think it were better that the legal principle involved should not have been violated. The right hon. leader of the Opposition has made a suggestion—at least I took it as a suggestion—that, since the hon. Minister of Railways has admitted so far that there was some slight error or irregularity, and has stated, that he does not think the like will ever occur again, the opinion of parliament on this matter should be conveyed quietly to Sir Henry. I think that is one suggestion of value.

I should like to ask if it is absolutely impossible for us to get away from this thing in any other way? Must it go on? Must this money be voted? Must the deal be made? Can it not be arrested? If it cannot, will the minister admit that a mistake has been made? There is an honour in admitting a mistake. I would rather vote $2,000,000 to the care of a minister who has the courage to admit that a mistake has been made, and that he will safeguard the country against the possibility of a recurrence of the mistake, than simply to blindly vote the $2,000,000, without the assurance that this thing will

not recur. I suggest that the minister would frankly admit to us that this was a mistake, a violation of principle, with which he does not concur, and that, the deal having been made, we have to vote the money and it must be paid, but that he will guarantee that, in so far as he is concerned, it will never recur.

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) a moment ago mentioned the fact that we were sitting now in the same position as shareholders at an annual meeting, considering the action of its executive. I think it was rather a happy thought, and perhaps one of the most intelligent observations made by him during the course of his remarks. We are in the position of shareholders. I was quite at a loss as a matter of fact, to understand why, however, it was so wholly wrong for shareholders to even question the action of the executive, as my hon. friend upbraided my right hon. leader and others for doing.

In reply to what the minister said a few moments ago when he repeatedly cited the Canadian Pacific and other large corporations in defence of the action of Sir Henry Thornton, namely that the directorate and president have wide latitude in matters of this kind, I said last night, and I repeat now, that the Canadian Pacific shareholders, if they were called upon to put up an additional $73,000,000, and if there were no dividends at all being paid, would very carefully scrutinize an expenditure of $2,000,000 in France on the part of its executive, and I think would condemn the executive very harshly for making such an expenditure without previously consulting with them. There is no parallel between a corporation operating in a successful manner and paying a dividend, and an institution that is calling upon its shareholders to supplement its losses with votes of new capital. That is on the question of principle or of practice, and altogether aside from the legality of the question. My hon. friend for Calgary East (Mr. Irvine), and other hon. members have asked, can we retire from this proposition? The minister told us the money has been paid and the property purchased, therefore there is no retiring from it. The only recourse we have, or hope to have in the future, is from this mythical syndicate in New York, or supposed to be in New York, whose personnel the minister does not know, unless he has learned it since last week—and I think he should have ascertained the personnel of this syndicate, whose financial standing he does not know. That is the only possible hope we have. But then we are told that there is another part of this whole matter that has not been discussed at all. This merely buys the old building which is an hotel. We are told that it is going to be transformed into an office establishment in the centre of Paris, and it is going to be rigged up with a picture theatre, or something of that character, for the purpose of showing views of Canadian life, which is perhaps all right. But that is going to cost the minister some money. I have heard—and again the minister will tell us nothing—that it is going to cost over $600,000, in addition to the $2,000,000, to equip the building. Who is ging to put up that money? Is the national railway going to do it? Is Sir Henry Thornton going to do it? Or is this government going to do it? Who is going to put up the additional sum of money? The worst feature of this whole business is this, that we enter into a discussion with this mythical syndicate as to a rental space in that building, and that our hands are absolutely tied, without any hope at all of having that syndicate complete its deal, unless we gave them a fixed rental for a long period of years—a rental that will ensure them absolutely a profitable return on their investment. The minister said last night that there were no documents and no definite agreement,—nothing in writing. He said that no discussion of the amount of rental had been entered into yet, and not even a verbal understanding. Yet $2,000,000 has been paid over and is in the hands of the purchasers of this property. It is paid out absolutely, and it is our money. Having done all that, we go to the alleged syndicate to fix a bargain for the rental we are to pay for, Heaven knows how long in the future. If I know New York financiers—that is the type that are able to finance—I rather imagine they will be sharp enough to say to this government or to Sir Henry Thornton, "You pay us a rental that will give us about 10 per cent for a great many years—20 years, say—before we will enter into this contract to return you the money." They have not got the money now. That is clear, because Sir Henry Thornton had to put it up. Sir Henry Thornton dipped into the treasury of the country illegally and put it up. Of that there is no question. I move an amendment, seconded by Mr. Boys, as follows:

That item 139 stand until the president of the National Railways submit to the House full information regarding the purchase of certain property in Paris:

(a) The names and financial standing of alleged syndicate.

(b) The rate of the rental to be paid.

(c) The commission, if any, and to whom paid.
(d) The reasons why the property was bought indirectly and not directly by the railway company and without any written agreement of any kind whatsoever.

That is information that, ordinary common sense demands, should be submitted to this committee before it grants $73,000,000 for the president of the National Railways to play with for the next year. What does this item say? Has the committee taken the trouble to note it particularly? This item is virtually granting a blank cheque for $73,000,000, subject to certain conditions. It outlines the manner in which the money is to be paid, and then on the second page this will be noted:

The amount herein authorized may be applied from time to time, in the discretion of the Governor in Council.

And I want the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) to listen to this. He said that this should be spent in the discretion of Sir Henry Thornton; that Sir Henry Thornton should have the discretion to spend this how he liked, and that he was to be brought to book only at some future date and only if he made a mess of the matter. But the law says and the appropriation says this year, as they said last year, that this money is granted, the Governor in Council saddled with the authority or the discretionary power of seeing that it is properly applied. In this case—and I would cite this to support my resolution—the Minister of Railways told us last night that Sir Henry Thornton did not report this transaction to him until after it was done. The Governor in Council had thus no opportunity to exercise discretionary power; the hands of the Governor in Council were tied. I will venture to say that if one could look into the mind of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) at this moment, one would see reflected there the rather heated discussions which occurred in the council chamber within the last few weeks when this transaction became known to the cabinet. Not one of them outside of the burlesque by the Minister of Agriculture, not even the Minister of Railways himself, has attempted to support this transaction this afternoon. The Minister of Railways told us last night that he would have done this in a different way. He told us to-day that he had to apologize to the committee for the transaction, and I do not blame him. I feel that if the minister would be perfectly frank with the committee, he would tell us that he was surprised and mortified when he learned in the first place that this transaction was made; that he had called Sir Henry Thornton into his office and severely reprimanded him for taking this course. I have no doubt that he did so. Why not publicly discipline this gentleman by frankly admitting this before parliament? That will probably do him a great deal of good. Let me put this to the government, and particularly to the Prime Minister. If this transaction had been allowed to pass without comment last night or through this parliament, I venture to say that next year Sir Henry Thornton would not have stopped at $2,000,000 in Paris. The one thing that will prevent this gentleman from repeating this practice is just what has gone on last night and to-day. If a private corporation were concerned, what would prevent him would be the criticism of the shareholders. I want to say to the Minister of Agriculture who lectured us here pretty severely, who charged us with trying to discredit the National Railways, that he cannot discredit the National Railways more effectively than by giving a free hand for transactions of this sort. I want to say to him further that he stands to-day before this country a minister of the Crown knowing this transaction, condoning the move and the steps taken by Sir Henry Thornton; he stands approving the paying over of $2,000,000 of the money of the Canadian people for a mythical and undisclosed syndicate. And he cannot escape that. He has approved it and condoned on the floor of this House. He has approved it and has condemned those who dare to question it. The Minister of Agriculture cannot get away with that sort of thing. I know his colleagues at least feel and feel keenly—one has only to look at their faces—that this is a transaction that is not to the credit of any government. I have watched each minister yesterday evening and this afternoon, and not one of them is comfortable under this matter. It is to their credit that they are not comfortable. The one thing, however, that is not to their credit is the extent to which they condone this transaction.

An attempt was made yesterday by one of them, the Acting Minister of National Defence (Mr. Macdonald) to take responsibility and defend this action. To that extent I think he is culpable together with
5 p.m. the president of the National Railways. This is not a trivial matter; this is not a matter of a small purchase; this is a heavy investment. And we in Canada are striving under a load of debt. One of the difficulties we are faced with is the cost of transportation. What is the problem in the prairie provinces to-day? To get the products of the soil out to the seaboard. What is the chief part of that problem? The cost

of moving that stuff. What makes the cost of moving goods to the seaboard? The cost of operating the railways. Here we have as an exhibition of what we are to hope for in the future in the way of economy in transportation, the president of the National Railways, lightly, flippantly and in a most frivolous manner, flinging $2,000,000 into the heart of Paris, as if that were nothing. What hope is there in this country for economy in operation with an extravagant person like that at the head of the National Railways? Just as soon as possible the president of the National Railways must be brought to understand that that form of extravagance will not be tolerated in this country.

I move this resolution for this purpose, that the members of this House, as shareholders of this great undertaking, may receive the information to which we are entitled. The minister has not even been entrusted with the names of the syndicate. Is that appalling fact clear to the House? Think of it! He said at the commencement of the argument last night—and it was an argument—that it was not in the interest of the National Railways to disclose the syndicate. Later on, in reply to a question by myself, he admitted that he did not know the syndicate, and that is the real reason why he cannot disclose it.

Mr. GRAHAM: Not at all.

Mr. STEVENS: He certainly cannot disclose that which he does not himself know. Does the minister know the names of the members of this syndicate? Will the minister answer me that question before I proceed further?

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend is making an argument and giving a reason why I did not give the names. That is the thing to which I object.

Mr. STEVENS: Will my hon. friend be good enough to answer my question: Does he know the names of the syndicate?

Mr. GRAHAM: I am not in the witness box. My hon. friend has taken the opportunity to ask me a question. I will answer it in my own way and not be dictated to at all.

Mr. STEVENS: I am not desirous of dictating.

Mr. GRAHAM: I have the floor and I am trying to answer the question.

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend cannot accuse me of being discourteous to him.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am not doing so. My hon. friend had better let me answer the question. He gave as a reason why I did not give him the names of the syndicate that I did not know. It is true I do not know; but if I did know, I would be in the same position.

On the advice of the president of the board and with the concurrence, I think, of the solicitor, it is not in the interests of the Canadian National Railways that the details of this unfinished transaction should be made public at the present time.

Mr. STEVENS: Very good. Then we have the minister coming before parliament advising that he, or the government, or the National Railways, has parted with $2,000,000 in the interests of a syndicate whose names not even the minister knows in confidence. This is an appalling situation.

Mr. GRAHAM: It would be if it were true.

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend told us last night that he did not know the names of the syndicate, and he says he does not know them now. I say it is an appalling situation.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is not what my hon. friend said was an appalling situation.

Mr. STEVENS: I say that is an appalling situation.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is his opinion.

Mr. STEVENS: Certainly, it is my opinion. The minister does not know the names of this syndicate, that, I think, is the most extraordinary feature about this whole transaction. And yet we are really asked to approve the turning over of $2,000,000 to undisclosed, unnamed and unknown Americans in New York. That is what it amounts to. That is the situation which we cannot excuse, it is a situation that the government cannot defend, and my resolution asks that the names of these gentlemen and their financial standing and ability to carry through this deal be disclosed to the House, so we may know something about who they are, the terms of the rental and the rates to be paid for the space, the lease for which will have to be signed before this House meets again—probably tying us up for ten or twenty years, for certainly we ought to have a long-term lease on the main street of Paris—and furthermore, that the reasons why this property to the value of $2,000,000 was bought through an official of the railway company in Paris and not directly by the railway company itself, and why the title should be in the name of this official. This information and these reasons we are entitled to have and they should be given to the committee. My

resolution asks that the committee order that the item stand until this information is brought before us.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Marcil, Bonaventure): I am of opinion that this motion is out of order, for the reasons set forth in Beauchesne at paragraph 169:

A proposed resolution may be allowed to stand over with general consent until another occasion, but if it has been regularly proposed from the Chair and discussed, no motion for its postponement is regular because there is no period to which it can be postponed.

There is a reference to Bourinot, page 426, which is a repetition of the words contained here, and also to May, page 479, which also stipulates to the same effect, namely:

No amendment can be moved which is not relevant to the grant under consideration, nor can a motion for postponing a proposed resolution be entertained.

Therefore I have to declare this motion to be out of order.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Before you declare it out of order, Mr. Chairman, I shall have something to say about it. I have the greatest admiration for the Deputy Clerk and for his book, but if it says what the Chair states is the law I shall be surprised. The Chair has ruled that a motion to pass an estimate cannot be postponed. Why, such motions have been postponed dozens of times.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Marcil, Bonaventure): By consent.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, not by consent. You cannot enforce the closure, Rule 17B, without postponing the item under discussion at the time. Under this rule, in order that the closure may apply on the second day, on the first day there must be a motion in committee to postpone consideration of the item. We have moved it over and over again; if I remember rightly before there was any closure rule. The rule that there cannot be a postponement of an item under consideration of the committee is, I think, with all deference to the Chair, preposterous. Certainly there can be a postponement, and we can surely give reasons for the postponement in the body of the motion.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Marcil, Bonaventure): The rule I have cited applies only to Committee of Supply according to Bourinot.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Bourinot was written before this rule 17B was passed.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Marcil, Bonaventure): There is another point, that the committee has no authority to impose a condition upon the House.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We are not imposing a condition upon the House, but upon the committee.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Marcil, Bonaventure): The words of the resolution are, "until the president of the National Railways submit to the House."

Mr. MEIGHEN: That may be. That is not a condition imposed on the House, but a condition that must be fulfilled before this estimate is proceeded with. We cannot restrict the prerogative of parliament, everyone admits that, but to suggest that in Committee of Supply we cannot move postponement of an item does not admit of argument. Let me read section 17B:

Immediately before the Order of the Day for resuming an adjourned debate is called, or if the House be in Committee of the Whole, or of Supply, or of Ways and Means, any Minister of the Crown, who, standing in his place, shall have given notice at a previous sitting of his intention so to do, may move that the debate shall not be further adjourned, or that the further consideration of any resolution or resolutions, clause or clauses, section or sections, preamble or preambles, title or titles, shall be the first business of the committee, and shall not further be postponed;—

Mr. CANNON: "Shall not be postponed."

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly, but he has to give notice before. The procedure is this: In Committee of Supply a motion is made that the consideration of the items one by one be deferred, then at the close another motion is made after a day's notice that those deferred items be at the next sitting of the committee the first business and that their consideration be not any further postponed. I think I should know the rule pretty well.

Mr. CANNON: I understand my hon. friend had something to do with the drafting of it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did, I had everything to do with it, and I have never had reason to believe it was faulty. I notice that hon. gentlemen opposite who criticized it do not repeal it; they are careful to preserve it. I say that under the closure rule a motion to postpone must be made.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Marcil, Bonaventure): After notice.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, no.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Marcil, Bonaventure): Read the rule.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The notice is in this form: A motion to postpone is made; there is nothing prior to that; but after that is done, then notice is given, effective the next day,

that these items, consideration of which has been postponed, be the first business of the committee and be not further postponed. That is the notice. But the notice is given after. There is a preliminary motion to postpone consideration. There is no question about it at all, and I am sure if the Deputy Clerk has a moment to look it up he will immediately concur with me. The first thing done is a motion to postpone, subsequently there is a notice that at the next sitting of the committee there will be a motion made that all the postponed items be the first business of the committee and be not further postponed. Then, this notice being given, next day the motion accordingly is made that these items be not further postponed. Consequently a motion to postpone is in order. I think, as well, reasons can be given, but I do not speak so definitely on that point. I do not know why reasons should not be given, so long as those reasons are applicable only to the committee. But as to the first there is no doubt whatever.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Marcil, Bonaventure): Does the right hon. gentleman desire to appeal from the ruling?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not wish to appeal. I ask that the Chair reconsider the decision, because there cannot be any question about it. It is a very serious ruling.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Marcil, Bonaventure): I am occupying the Chair only temporarily, but Rule 169 is very plain to me. It says:

> A proposed resolution may be allowed to stand over with general consent until another occasion, but if it has been regularly proposed from the Chair and discussed, no motion for its postponement is regular because there is no period to which it can be postponed.

That is based on Bourinot, and it has been the invariable procedure in Committee of Supply.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That was long before Rule 17B was passed; consequently it must merge into 17B so far as it prevents a motion being postponed.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Marcil, Bonaventure): Closure cannot apply here, because no notice has been given.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am not asking that it apply. But after that rule is passed there must be eligibility for a motion to postpone. A ruling that it cannot be done means that 17B never can be applied again.

Mr. CANNON: The closure rule, 17B, is in the nature of an exception; it does not do away with the general rules of the House as they stood before. Now, let us read 17B. It does not state that there must have been a previous motion to postpone; it simply says:

> Immediately before the Order of the Day for resuming an adjourned debate is called, or if the House be in Committee of the Whole, or of Supply, or of Ways and Means, any minister of the Crown who, standing in his place, shall have given notice at a previous sitting of his intention so to do, may move that the debate shall not be further adjourned.

A minister of the Crown gives notice that at the next sitting he will move that a debate be not further adjourned, but there is no previous motion to postpone. The rule does not mention any such motion.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In that case there must have been a previous motion to adjourn, because you could not move that it be not further adjourned unless it has been adjourned once. Similarly, when it is in committee there must have been a previous motion to postpone, otherwise you could not move that it be not further postponed.

Mr. CANNON: For instance, last night this item was discussed and then it was allowed to stand. But if it had not been allowed to stand, the committee would have reported progress; we would sit again to-day and the committee would make the same report. Closure would mean that on a subsequent day the minister would rise and say that when this item would be discussed there would be no further postponement. That is what closure means.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly, that is what closure means. Closure proceeds on the assumption that when a minister says "stand," that is a motion for postponement. When a minister brings in an item he is supposed to move a resolution for the passing of that item. He does not in so many words do so, but as a matter of fact in all application of the closure, in so many words he does so. The closure rule cannot be operated unless on the assumption that there has been a previous motion to postpone, whether in committee or in the House. I am sure the hon. member will come to that conclusion.

Mr. CANNON: Even assuming the right hon. gentleman is right, which I do not admit, I say again that 17B is in the nature of an exception. Secondly it is a rule which applies only in favour of a minister, and the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) is not a minister. Therefore the old rule, the general rule of the House which has been quoted by the Chairman, should prevail.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It assumes that the motion in the closure case is made by a minister, of course. But any motion that a minister can make, anyone can make. I have not had time—

Mr. GRAHAM: The rule does not say so.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The rule does not touch the matter at all.

Mr. CANNON: The right hon. gentleman does not seriously contend that a private member could impose closure?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, I know that he could not. A private member could move postponement but he could not give notice afterwards that the postponed item be considered the next day, because the rule says that a minister only may do so. What I am trying to draw attention to is this: That rule 17B necessarily and inescapably implies that a motion to adjourn is in order—to adjourn consideration of anything. Why should it not be in order? What is wrong about a motion to adjourn consideration? I have not looked into what has been referred to as rule 169, but whatever it may be it is undoubtedly modified by rule 17B, which came later. As a matter of fact, there is no rule 169 of this House anyway. I certainly think it would not be applicable to prevent a motion to postpone consideration of anything in committee.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): It is very clear that unless something to the contrary can be found in 17B, which is the rule relating to closure, a motion to postpone a resolution in Supply is not in order. The rule read by the Chairman of the committee and the references to Beauchesne and Bourinot clearly show that that principle should prevail. Now, is there anything in this rule about closure which could be accepted as changing or modifying that old-established principle? The rule provides that a minister of the Crown can give notice of certain things, can move that the debate shall not be further adjourned or that the further consideration of any resolution or resolutions shall be the first business of the committee and shall not further be postponed. My right hon. friend does not say that he can find any rule that expressly reverses the old principle to which I have referred, but he suggests that the inference is that rule 17B does reverse it. I submit there is no such irresistible inference; if it had been intended to change the old rule, parliament would have said so. There is nothing to compel a minister of the Crown to give notice. The rule does not say that the consideration of the resolution shall be postponed; the motion is that it shall not further be postponed. It is therefore not open to my right hon. friend to draw the inference that he suggests, and clearly the long-standing rule which is cited by all the recognized authorities is in line with the ruling of the Chairman of the committee.

Mr. GOOD: I am not a lawyer, but it seems to me that the rules ought to conform to common sense, and if it is irregular to move that an item stand until we get certain information, I think we are in a queer position. How do we know whether or not this item should pass? We want certain information. We may not be disposed to cut the item down or to refuse it; it may be simply a matter of waiting until we get certain information. It seems to me to be entirely in accord with common sense that this motion should be allowed; if the rules forbid it, then I think the rules ought to be changed.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I simply call attention to the fact that 169 mentioned here is not a rule; it is a quotation from Bourinot.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Marcil, Bonaventure): Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Very well. It is not the first time that errors have been found there. These boks are compiled mainly from British authorities and certainly would not prevail over our own specific rule, which admits that we may move to postpone. Let me read 169:

> A proposed resolution may be allowed to stand over with general consent until another occasion,—

I ask that the committee remember that.

> —but if it has been regularly proposed from the Chair and discussed no motion for its postponement is regular because there is no period to which it can be postponed.

Well, if there is not, what happens when it is allowed to stand by general consent? The reason is just as applicable against the standing by general consent as standing on a motion. In a word it is absurd as applied to our practice. A motion that is postponed in committee can be taken up at any time. We do it repeatedly when it stands at the instance of the Chair, so there is no reason whatever against this motion.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): My hon. friend overlooks the statement of May who says:

> No amendment can be moved which is not relevant to the grant under consideration, nor can a motion for postponing a proposed resolution be entertained.

That is May, the authority on parliamentary procedure.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is not applicable here in the face of a definite rule.

definite rule. My right hon. friend says there is a definite rule, but there is not. He says that a rule has been made in regard to closure, which he drew up himself, which provides that a minister of the Crown by giving notice can stop debate and force a vote. But there is nothing in that rule which says that a motion can be postponed, and my right hon. friend knows that. He says there is an inference to be drawn, but you cannot override the well-settled parliamentary rule which every parliamentary authority including Bourinot and May has laid down, and which has been followed for ages, and by inference say that that shall be disregarded or overruled.

Mr. CANNON: I do not think the normal rules of parliament can be altered by a freak or exceptional rule. Rule 17B is an exception, as I said before, and the general rules must prevail. My right hon. friend says there is a rule of parliament in support of his contention. Where is it?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Rule 17B.

Mr. CANNON: No. Rule 17B provides for closure. Where is the rule of parliament that gives a private member the right to postpone a resolution in committee of supply?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is the constant practice as well.

Mr. CANNON: Just the contrary.

Mr. STEVENS: Has your ruling been given, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Marcil, Bonaventure): Yes. I base myself on the invariable practice as found in Bourinot and May.

Mr. STEVENS: I have no intention of appealing against your ruling, Mr. Chairman, not that I wish to agree with it because I think it is perhaps not quite in accord with the rule. However I have a great regard for you, Sir, and I have no desire to appeal against your ruling. I would ask the minister, in view of the ruling of the Chair, if he will accept the spirit of the resolution and let this item stand until the president of the railway has had the opportunity of furnishing him with the full information asked for in this resolution.

Mr. GRAHAM: The object of this resolution may as well be understood. The object is to have parliament express a vote of want of confidence in Sir Henry Thornton. That is the object of it, no matter how it is brought in or how it is worked out, and the result can only be, if Sir Henry Thornton is a red-blooded man as I believe him to be, injury which we cannot perhaps estimate to-day to the Canadian National system. I am not going to say that that is the object, because I have no right to say so. I am saying that that may be the result, and every man in this House who votes to haul Sir Henry Thornton, the head of the Canadian National Railways, before us to give certain information which through me he has said to this House will be detrimental to the Canadian National System, votes want of confidence in the head of that system. Sir Henry Thornton has made a success of the system up to date and is making a success of it to-day, and if everything hon. gentlemen said were true the members of this House must understand that they are taking the responsibility of leaving the Canadian National railway probably without a head in the midst of a busy traffic. What the object is I do not know, but the result may be that, and the men who pretend to be in favour of making a success of the national railways cannot well vote, even if what my hon. friend has said is true, want of confidence in a man who up to date is making a success of that great undertaking, which is the greatest experiment in government ownership and operation that we have had in the Dominion of Canada.

I knew something would come up to give an opportunity to divide this House. The Liberal party, even those who do not believe in public ownership, are obliged to give it a fair trial. Not that every one of us believes in it. I know many do not, but we are pledged to give it a fair trial. Hon. gentlemen over there are pledged to government ownership, and now we have a distinct cleavage between the men who are trying to destroy public ownership and the men who are in favour of it. My hon. friend can disguise it anyway he likes. I have given the opinion of Sir Henry Thornton as head of the railway, an opinion that will be shared by every business man, that an uncompleted transaction of a great corporation should not be divulged to the shareholders even though the shareholders be the Parliament of Canada. My hon. friend took the same ground in his term of office, that to divulge an uncompleted transaction might be detrimental to the transaction. He asks for the name of a syndicate in New York. To give that would be to give him half the information that Sir Henry Thornton thinks would be detrimental to the system. What would happen when the representative of this syndicate in New York landed in Paris later on to make ar-

rangements as to the rentals? The Old Country system of rentals is different from ours; they have leases that run for years and are very valuable, and whoever takes over this property has to take over these leases and make some settlement with the leaseholders. And we are asked to announce to every person in the world that we are taking over this property and let the leaseholders be prepared to make the biggest bargain they can possibly make. If it was a private concern such information would not be asked for. They would take the word of those responsible. Acting as the go-between between the government and the president of the Canadian National Railways I have been advised by Sir Henry Thornton that in the interests of the Canadian National system it would not be well, for obvious reasons, to give the particulars of this arrangement about to be completed. That being the case I want to warn hon. gentlemen about the specious argument of getting Sir Henry Thornton here. That argument, no matter how specious it is, if backed up could only have the result of injuring the system and making public ownership possibly a failure in the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend has made a very gallant effort to divert the attention of the committee and of the country from this transaction, which he does not attempt now to defend, to the great question of dividing the country and the House upon government ownership of the railways. He does not need to reach very far in any direction from where he is sitting to touch those who attack the government ownership of railways. As far as I am concerned, and I think I can speak for many others here, we are anxious to see this government ownership of railways succeed. But we are not prepared to give unrestrained liberty to any individual who apparently is inclined at least, if not to abuse that liberty, to treat it in a very trivial manner. My hon. friend asks what is going to happen if the name of this syndicate is disclosed. When they go to Paris it will be known that some syndicate representing the Canadian National Railways is going to do some business there. Why, Mr. Chairman, it was placed before this country in the press two weeks ago that Sir Henry Thornton had bought a hotel in the heart of Paris, and that he was going to transform the whole building into offices for the Canadian National Railways and to house the High Commissioner and other departments. All these details were disclosed two weeks ago, and everybody in Paris that is interested, everybody in the world that is interested, knows all that the minister says this resolution of mine is going to disclose to the world. Such an argument is not worthy of the long parliamentary experience and intelligence of the minister.

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend will not fool anybody with that.

Mr. STEVENS: Possibly, but the minister will never fool anybody with the argument he made about interfering with the business of closing out certain leases.

Mr. McBRIDE: Might I ask the hon. member a question? When he was trying to get a lease of Point Grey sand heads out at Vancouver, why did he not come out and tell the people who were behind the transaction and give the public the name of the company?

Mr. STEVENS: That is pretty nearly as good a herring drawn across the trail as the minister attempted to draw. Sand was being taken from what was alleged to be government property at the time, and the Public Works department at Ottawa imposed a restriction upon it. However, that has nothing to do with this matter.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. STEVENS: No it has not.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): It is a good illustration.

Mr. STEVENS: Inasmuch as the committee seem to desire the facts I can give them and very quickly. The facts of the case are these: There are certain sand heads off what is known as Point Grey just at the mouth or entrance to Vancouver harbour. These sand heads were claimed by the Public Works department of Canada for the right of the Dominion, they were also claimed by the provincial authorities. Certain persons dealing in sand, lime and gravel were taking the sand off these sand heads. Other persons made application for what is known as a license or a lease, which is a common form granted by the Public Works department to take sand from these banks. This application was entertained by the Public Works department and granted. The provincial authorities disputed it. The matter was carried to the Privy Council, and it was decided that the title to the property rested in the province, and the parties who got the license from the Dominion authorities were out of pocket whatever investment they had

made. That is all there is to it. Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to digress into matters of this kind.

An hon. MEMBER: Another smoke screen.

Mr. STEVENS: Yes, another smoke screen. I want to say to the minister that the information we are asking for is reasonable information. It is not unreasonable, it is not information calculated to interfere with the National Railways. We are not asking that Sir Henry Thornton be brought to the bar of the House, or before any committee. We are simply asking, in view of the admitted ignorance of the minister of the facts, that this item should stand until these facts, which are facts I think the committee are entitled to, are disclosed.

Mr. FORKE: I think a good many members in this House, more especially members in this quarter of the chamber, have listened to this long and protracted debate that lasted all yesterday afternoon and evening, and apparently it is going to last all this afternoon—

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Only last night, not yesterday afternoon.

Mr. FORKE: Very well, it does not make very much difference. I do not like to act in the role of a critic but really it surprises me to hear the nature of speech after speech made here. It is simply a case of member after member getting up and repeating what previous members have said. I have been really anxious for information in order to know just how to form an opinion on this matter, and I was quite prepared to listen, I think without prejudice, to either side in order to get at the foundation of this whole affair. At the very commencement it did strike me that it was rather a serious thing. We are very anxious for the success of the National Railways. I think, perhaps, all of us are, with probably a few exceptions. We have a man at the head of affairs and apparently accusations are being cast at him from the House here of having been injudicious, of having overstepped the bounds of prudence—in fact doing what was really illegal. The accusations may or may not be true. Perhaps I have not a legal mind, a judicial mind. I am not just prepared yet to express an opinion as to exactly how far the president over-stepped what it was his right to do. Nevertheless, I cannot help but think, Mr. Chairman, that the desire to manufacture a certain amount of political ammunition is entering into this debate, and there has not been an earnest desire, perhaps, to give that information to the House that it is in the power of some members to give. I have not a bit of hesitation in saying that I believe the right hon. the leader of the Opposition probably knows just as much about all these matters as do some hon. gentlemen on the front government benches. I may be wrong or I may be right but I have the suspicion that certain hon. members know a great deal more than they are telling, that they are not taking the House into their confidence, that they think they have got the government in a very embarrassing position, and they are going to make the very most of it from a political point of view. That is the inference I have drawn and I am drawing it without being influenced by any prejudice whatever.

An hon. MEMBER: It is good drawing.

Mr. IRVINE: Yes, for you.

Mr. FORKE: I beg your pardon. If you would keep in your own seat it would be better.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: He is in a bad corner there.

Mr. FORKE: I cannot say that I am entirely satisfied. There is perhaps a little more mystery about the whole of the circumstances than I would like to see in this House.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Why not try to get at the bottom of it then?

Mr. FORKE: Excuse me. Perhaps you will be able to enlighten us when you get up; we have not heard from you yet. I take this point of view—I may be right or I may be wrong—there is some mystery here that I would rather not see in connection with this matter. But the consequences are so great, the issues are so tremendous, in regard to the management of these railways, that I am willing to let the matter go at the present time. But if subsequently when information comes to this House it can be shown that the government has acted in any underhand or improper way, that the proper handling of the country's money has been prejudiced in any shape or form, then no man in this House will be more ready to condemn them than I am. But taking all the circumstances into consideration at the present time I do not believe it is in the public interest that this matter should be debated at any further length. I believe that incalculable harm has already been done by this debate.

Mr. GAUVREAU: Purposely.

Mr. FORKE: I do not know as to that, but I am stating my candid opinion without any desire to favour either the government or the

opposition. However, I am not going to occupy any more time because I believe that many of the speeches on this subject could be curtailed with great advantage to every one concerned, the country included.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think this is, perhaps, an opportune moment to say a word as to the relations between the government and the Canadian National Railways, and particularly as to the relationship between Sir Henry Thornton, as the head of the railways, and myself in the position which I occupy at the moment. When the government asked Sir Henry Thornton to take control of the railroad we gave him—and I in the name of the government gave him—a distinct pledge that he would be entrusted with the management, that he would have a board of directors with whom he would be associated, and that the board and he as president would be given a free hand, and that there would be no interference on the part of the government with the action which they were taking. We told him, however, that we would hold him responsible for the manner in which he conducted the affairs of the system, but that while we held him responsible we would give him a free hand and would not interfere with him.

That was one possible attitude. The other attitude would have been that as a government we would wish to know everything that he was doing, and the responsibility then would be ours. Sir Henry Thornton in his first interview with me made it perfectly clear that unless he and the board of directors were to have a free hand in the management of that road he would not for one minute consider accepting the position of president. From the moment Sir Henry Thornton took over the control of the railroads to this hour there has been no attempt on the part of the government, in any particular, to influence his judgment or his course of action in any matter. Whether there will be reason in the future to alter the attitude that we have assumed towards him and the board of directors will depend very largely upon how different transactions of the road turn out in the course of affairs.

So far as this particular transaction is concerned, the position, as I understand it, that Sir Henry Thornton takes, is that to-day there is known throughout Europe one great railway system in Canada, the Canadian Pacific Railway; that the people of Europe know nothing whatever about the Canadian National Railways; that if Canada is to get her share of business from Europe for her system of railways she must be as much on the map in the heart of that continent as the Canadian Pacific Railway is and have as wide a connection not only with the railroads on this continent but with the railroads in Europe so as to get the benefit of any business in the way of traffic originating there. Sir Henry Thornton, in his judgment felt it desirable for the Canadian National Railways to obtain a site in the heart of Paris which would be conspicuous, and where the affairs of the railway might be so put before the European public that they would soon become conscious that there was a competitor to the other great transcontinental railway system in Canada, namely the Canadian National Railways.

Sir Henry Thornton, like every other railway president, in endeavouring to carry out a move of the kind, naturally surrounded his actions with a certain degree of secrecy. He took this action without any knowledge on the part of the government. Nothing was said to the government with respect to what he or the board of directors proposed to do. Why? Because we told him we expected him and not the government to manage the railway. Does the House wish us to change that policy? Does the House ask us to go to Sir Henry Thornton and say "From now on you shall not enter into any business transaction without placing it before the government and having us approve of it?" If that is the attitude hon. members want us to take, we shall have to change our whole policy with respect to giving a free hand to the Canadian National and giving the board of directors a chance to manage it as in their judgment they think best.

Sir Henry Thornton felt it necessary there should be a building in a conspicuous part of Paris which would be known as the Canadian National headquarters. I have no doubt that, in his endeavour to get the best building, he was anxious to make it in every way the centre or home of Canadian business, and possibly he has had in his mind the moving of our Canadian offices into that building, and perhaps getting other business interests in Canada to rent premises as well. It is a business matter. As a man of wide business experience, he probably knows what is best to do in a transaction of this kind. If Sir Henry has seen fit to conduct that transaction as all business houses transact their business, with a certain amount of secrecy, I think we all owe it to him to wait and see how his experiment works out before we pronounce judgment upon it; and so far as

the government is concerned I wish to say that we stand here prepared to support Sir Henry Thornton in the transaction which he has made and the step which he has taken. We will judge him as the head of the railway by the manner in which that particular transaction, as well as all other transactions while he is president of the road, turn out. But while he is president of the Canadian National, and we are representing the people of Canada in this House we propose to give Sir Henry Thornton in this and every other transaction precisely the same degree of latitude and freedom as the shareholders of the Canadian Pacific would give to Mr. Beatty.

Mr. SHAW: I shall not adopt the pose of sitting in judgment upon any individual or any part in this House. I listened with a great deal of care to the discussion last night, and I read the debate in this morning's Hansard, with a view of ascertaining the facts in connection with this particular matter. At the outset I may say that I yield to no man in the House in my desire to see the Canadian National Railway experiment prove a splendid success. I say further that I have every confidence in Sir Henry Thornton as an experienced railway man. While I know little about it, I am prepared to give him the heartiest possible support that it is possible for one in my humble position to give. I think the government, in assuming the attitude which was assumed towards Sir Henry, acted properly. They gave him a free hand to administer and manage that particular railway. I think it was desirable to do that, because, of course, it was a matter of tremendous moment to the country, a matter fraught with a great deal of significance to the people of Canada. But I suggest to the Prime Minister that the free hand was given to Sir Henry subject to the laws of this country. Even the Prime Minister of the country is not in a position to override the law. That is a matter for parliament.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Where has the law been overridden?

Mr. SHAW: I think perhaps the fact that the Prime Minister was not in attendance in the House earlier, and did not hear the frank admission of the Minister of Railways, would justify him in asking the question.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The question I asked has not been answered.

Mr. SHAW: I will deal with the Minister of Agriculture in a moment.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I should like to hear from the hon. member wherein the transaction was unlawful.

Mr. SHAW: Perhaps the hon. senior member for Halifax has not been in the House either. I am not going to say anything further except that I commend the Minister of Railways for coming before the House and saying that in his judgment it was improperly done.

Mr. GRAHAM: I wish I had had a legal training. I could then express things much better than I do express them. Our legal friends, when they get up, kind of put you "in wrong" with their language and not your own. I distinctly said if I had been doing it that I would probably not have done it in the way it has been done. I also said that the solicitor for Sir Henry Thornton informed Sir Henry that the transaction was perfectly legal, and that I stood by his opinion rather than by the opinion of others.

Mr. SHAW: It is not my purpose in view of the discussion that has taken place to argue as to the legality or illegality of the transaction. Suffice it to say that I simply expressed my opinion, after a fairly close examination of the statutes in this regard, that the transaction so far as it has gone is illegal. I do not say it is improper. I impute no motive of impropriety to Sir Henry Thornton at all.

Mr. CANNON: Under what clause of the act does the hon. member undertake to say that the transaction is unlawful or illegal?

Mr. SHAW: If the hon. member will look at the Canadian National Railway Act, and refer to sections 11 and 23, he will find that the powers given to the officers, the president and the board of directors, are there enunciated. That is the limit of their power. I have sought in my own mind some justification for the expenditure in Paris, and so far as I can observe, about the only justification so far urged has been that apparently the Canadian Pacific Railway has a very ambitious office in that city. They, too, are on the front street of Paris. But I am not so sure that it should always be the ambition of the Canadian National Railways to live in the atmosphere of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is where they are today.

Mr. SHAW: Then I think it is unfortunate. If the minister suggests that the Canadian National is living in the atmosphere of the

Canadian Pacific I am sure a lot of people will view that statement with a good deal of regret.

Mr. GRAHAM: We are compelled to admit the fact, not in any theoretical sense that the Canadian Pacific is here. We are confronted with a healthy rivalry and we have to do the things a business firm would do, in order to get our share of the business, if we are going to make a success of the road.

Mr. SHAW: My suggestion was that, so far as I was able to observe, the substantial reason given was to put it in this sense, that the Canadian National must live in the atmosphere of the Canadian Pacific. In this particular transaction, it appears to me that the moneys belonging to the people of Canada, have been taken for the purpose of financing a New York syndicate, in order that they may subsequently at some time purchase this particular property. That I think is an undesirable thing for the Canadian National Railway board to do. I do not think it is a commendable thing that the money should be taken from the coffers of this country in the method indicated and used for the purpose of allowing a New York syndicate to subsequently acquire control of this particular property.

The Minister of Agriculture interrupted just a few moments ago and I want to compare his words in this matter with those of the Minister of Railways. The Minister of Railways says frankly that if he were carrying out this particular transaction, he would not carry it out in this particular manner at all. On the other hand, the Minister of Agriculture, in the light of that fact and with the knowledge imparted to him by the Minister of Railways, seeks to give this transaction his special benediction. I want to dissociate myself from the attitude assumed by the Minister of Agriculture. That I do not believe to be a commendable code of morals whatsoever, and all I can say is that he made a most illogical apology for an illegal act.

The question is: What can be done under the circumstances? The transaction may be and, perhaps, is perfectly legitimate, and I have little doubt that upon investigation, it will be found that the transaction is in the best interest of this country and of the Canadian National Railways. Why is it not possible for us to get these facts? A few material facts are required, and it seems to me that we have a right to ask for the facts, in view of the expenditure, particularly outside of this country, of something over $2,000,000. I do not see how anybody could be prejudiced, despite the statement of the Minister of Railways with regard to the leaseholders. The facts are already known; they have been within the knowledge of members for some time, and they must be within the knowledge of the leaseholders of that particular hotel building in Paris. Therefore, I would suggest that, perhaps, the minister would be willing to allow the matter to stand in order that he can get the facts that are required and place them before the House. I am sure neither he nor Sir Henry Thornton will ever regret having stated to the House all the facts.

Mr. GRAHAM: The difficulty with that is that my hon. friend must not forget, as some hon. members seem to be trying to forget, that Sir Henry Thornton is the head of the Canadian National Railways, and responsible for its success to the people of Canada. He knows the situation, and he has told me that to divulge the details of this transaction at the present time would be detrimental to the interest of the Canadian National Railways. If I approached him again, he would tell me the same thing. Under those circumstances, if we have any faith in Sir Henry Thornton, we ought to do with him exactly what would be done by the shareholders with the head of any great company—accept his word and act accordingly.

Progress reported.

The House resumed.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the minister obtain, before we meet at eight o'clock, information as to where the transaction is? How far has it proceeded? Have we, or has the Canadian National Railways, any contractual relationship yet with this syndicate in New York? How far has the syndicate proceeded? When we know that, we shall know a little better just how to estimate the advice which Sir Henry Thornton gave.

While I am on my feet, I am going to enter a protest against the too oft repeated assumption of the leader of the Progressive party (Mr. Forke) that he is sitting in final arbitrament over the moral quality of all other people in this House; nor do I thank him for the suggestion that I have certain information of my own about this transaction which I am concealing from parliament. I should like to know his authority for this suggestion. I tell him I know nothing about this, not one word, not a tittle of information, that he does not know if he has sat through the discussion in this House. I ask him, before he attributes to me concealment of facts known to myself for partisan

purposes, that he have some authority for his words. He goes on and he states with an air of sanctimonious complacency, that we of the opposition have no right to proceed with our criticism because we are seeking party advantage. I do not pretend not to be seeking party advantage provided that it is legitimate and right, and I do not expect the leader of the Progressive party to pretend to parliament not to be seeking party advantage provided it is legitimate and right. Am I to be deterred from criticism of a transaction which I believe to be wrong and which I believe I can demonstrate to be wrong, because if we succeed in bringing wrongdoing home to the government, it would be detrimental to an opposing party? Are we continually to be taunted, when we make criticism or censure that we are acting merely in a partisan spirit and not doing our duty as members of parliament? What does he conceive to be our duty?

Mr. FORKE: If my right hon. friend would ask only one question at a time, I would have some chance to remember it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I proceeded on the assumption that the hon. member's mind can carry more than he thinks it can. I will put my questions one by one in future.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would like to remind the right hon. gentleman that the Mace is on the Table. We are not in committee.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 107 (from the Senate), to incorporate Montreal Finance Trust (As Amended, and recommending that the title be changed to "An Act to incorporate Family Trust").—Mr. Papineau.

Bill No. 176 (from the Senate), respecting The Northern Trusts Company.—Mr. Hudson.

Bill No. 177 (from the Senate), respecting The Subsidiary High Court of the Ancient Order of Foresters in the Dominion of Canada.—Mr. Euler.

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 193 (from the Senate), for the relief of Lillian Beryl Brayman.—Mr. Ryckman.

Bill No. 194 (from the Senate), for the relief of Roland Bergeron.—Mr. Carruthers.

Bill No. 195 (from the Senate), for the relief of Florence Cohn.—Mr. Church.

Bill No. 196 (from the Senate), for the relief of Cecelia Maria Taylor.—Mr. Guthrie.

Bill No. 197 (from the Senate), for the relief of William August Kruger.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 198 (from the Senate), for the relief of Thomas Benjamin Brown.—Mr. Carruthers.

Bill No. 199 (from the Senate), for the relief of Elva Burnside.—Mr. McKay.

Bill No. 200 (from the Senate), for the relief of Alfred Thomas Candy.—Mr. Duff.

SUPPLY

The House again in Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

Railways and Canals—chargeable to income, $73,000,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I had made some references to comments on the motives of members of this House in attacking the transaction in question. I want to refer for a moment to the appeal made by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King). The Prime Minister seems to think that the question whether we know where we are at in connection with this deal or do not is really a question between political management of the Canadian National Railway and business management. Could a more preposterous suggestion be made? He says, "We told Sir Henry Thornton to go ahead and we would give him a free hand; we would not interfere with him at all." Sir Henry Thornton did as he was told; consequently it cannot be wrong. If the government told Sir Henry Thornton to go ahead beyond what Sir Henry Thornton and his board's powers were under the act, then the government is accountable to this House and should receive just what Sir Henry Thornton is receiving. Sir Henry Thornton is properly told to go ahead with the management and operation of the railway, and I would that the government were carrying out to the full the whole spirit and intent of the injunction they gave him so far as management and operation go. But the government has no right to tell Sir Henry Thornton to go ahead and invest moneys of this country in capital ventures unless parliament has previously voted the money to do it. The Minister of Railways definitely told us they did not tell him to go and do that; that they gave him no authority at all; that he never consulted them in any way. Consequently he is clearly subject to reprimand, and no one would be doing his duty in par-

liament if he did not make that perfectly manifest.

Now, the question is this: Should we vote the $73,000,000 that is before us, which is the main railway vote to the National Railway board, until we know what position the country is in? I come in this connection to say a few words as to the minister's argument. The minister's argument is: Here is an attack on the railway; if we submit to this motion and do not pass this $73,000,000 item without the information demanded, it simply means that the opponents of the National Railway must definitely sever themselves from its supporters and the issue be joined throughout the country. I do not know what the minister means. Is the House not entitled to know where we are at with respect to two million dollars of our money that has gone from our possession? We do not know about it; the minister himself does not know, and all we are asking is that he find out.

We may be in one of two or three positions. We may be the definite owners of the property, of course, in the name of the National Railways or rather of Aronovici. We may be the final owners of it, and so far as the legal position is concerned, my thought is that that is where we are. So far as I have been able to find from the minister, we have no undertaking of anybody to take it off our hands, we are tied there by the act of Sir Henry Thornton in defiance of the law of Canada. Well, if we are in that position the hour has struck now for a reprimand. We may be in another position: we may be in a position of temporary ownership, legal ownership, with the undertaking of others to take it off our hands at what we paid for it, subject to some understanding on our part that we will help them out by a leasehold interest. If we are in the latter position, which the minister intimates we are in, surely we are entitled to know the facts about it. Surely we are entitled to know the value of the covenant we have, if we have such a covenant, with this syndicate in New York, and if we vote this money, when are we going to know? When we vote this $73,000,000 we place it or authorize the minister to place it month by month where Sir Henry Thornton can do with it again just what he has done now. Should we do that till we know the real position we are in as to the first $2,000,000? Oh, the Prime Minister says, we ought to give him full authority to buy hotels in Paris or buy hotels in Hong Kong, and not only should he have the authority, but if he does it parliament should not know the facts about it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: When did I say that?

Mr. MEIGHEN: This afternoon.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I made no such statement.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If parliament is entitled to know the facts, then let us have them. That is all we ask; that is all the motion asks. It is a fact that we have a covenant with a syndicate to take this off our hands or we have not.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Please keep to the facts when you are speaking of facts.

Mr. MARTELL: Hear, hear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is precisely what I am doing and I am getting, "hear, hear," from hon gentlemen opposite.

Mr. MARTELL: It was not intended for you.

Mr. MEIGHEN: As it comes from the hon. member for Hants I am still more confirmed in my position.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): You were a little doubtful before.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am more confirmed. The Prime Minister did not state to this House that this vote should go through before we know the facts as to the late transaction. His Minister of Railways has told us over and over again that we do not know the facts, that he does not know them himself. He does not know who the syndicate are whose credit we are asked to take for this $2,000,000 that has gone. Are those facts to be known or are they not? They are not known. We are told we are not to know them until the $73,000,000 is placed in the position where it may go in exactly the same direction and by the same plan. Now is it an unfair thing to ask of the minister that before he asks parliament to vote $73,000,000 more to be in a position to be used just as Sir Henry Thornton used this, he should be in a position to tell this House what really has happened to the last $2,000,000? He is not to-night. The reason he gives I must say I do not appreciate. I do not know what harm it is going to do that syndicate for this parliament and for the government to know who they are. The minister says there are tenants in that building and if they know who own it it will be hard for those owners to make terms with the tenants. How can they make terms with the tenants until the tenants do know who owns it? I do not see what difference it makes to the

tenants whether it is owned by Aron-ovici in Paris or Moses-ovici in New York. What is the difference to them? If there is any reason for secrecy the minister has not suggested any circumstance that would justify his claim for secrecy, none at all. Certainly the tenants of the building know it has been sold. The minister has told the House that, he has volunteered it himself; it has been in the papers for two weeks. They know it has been sold and that arrangements have to be made, and how is it going to hurt the owner that the owner should be known? But even if it is going to, are not we entitled to know? Why should we vote money without knowing to whom the last money we voted has gone or at whose credit it rests at this hour? That is the position the Opposition takes. There are hon. members of this House who say it is all right—all right that $2,000,000 of the money of Canada, $2,000,000 added to the deficit of Canada on the National Railways should lie somewhere in Paris subject to redemption at the hands of men we do not know anything about, and whose names even the Minister of Railways has no knowledge of. Now if other hon. members are satisfied with that condition I am not, and I do not propose to take the responsibility of voting further money until we do know. If the House wishes to do it, then my vote will be the measure of the responsibility I take.

The minister says: Do not attack Sir Henry Thornton. Look at the success he has made of the National Railways. Well, that question is not up for discussion now. But I venture to say to the minister that the National Railways were succeeding just as well when Sir Henry Thornton took charge as they are to-day, that they were succeeding just as well at the hands of the manager whom he and his government dethroned and cast out of office, certainly as well as they are to-day. I venture to say more, if you will search the whole history of Mr. Hanna's tenure of office you will find nothing to compare with a transaction like this. No, it was never even alleged that he went beyond the limits of his power, never alleged that he broke the confidence of the Commons of this country or went beyond the limits fixed by statute as the limits within which he ought to restrain himself. No, no breach of confidence was ever even suggested of Mr. Hanna. But the question of Sir Henry Thornton as general manager is not the question before this House, and the minister cannot make it so. The question is this, whether in a case where admittedly money has been wrongfully taken from the treasury of the Canadian National Railway we are not entitled to know just exactly the position that money is in before we vote more money into the same position. That is the only question before us.

The Prime Minister says the money has not illegally gone, and the Minister of Railways says it has not illegally gone. The Minister of Railways admitted that if they had bought the property in their own name it would have been illegal, that they had not the power to do so and we are supposed to be satisified because they went through the formality of putting it in the name of Mr. Aronovici. The matter is not changed in the slightest by the property being in the name of Mr. Aronovici. The essential facts are these, that plainly in defiance of the word of parliament and the statute of Canada, $2,000,000 has gone out of the treasury of the Canadian National Railway, and we are supposed to vote more money where it may be similarly dealt with without knowing the position the last $2,000,000 is in.

Mr. FORKE: Mr. Chairman, I might be permitted to say a few words in reply to the lecture I received from the right hon. leader of the Opposition. Let me say at the outset that I have in no way freed the government from responsibility in this matter. I stated my opinions then. I also ventured to assert that probably the right hon. leader of the Opposition knew just about as much about this transaction as the government. At this statement he was very indignant, and that surprised me very much because I listened to speeches last night and this afternoon by members in that part of the House twitting the government with knowing nothing about this transaction, so I do not see why he should have been so indignant when I insinuated that he probably knew as much as they did. But I am quite willing to take it back if I am wrong. I only made a guess.

The right hon. leader of the Opposition also told me that I had no right to lecture the members of this House. Well, I do not know that he has the keeping of all this House in his pocket. Is he the particular guardian of their rights and privileges? I can hardly see why he should take what I said to himself so very quickly if I was not hitting a sore spot. I have a great deal of respect for the right hon. gentleman, and I think he knows it. I respect his ability, his industry, and his many good qualities, but I want just to tell him right here and now that if he thinks that any special or peculiar sanctity surrounds the personality of the leader of the Opposition

he is entirely mistaken. Now, I think, perhaps I have said enough; but I do not intend to be lectured by the leader of the Opposition, or any other member in this House, when I am occupying a position that I have a perfect right to occupy. I think, Mr. Chairman, you will all acknowledge that since my election to this House I have not indulged in any long speeches; I have never wasted the time of the House. Perhaps in that respect I have made a mistake and allowed opportunities to pass that I ought to have taken advantage of. However I am going to promise hon. members that from this time forward I am going to utilize my due share of the time which is available for discussion.

Mr. GOULD: I do not wish to keep the House very long, but I am more or less in sympathy with the sentiments that have been expressed concerning the $2,000,000 which is under discussion. It seems to me that the attitude of the government, or of the Minister of Railways, is that we should sign a blank cheque and allow moneys to be spent without asking for details. That is the only interpretation to be placed upon the attitude of the government or of the minister. As to the purpose for which this money is taken we have had no specific details. Am I not therefore justified in saying that we are practically asked to sign a blank cheque? We have a total contemplated expenditure under the vote before the committee of $73,000,000 which may be spent for this, that or the other purpose, and I think we would be establishing a wrong precedent if we voted this money without any question or without criticism. To my mind in this case there is justification for more or less criticism. In private life I could not for a moment think of taking such an attitude as is assumed here in respect of matters of business. I want to say that I have all respect for the Minister of Railways, and if he had been duly advised of all the details concerning this arrangement, or this understanding, and had come to the House and given his word of honour as a gentleman and as a business man that the arrangement was all right, and also had advised Sir Henry Thornton that such a method of doing business did not meet with his approval, I would be prepared to accept the hon. gentleman's word in that regard. But when no real information is supplied to the committee concerning the matter I am disposed to be more critical than I otherwise would be.

Now, I do not know whether the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) has been disposed of or not but I wish to call the attention of the committee to this circumstance; that some few weeks ago when a very interesting debate took place here on the question of immigration we asked that the item be deferred. I do not think there was a formal resolution but it was asked that the appropriation be deferred and brought down in a more itemized form. That was done and the total was divided into, I think, at least sixteen different items. The request in question was very readily acceded to at that time and it seems to me that this demand of the hon. member (Mr. Stevens) is no departure from the principle then admitted. I think that by adopting such a precedent to-day we may reasonably infer that in other cases, let us say for example the Canada Colonization Company, if they are granted an appropriation next year, there will be a repetition of making expenditures in advance of parliamentary authority. That is a wrong precedent to establish, and we have a right to insist that such things should not continue.

The Minister of Agriculture claimed that the West is in favour of government ownership, and he pointed to the fact that that principle had been carried out in the matter of these railways. I think, however, that statement needs a little qualification. As the matter stands in the West we are in favour of the principle of government ownership, and I wish to remind the minister that we predicted fifteen years ago that government ownership would come. However, if the minister will cast his mind back and take the case of the Saskatchewan Co-operative Elevator Company he will realize that the sentiment of the people of the West runs more along the line of co-operation rather than government ownership. Yet we give our hearty support to the principle of government ownership, or more properly speaking public ownership, of railways. That condition has been forced upon us. I have no desire to harass the minds of hon. gentlemen opposite but I would remind them that some years ago we gave a blank cheque to a Liberal government with respect to the Grand Trunk Pacific, the construction of which line they said would not cost the country one cent. That is one reason why we hesitate to grant any more blank cheques in the case of other arrangements or agreements. The country has not forgotten the experience of the past. Our past experience renders us very cautious in regard to agreements of this kind. Possibly this discussion will serve a very useful purpose if it teaches these men who talk of money in millions and who do not have to

dig down into their pockets for money, the value of a dollar, and render them a little more cautious in the expenditure of the people's money. The people themselves are very much concerned about expenditures of this kind and this debate will have served a really good purpose if those who are responsible for this expenditure are induced to act with greater prudence and circumspection hereafter.

Mr. RYCKMAN: I am opposed to this vote unless further information is given as to its necessity. The ground of my opposition is that with the information in my possession I think $2,000,000 is an excessive price to pay for this property, if it is the one indicated in the public press. I saw the Hotel Scribe in 1911, I saw it again in September, 1921, and while I cannot for a moment set myself up as a valuer of property in Paris yet I feel that I can say, with all confidence, that $2,000,000 for that property is a price that has something behind it. It is not even on "the main street," and I appeal to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and to the Minister of Finance, who were in Paris very recently, to confirm that statement. If you take $2,000,000 at 5 per cent that means $100,000, and no one can tell me that the American Express Company, which occupies a corner of the Rue de la Paix near the Place de l'Opera, pays 1,400,000 francs for its yearly tenancy of that building. It does seem to me that before a matter of this kind, coming up in the way in which it does, should be accepted by this House we ought to know that $2,000,000 is a fair price, or anything like a fair price, for the Hotel Scribe. The public prints also tell us that the de facto Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Duncan Marshall, was in Paris recently. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, and I know the responsibility I take in doing so, that I am perfectly satisfied that if any member of this parliament had gone to Paris to bargain for what was known as the Hotel Scribe—I do not know whether it is still occupied as the Hotel Scribe, but it was formerly known by that name—and had $2,000,000 in his pocket the property could have been bought for much less money. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I think there ought to be some means of testing whether an excessive price, a price with a meaning behind it, has not been agreed to be paid for this property.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Before this vote carries I would like to ask the minister if the government have in view any purpose in regard to the Transcontinental railway to Quebec. That road is practically out of commission at the present time. I think that in 1919 there were no less than 7,000,000 ties put on it, ties that had not worn out but had rotted from lack of use. I presume that by this time they will have rotted also, and it seems to me that some use ought to be made of that section of the line. Recently a number of us from the west visited the city of Quebec and saw a shipment of cattle from western Canada loaded on board a steamship there. There are a great many advantages in shipping those cattle through the port of Quebec. They arrive there in very much better condition than they arrive at Montreal. The facilities for handling them at that port are so much more superior to the facilities at Montreal that the United Grain Growers, I understand, paid a vessel $600 to stop there. Hon. members can see the situation. The full freight from Montreal to Liverpool was charged, although the cattle were loaded at Quebec. The Grain Growers paid a bonus of $600 to the steamship company for taking these cattle on board at Quebec, and yet they figured that, in the saving of shrinkage and the saving of time, they were money ahead by bringing the cattle over the Transcontinental to the latter port. It appears to me that if a proper grain rate were put into effect on the Transcontinental a great deal of the overflow, which at present goes down through the United States and which is used to create business for American ports, would go to Quebec.

It seems rather remarkable, and it is discriminatory in fact, that to-day the rates on grain from Port Arthur, or an equivalent point on the Transcontinental, say Armstrong, to Quebec, is just double the rate charged for handling grain for a similar distance in the West, and one might be almost pardoned for supposing that those in charge of the operations of the railway were discriminating against that port, in favour of either the American route or the lake route. I know that some hon. members in this House are of the opinion that under the prevailing grain rates in the West, the Crowsnest pass rates, the railways are losing money in handling our grain. If any hon. member will look over the statements of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canadian National Railway for the past few years, and compare them with the information given before the special rate committee last year by President Beatty and President Hanna, he will be quite convinced that grain was handled at a very large profit by the railways, even under the prevailing rates. If it can be handled at a profit on the prairies, there is no reason in the world

why the Transcontinental cannot be used from Winnipeg east to take the overflow of grain.

I am not suggesting any discrimination against the port of Montreal, where they have the finest facilities probably of any port in the world, but with the amount of money the government has spent on the port at Quebec, with the excellent railway we have there—and the Transcontinental is a road which has been excellently built—and with the equipment they have, there is no reason in the world, to my mind, why a large part of the overflow grain cannot be carried by way of that port.

I think in all sections of the House there is a great deal of sympathy for the western farmer, particularly in the marketing of cattle. We have just recently secured an opening for our cattle in the British market, which means a great deal to us. It will mean all the difference between profit and loss in raising these cattle, if we can ship them from the port of Quebec. It is very, very important, but if we have to pay a bonus of $600 to a steamship company to stop there for every shipment, it is no use to us. It would amount to $1.25 a head if we had to pay that sum, and that much extra deducted from the small profit, or added to the loss, means a great deal to the western farmer. I think the government can do us a very great service in this matter by approaching the managing officials of the Canadian National Railways and trying to see if it is not possible to get the usual rate—I do not suggest any lower rate—prevailing on the prairies, for the transportation of grain from Winnipeg to the port of Quebec. If there is a sufficient amount of grain to be handled vessels can call at that port, and in this way we can get our cattle shipped without any extra bonus. In addition to the saving of the bonus there will be a saving in the freight paid on cattle from Montreal to Quebec, because in the shipment I mentioned they had to pay, in addition to the bonus, the full freight from Montreal to Liverpool. I trust the government will try to do something in this connection.

Mr. STEVENS: I moved this afternoon that this item should stand, pending the presentation to the committee of certain information which many of us believe the committee has the right to demand. That motion was ruled out of order. I then appealed to the minister to allow the item to stand until he was in possession of this information and submitted it to the House. This he refused to do. The minister then endeavoured to divert the attention of the committee from the immediate subject under discussion, and to introduce the question of an attack on the Canadian National Railways as a whole. In order to avoid that, and to make it clear that we do not attack the Canadian National Railways as a whole, I purpose moving, seconded by Mr. Boys, in protest against the manner in which the minister has endeavoured to put this item through, that item 139 be reduced by the sum of $2,000,000. That is the only way in which we feel we can formally and properly bring our protest before the committee, inasmuch as the other motion which reflected our views more accurately was ruled out of order.

Mr. GRAHAM: I wish to reply to my hon. friend from Mackenzie (Mr. Campbell). No man in this House is any more delighted to hear what he said about the port of Quebec than myself. The development of that port when I happened to be Minister of Railways before was a hobby of mine. It was a little mutilated by the successors of the then government, and the plan as outlined by the government of which I had the honour of being a member, headed by Sir Wilfrid Laurier, who represented Quebec, was changed, I think not for the benefit of the port of Quebec. But it has been changed and certain advantages given to other railways that were not at all intended. However, the Transcontinental, I think I am safe in saying, is in good physical condition—at least I am so informed—and anything that can be done to increase the traffic over the Transcontinental to the port of Quebec will receive my hearty support. The fact that cattle can be landed there quickly by the Transcontinental and shipped has been proven, I think, very recently. As a matter of fact, I do not pose as a farmer.

Mr. BANCROFT: The only man in the House that does not.

Mr. GRAHAM: Now do not misunderstand me. Of course, I mean that everybody else does. Why not I?

Mr. BANCROFT: I said that the minister was the only man in the House that did not pose as a farmer.

Mr. GRAHAM: Then I will not say what I was going to say, but I think I am safe in saying that speed on the rails is a factor in the proper delivery of live stock, because the longer they are on the hoof in the car the greater their deterioration—I mean in regard to shrinkage in weight and so on. Anything I can do to improve conditions along that line I can assure my hon. friend I will be delighted to undertake, because I believe in the port of Quebec, and I believe in the

Transcontinental as the line to reach that port. My hon. friend (Mr. Stevens) has moved that this vote be reduced by $2,000,000. I want to tell hon. gentlemen that they are not interfering with the $2,000,000 but that they are crippling the management of the Canadian National Railways to the extent of $2,000,000. Some of the things that they probably want to do, it will be impossible to do, but that is beside the question. The situation is just as it was before. I cannot say anything more than I have said. My right hon. friend would do exactly the same thing if he were in my place; he could not do anything else.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I would do a great deal more.

Mr. GRAHAM: Along the same line, I think he would do a great deal less, because that is his history—give no information.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Rule 17B.

Mr. GRAHAM: I can go back two or three years in Hansard, and that is the principle laid down by my right hon. friend.

Mr. MEIGHEN: As regards day-to-day operation, my hon. friend can read Hansard for five years back and he will find nothing different.

Mr. GRAHAM: That would be a waste of time.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It would be if he were trying to find anything different.

Mr. GRAHAM: I say that the principle that would be adopted by any great company in regard to the president of it, the position that Sir Henry Thornton is in, and the principle my right hon. friend would have to take were he in my place, would be that this being an uncompleted transaction and the president and the solicitor assuring me that, in their belief, to give these details at the present moment until the transaction was completed, would be detrimental to the Canadian National Railways, no other stand is possible than to abide by that advice. Who is to give me advice in regard to the Canadian National? My right hon. friend? No. I would not think it was good. The man whom the country has engaged to run the Canadian National Railways? If his advice is not good legally, then he has an adviser in the person of Mr. Ruel, I think one of the best—I will leave it at that—railway lawyers, at least, and business lawyers in the Dominion of Canada. His advice is the same as that of Sir. Henry Thornton: Knowing the inside of the transaction, he considers that it would be injurious to the Canadian National Railways if the details which are asked for were made public. They are not merely for this House; they are intended for publication the world over as they would be published, and the opinion of these gentlemen is that that would be injurious to the Canadian National Railways. These men have advised me so. If you were in my place, what would you do? The responsibility is on the man whom we have hired to accept the responsibility, and I am not going to allow it to be put on my shoulders. I am taking the advice of these gentlemen. To reduce the estimate by $2,000,000 will not affect the transaction in any degree; it will only reduce the amount of money we can expend on betterments, buying of stock or anything of that kind for the Canadian National system. We have discussed this matter thoroughly; the committee has expressed its views; there is no portion of this committee that has not had full opportunity to place its protest on record; but as a principle of business that will be followed by any company, I say that the details should not be given out at the present moment, and I say that on the advice of the president of the company and his solicitor.

Mr. RYCKMAN: Did the minister, as head of the department of government purchasing this property, ask for a valuation of it?

Mr. GRAHAM: I did not purchase the property.

Mr. RYCKMAN: The government advanced $2,000,000 in connection with or in relation to the purchase. That is broad enough. The security that the country has, if there be any failure to complete this transaction, is this property. We have heard that over and over again. Has the government had any valuation made of this property?

Mr. GRAHAM: The government did not buy the property.

Mr. RYCKMAN: I quite understand that.

Mr. GRAHAM: The Canadian National Railway Company through their agent bought it—I should not say that.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It very nearly slipped out.

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend has said it so often; when you hear a story often you sometimes believe it. The Canadian National advanced the money for an agent to buy the property. Their judgment, the judgment of the president—and he has been in the pro-

perty very recently and knows the location —although my hon. friend says it is not on the main street—is that there are so many main streets in Paris that one cannot select one. Without fear of successful contradiction, I say that it is possibly in the best situation in Paris. I must assume that the president of the Canadian National Railways before he advanced the money, knew what he was doing, and I intend to leave the responsibility on his shoulders.

Mr. HANSON: Had the Canadian National Railways any independent appraisal of the property made?

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not know.

Mr. HANSON: Does the minister not think the committee ought to know that? With all his great qualifications, Sir Henry Thornton cannot possibly be a judge of values of real estate in Paris.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am rising for the purpose of asking my hon. friend, as he refuses to give the other information, whether there will be any possible objection to producing the opinion of the solicitor to which reference had been made more than once? If the Commons have any rights at all under this new government that in opposition prided itself so much in connection with the rights of parliament, surely we have a right to the production of the solicitor's opinion.

9 p.m.

Mr. GRAHAM: I think I have stated it several times, but I will do it again. Verbally, the solicitor assured me that this transaction was perfectly legal, because I asked him that question.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Did the minister put it in this way to him, because I venture to say that if he did, he could not get an affirmative answer—that it was legal to do so without the authority of council and prior vote of parliament? I would be most interested if the minister could produce Mr. Ruel's opinion that it was. I venture to say now that he cannot.

Mr. GRAHAM: I cannot produce it in writing because it was not produced to me in writing.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He can put it in writing if that is his opinion.

Mr. GRAHAM: Surely my right hon. friend will accept a statement made on my responsibility.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Mr. Ruel did not understand what the minister said if he made any such statement. There would be no difficulty for the minister to get the opinion if Mr. Ruel is of that view. I ask him to get it.

Mr. GRAHAM: I have that opinion, not in writing; but my right hon. friend surely sees his peculiar position. He says that this was bought without an order in council.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Without authority.

Mr. GRAHAM: Put it in any way you like; but in the face of that, I assure the committee that Mr. Ruel, as legal adviser of the Canadian National Railways, assured me that this was perfectly legal.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Let me put it in this way, if I canot get the minister to get the opinion: Does the minister think it ought to be legal—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Hon. gentlemen have a strange idea of a joke and just as strange an idea of the law. Does the minister think it ought to be legal that the management or the directorate of the Canadian National Railways should be allowed to buy a $2,000,000 property in Paris without the knowledge of the government and prior vote of parliament?

Mr. GRAHAM: All I am saying is what it is, and I did not frame the law.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am asking the question: Does the minister think it ought to be?

Mr. GRAHAM: My own view quite frankly would be that it would be better for such transactions as that to be made after consultation with the government, even to the extent of an order in council. I have no hesitation in saying that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the minister thinks it should not be the law, supposing it is, is he prepared to bring down legislation to amend the present act so as to ensure that it does not remain the law?

Mr. GRAHAM: I certainly will make inquiries as to the law; but my right hon. friend has so befuddled me during the last two days with insisting that the law has been broken, that this would require some consideration. If, however, I am advised by the Minister of Justice that it is legal for the board or the president or any of the officials to purchase property without the consent of the government, I would suggest that the act should be amended so that this would not be legal.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I would like to see anything devised that is plainer than the present act.

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): Mr. Chairman, the minister tells the committee that he does not

know the facts of the case,, he does not know whether the Canadian National Railway has bought this property or has an option on it.

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend has not been here surely.

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): But he says he is advised by counsel for the railway that the transaction is perfectly legal. Therefore the railway counsel must have the information, and it would be quite simple for the minister to become seized of the facts. He could then make up his mind whether it is in the public interest to disclose the information to the committee.

The minister has just asked hon. members what they would do if in his position. For my part I would suggest to him that there is no crying necessity for the passing of this main item to-night. In the course of a few weeks undoubtedly the information asked for will be available, the transaction will have reached such a stage that it will be advisable to let the committee and the public have all the particulars. In the meantime there is lots of other business to engage our attention, and this item can stand until the minister and the government are in possession of all the facts, when they can decide whether or not it is in the public interest to disclose these facts to the committee before asking a blank cheque for $73,000,000. I think in view of the disastrous consequences which have resulted to this country in the past through the giving of blank cheques, to be filled out at the will of government officials and governments, that we would do well to hesitate in this instance. I do not think that that is an unreasonable answer to make to the minister's question. I would say, for the time being let the item stand. Such postponement will not cost the country a cent, and I submit it is the proper way in which to deal with a public transaction of this magnitude, for it will satisfy the public better, and undoubtedly it will satisfy the committee better if I am any judge of the feeling of hon. members to-night.

Mr. CANNON: If there is one man in this House, Mr. Chairman, who ought to know everything about the Canadian National Railway legislation it is the right hon. leader of the Opposition. He framed that law, he brought it before the House, and if I remember rightly he defended it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The National Railway Act?

Mr. CANNON: Of 1919.

[Mr. G. Black.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, the hon. gentleman's memory is rather wrong there. I did not introduce the bill, I did not frame it, and I had no particular connection with it except as a member of the government.

Mr. CANNON: If I remember correctly, the right hon. gentleman took part in the debate on the bill and defended it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think so. I am proud of that.

Mr. CANNON: Anyway, the right hon. gentleman was a member of the government at that time, therefore he knew of the bill before it was introduced, and according to the rules of our constitution he was responsible for the legislation in common with his colleagues. The main argument put forward by the right hon. leader and his friends is that this is an illegal transaction. I have the act before me. I do not claim to be a great lawyer, but I should like the right hon. leader of the Opposition to point out once for all anything in this law upon which he can base his assertion that the transaction in question is illegal. I do not see anything in the law to warrant his statement. The hon. member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton) last night argued that the board of directors of the Canadian National Railways had exactly the same powers and privileges as the directorate of an ordinary company. Is there anything in the Railway Act which says that the board of directors of a railway company cannot purchase a property without being authorized beforehand by their shareholders? I do not think that any such provision is to be found there. I say, therefore, that according to the Canadian National Railway law, introduced by the friends of the right hon. leader of the Opposition, there is absolutely nothing to prevent the Canadian National Railway board from doing what it has done.

I do not wish to repeat the argument which I made yesterday, but I think it would be a good thing for the members of this committee to bear in mind that the government to-day is simply putting into application the law which was framed, the law which was defended and the law which was first put into force by my right hon. friend and his associates. Why should the opposition to-day come before this committee and denounce this transaction as scandalous, when it has been put through in accordance with the law passed by the government of which the right hon. gentleman was a shining member? A minute ago the leader of the Opposition was asking my hon. friend, the Minister

of Railways (Mr. Graham) to amend the law. Why was the law framed as it stands to-day if it is so bad? Why did my right hon. friend give to Mr. Hanna and the former directors of the Canadian National Railway board the powers which are contained in the law of 1919, and seek to deny those powers to Sir Henry Thornton and his board of directors to-day?

I shall not go into the merits of this transaction, I do not claim that it is good or bad, but I say that the government cannot be held responsible for such a transaction, and I can only conclude that the opposition in the attitude it has taken is simply playing a political game. I am a politician myself, I do not claim to be a statesman, but when I play politics I play it openly and I say so. Why should our friends on the other side claim that they wish to save the country from a tremendous catastrophe when they are simply playing the ordinary game of politics?

I have in my hand, Mr. Chairman, the Journals of the House of Commons of 1921. On the 22nd of March, 1921, the Liberal opposition, of which I was a member, was desirous of securing certain information with respect to how the Canadian National railways were being run. We thought that parliament should be furnished with certain particulars and certain details as to the management. My right hon. friend was a minister at that time, and the hon. member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton) was also a minister. The hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) was a member of the House, as was the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Manion). All these gentlemen whom we have heard since last night asking for information, asking for particulars, saying that this vote should not go through unless all the documents connected with the transaction were laid on the Table—what did all these gentlemen say when we asked for information? At that time Sir George Foster moved that we go into Committee of Supply, and the then leader of the Opposition, now Prime Minister, moved:

> Subject to the reservation that in exceptional cases there may be documents of a confidential character which, in the public interest, may properly be withheld from publication, the House declares that it is the undoubted right of parliament to demand and receive copies of all reports, accounts, correspondence and papers in relation to the management of every department of the public service including the affairs of the Canadian National Railways, whether operating directly under the control of the department, or under corporate form.

We voted—

Mr. RYCKMAN: Did you vote for that?

Mr. CANNON: Certainly I voted for it, and I have not since changed my opinion. My opinion is very simply stated: I say that this parliament should be given every information that is not of a confidential character or the disclosing of which would not be detrimental to the public interest. The stand I took then is the stand I take to-day, and that is what the resolution meant. We were simply asking that any information that was not confidential or the furnishing of which would not be detrimental to the public interest should be made available to parliament, and these gentlemen not only denied us the right to have information that was not of a confidential character, but said that we were entitled to no information whatsoever.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh, no.

Mr. CANNON: The resolution is right here; my right hon. friend can read it. Now, Mr. Chairman, to show how sincere these gentlemen are to-day in their attitude in this fight they are putting up, I would ask you to read the list of those who voted on the division which followed the presentation of the resolution to which I have referred. Where was the right hon. leader of the Opposition on this question? Was he then, as he is to-day, in favour of information being given to representatives of the people? Where was the member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton)? Where was my eloquent friend from Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) and my also eloquent friend from Fort William (Mr. Manion)? They were on the side of those who denied the representatives of the people the least information.

Now, if this is going to be a fight as a party question, let us fight it out. We are not afraid; this is not our first battle. But the right hon. leader of the Opposition reminds me of a god whose name I have forgotten but of whom I read in my Greek mythology. It was a god who used to eat his own children so as to preserve their father. Who, Mr. Chairman, is the father of this Canadian National system? The right hon. gentleman. In 1912 in this House, in the words of the then member for Calgary, he was the "gramaphone of Mackenzie and Mann;" he carried through the legislation which was afterwards denounced all over Canada. He is the gentleman who, in the House of Commons, burdened the people of Canada with every debt, every obligation incurred by the Canadian Northern and by Mackenzie and Mann. Who is the man who forced on the people of Canada the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Grand Trunk system? The right hon. gentleman. Who brought these

children into the world? He was their father; but to-day, in order to preserve himself politically, he wishes to swallow them. The Tory party is evidently playing the old game of leaning on the Canadian Pacific Railway so as to kill the Canadian National Railway and preserve its own existence. If the right hon. gentleman wishes to be in this House, having been the father of the Canadian National Railway, the representative of the Canadian Pacific Railway, it is his own business. But I do not think the people of Canada are ready to follow the right hon. gentleman in his political game.

One last word: Not only did these gentlemen refuse us any information when they were in power—information of any nature,—but to-day they say a great principle is at stake, the principle whether public moneys are to be expended by the directorate of the Canadian National Railway without previous consultation with the government or with parliament. Well, if that principle is so sacred, if it is of such importance, how is it that when these gentlemen were in power they expended $72,000,000 in building up a merchant marine without even calling for tenders? Was parliament consulted when the Hon. Mr. Ballantyne, then Minister of Marine, expended $72,000,000 to build up a merchant marine? We were told about it afterwards, when the ships had been built—and painted. Mr. Chairman, when this amendment is put to the vote I am confident that we shall have the support of every member who wishes to give the Canadian National Railway system a fair trial. We from Quebec are not very enthusiastic supporters of public ownership. This system has been imposed on us; we are willing to give it a fair trial, but the debate that has taken place here to-day is not of such a nature as to increase our confidence in public ownership. If public ownership is to be denounced by representatives of the western provinces, if it is to be denounced by its own fathers, pretty soon the people of the province of Quebec will firmly believe they were right in not being very enthusiastic about it.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Will the hon. gentleman tell us who were the members from western Canada who attacked public ownership in the House?

Mr. CANNON: I understand that my hon. friend was in the House; he must have heard the speeches the same as I did.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I heard some speeches, but I heard no attack on public ownership from this section of the House.

[Mr. Cannon.]

Mr. CANNON: Well, evidently my hon. friend is more indulgent than I am in interpreting the speeches that he hears. I heard an hon. gentleman who represents the West saying that if the administration of our railways meant that considerable sums of money were to be spent the way this money had been spent the sooner we put a stop to the system the better. How can our railways be administered in a practical, businesslike way if the directorate is to come to parliament and ask the previous permission of parliament before they do anything? I heard with considerable astonishment my good friend from Vancouver Centre, who generally speaks in a very moderate way, suggest that we bring Sir Henry Thornton before this House to give him a spanking.

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend, whom I am delighted to have provoked into making this speech because we are always so glad to hear him, will permit me to say that I made no such statement. The Minister of Railways repeated some such statement as that as coming from me, and I immediately took occasion to correct him.

Mr. CANNON: I think my hon. friend in a flight of oratory suggested that Sir Henry Thornton be severely castigated.

Mr. STEVENS: No, but I am inclined to agree with my hon. friend on that point.

Mr. CANNON: Can you picture, Mr. Chairman, the supposed advocates of public ownership proposing on the one hand that not a cent be expended before the previous approval of parliament has been obtained, and then on the other hand suggesting that the chairman be brought here whenever we want him to receive a castigation? As far as I am concerned I have never been a very strong advocate of public ownership. In my province we are not very enthusiastic over it. But if the system is to be subjected by parliament to the very severe restrictions suggested today I do not think it will last very long.

In summing up, I say that if we are to have public ownership we cannot have it in any other way than we have it now. If we want to revert to private ownership, and we can devise a way of going back to private ownership, it is for parliament to decide. This debate is a debate which has been brought on by my hon. friends simply for the purpose of making some political headway. I do not blame them. The political horizon is rather cloudy for my hon. friends. I saw that the right hon. gentleman who leads the opposition piously undertook last night a pilgrim-

age to Montreal. Was it yesterday in the city of Montreal that he received his inspiration for to-day's conduct in parliament? I do not know, but really if the Canadian National Railways, the children of my right hon. friend, are to be forsaken by their father and left on the hands of us miserable Liberals who can only be considered as stepfathers, then unless the Progressives step in pretty soon they may be orphans.

Mr. MEIGHEN: My hon. friend from Dorchester is a very interesting political libertine. He can stray from the facts with the most delightful abandon and always, notwithstanding the utter destitution of truth, say something interesting. One hon. member dared to contradict him when he asserted that public ownership had been attacked by hon. members from the West. Well, there was utterly no basis in fact, of course, for the assertion of the hon. member for Dorchester, and there was just as little for every single sentence he uttered from beginning to end. When the House possesses an oratorical ornament who can refer to me as the father of the Grand Trunk Pacific and still keep his face in utter and demure sobriety we ought really to rejoice in the possession.

Mr. CANNON: I think my right hon. friend is following my example and diverging from the truth.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Now that I have the admission of the hon. member for Dorchester as to his own conduct, I come to mine. He described me as the parent of the Grand Trunk Pacific, of the Canadian Northern, of the Grand Trunk itself, and it seems to me I have some other progeny in the railway line the name of which for the moment I cannot recall—the Transcontinental, I presume. Has the hon. member so soon forgotten his great leader as to ascribe to me the exceeding honour of being the parent of these political ventures in the early part of this century?

Mr. CANNON: I never said that. I said that Sir Wilfrid Laurier created these railways and that they were perverted by my right hon. friend.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They were perverted into their present position from the position of bankruptcy into which they had drifted. It is true he was the creator. It is true that my hon. friend and those around him were those who fastened those liabilities on this country. They signed the credit of the country to the whole ghastly responsibility. When we came into power the notes fell due. That is quite correct. But this is quite apart from the subject. No one could draw us so far apart save the hon. member for Dorchester with his romantic and picturesque eloquence.

Coming to the question of liability the hon. member says, and wisely he predicated it upon the modest assumption that he was not a good lawyer, unless you could show him something in the act that denies Sir Henry Thornton the right to buy a hotel in Paris, he had it, and he ought to exercise it. Everyone knows, lawyers and near-lawyers, that Sir Henry Thornton and his board have the authority given them by the National Railway Act and not one whit more by any act on earth, and unless they are given authority to make capital expenditure without the consent of the Governor in Council in that act, they have not the authority. But is argument necessary? Section 23 sets down clearly that for capital investment or for construction they must have the previous authority of the Governor in Council, and the Governor in Council cannot appropriate a dollar without the previous vote of this House. No argument is necessary. The government has admitted the position. Why is the hon. member for Dorchester coming along to argue that the Minister of Railways is wrong? The Minister of Railways is perfectly right. They have no authority to make capital investment, but by some contrivance they fancy they have got around it. They put $2,000,000 into the Bank of Toronto. The Bank of Toronto does not take up the exact bills that are put there but sends $2,000,000 of its own to Paris and it is handed to Aronovici who buys the hotel. The Bank of Toronto takes the undertaking of the National Railways, backed by the security of a $2,000,000 deposit, that it will get this money back. This is the device adopted. I must congratulate the Bank of Toronto on the sufficiency of the security. They have the government's cash and they have the pledge of the National Railway Board. Legality! There never was anything more flagrant, more brazenly opposed to the whole act than to buy property in another land, four thousand miles away, out of the money of the people of Canada. This is exactly what is done, this is exactly what the hon. member defends.

Mr. CANNON: Is my right hon. friend basing himself on clause 23?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Clause 23? I am basing myself on the fact that in the whole of the act there is no parliamentary authority to make capital investments without the authority of the Governor in Council.

Mr. CANNON: There is absolutely no mention of that in clause 23.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is "property" but this hotel in Paris? Let us read the section.

Mr. CANNON: You are talking of capital investment.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Buying property is capital investment. The Acting Minister of National Defence made a remark. Does he tell us that the National Railway board has the power to make capital investments without the authority of the Governor in Council?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I will tell my right hon. friend when he gets through. I will say this, however. He knows very well he is making an argument which he cannot substantiate as to section 23.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not rely wholly on clause 23. I said I did not.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Oh, yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, I told the hon. member that unless there was specific power given to the board to make a capital investment they have not got it.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): You said it was all in section 23.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not say it was all in 23. As to that I put myself in the judgment of the House. I never found an interruption of the Acting Minister of National Defence to be well based yet, in fact the more prolific his interruptions the more hopeless his case.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Do not get mad about it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Unless there is power given within the four corners of the act to make a capital investment it cannot be made. I venture to say there is no honourable member of this House who for a moment believes that the National Railway board has power to make capital investments without the authority of parliament. That being so what are we to think of the repeated statements of the Minister of Railways, the head of the department?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Is there any other section upon which my right hon. friend relies?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member (Mr. Macdonald) may perhaps think he is deceiving somebody by his smile, but he does not deceive even himself. He knows as well as I know—

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): You are shifting ground every moment.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am not shifting my ground. I am in the judgment of the House if I have not said from the beginning that unless there is authority given in the act to the board there is no authority.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): You cannot put your finger on it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I know I cannot. That is what I am complaining of, it is not there. How can I put my finger on the authority when it is not there.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I thought my right hon. friend said it was in section 23.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, I told the hon. member it was not there nor anywhere else. Clause 23 is a prohibition, that is all.

Mr. LAPOINTE: We have enough of that now.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Who is the latest joker and what is his joke? Someone says we have enough prohibiton now. Well, that may be a fact. Sometimes I think we need more.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Hear, hear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Now what does clause 23 say?

With the approval of the Governor in Council and upon any location sanctioned by the Minister of Railways and Canals the company may from time to time construct and operate railway lines—

Railway lines that they can construct—

—branches and extensions, or railway facilities or properties of any description in respect to the construction whereof respectively, parliament may hereafter authorize the necessary expenditure, or the guarantee of an issue of the company's securities. A copy of any plan or profile made in respect of any completed railway shall be desposited with the Board of Railway Commissioners of Canada.

Where is the authority there to make a capital investment without the sanction of the Governor in Council? But why waste time arguing this? Hon. members only want to waste time arguing it to keep the attention of parliament off the actual transaction. If there was authority to do it why did they take this circuitous way to get it done? Why did the Minister of Railways tell us they could not take it in the name of the company? The matter is abundantly plain.

Now, I want to come to the resolution referred to by the hon. member for Dorchester. There was a resolution moved that, subject to the reservation of information that might be confidential, all the affairs of the National Railways should be made known at once to the people's representatives in par-

liament. I opposed it, and rightly opposed it, and I would oppose it now. Hon. members opposite, I suppose, had they been in office then might have supported it and then when the time came when information was wanted they would do as they are doing now, tell us it is "confidential". I did not want to support the resolution and then merely play with it afterwards. Information is not "confidential" merely because a government or a board do not want to disclose it. Information, for example, touching the price paid for coal in one mine and the price being paid at a similar time in another, or information connected with a dismissal of an employee—that kind of information is not confidential and yet it should not be made a subject of discussion in parliament while these operation transactions are occurring. That kind of information, being a matter of the operation of the road day by day, should not be a subject for discussion in parliament. Consequently I was perfectly right to give a negative to that resolution. I thought it was better to do so frankly than to let the resolution pass and then at another time when anything came up to say that the information was "confidential." Such course would be unworthy of parliament. But here are hon. members who supported that resolution coming to this House to-day, not in respect of a matter of operation at all but in respect of a matter of capital investment and in respect of a matter where the money is gone, irrevocably gone, withholding the facts. Is the case not wholly different? Yes, obviously different, and no one knows this more clearly than the hon. member for Dorchester, yet he cannot even turn his own mind from the right and direct line of thinking, judging by the specious reasoning he sought to advance. I opposed the passage of a resolution such as he quoted and in opposing it I would be entirely consistent with the stand I have taken to-day.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I must say that I have heard my right hon. friend on many occasions speaking in the positive way in which he always addresses the House and making assertions with that bold manner which he always summons to his aid no matter whether the subject may be a serious one or comparatively unimportant. But we have heard it explicitly declared, respecting this act in connection with the Canadian National Railways that expenditures such as were proposed by Sir Henry Thornton to be made in Paris could not be made, because of their character without the direct sanction of the government. My hon. friend from Dorchester very properly said to-night to my right hon. friend that he could not find any such declaration within the four corners of that statute. The right hon. gentleman then proceeded to declare that that declaration was made and was to be found in section 23 of the act. When I ventured to interrupt my right hon. friend and to state that that declaration could not be found in section 23 of the act, he intimated that my interruptions were of no value whatever. Then I asked him if there were any other sections in which he could find legal justification for this position that he and his desk mates have been taking for the last two days, and then he admitted it was not in the act at all. And when he declared that it was not in the act at all. It is not in the act. My right hon. friend cannot find within the four corners of this act any statement, or any provision in the statute, which made it obligatory upon Sir Henry Thornton, as the president of this railway, to come to the governor in council for absolute authority before he proceeded to negotiate for the purchase of this property in Paris. So that we have that much in the way of clearing the air of all this mist, innuendo and suspicion which is being engendered by hon. members on the other side of the House for the last two days. What next? We had repeated demands that my hon. friend the Minister of Railways would explain clearly to the committee the attitude of the government in reference to the management of the Canadian National; but we have committed the task to Sir Henry Thornton, we are holding him responsible for the results and we are not interfering with him in regard to the plans he may make or the ideas he may conceive, in order that the end and aim of the Canadian people as a whole might be attained in regard to the successful operation of the railway.

My hon. friend does not think to-day as he thought a few years ago. There is nothing that my hon. friend resents so much as a charge of inconsistency and yet upon this very question, when we come to consider the point as to what information the Minister of Railways should give this House and the country with reference to the operation of the Canadian National by Sir Henry Thornton, we find that my hon. friend laid down two years ago a totally different doctrine from that which he lays down to-day and I will prove that statement. My right hon. friend speaking on a motion proposed at that time by my right hon. leader went on to speak as to the nature of the information that

the public ought to have with reference to the operation of the railway system, and first he spoke of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and as to how much information the public should have as to the movements of their directors, the movements of their president, and their method of dealing with the operation of the road.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Operation.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): And other things. He said:

The Canadian Pacific Railway Company would refuse to any man or to any parliament the disclosure of business that is its own; it knows that it cannot conduct the administration of that great enterprise and at the same time disclose to everybody just what it is doing from time to time.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Hear, hear.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): The right hon. member said further:

Not that what it is doing is wrong, but every business enterprise knows that it is impossible successfully to conduct a business, impossible to get the advantages which every business must get if it is to succeed, if everybody doing business with that enterprise and the public generally is to know all its moves on all parts of the chess board from morning till night and from day to day.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Hear, hear.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): It is very clear. Does my hon. friend agree with that to-day?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly, precisely.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): My hon. friend went further. He was speaking of the Canadian Pacific at that time, and proceeded to lay down the doctrine as to what should happen in connection with the Canadian National Railway, and as to that he was very clear. He said:

I think it will be obvious that if the Canadian National directorate are to be compelled to answer to resolutions which by the dozen may be put upon the order paper of this House every day, calling for copies of correspondence, for the disclosure of every fact and of every deed connected with the operation of the road—

Mr. MEIGHEN: Hear, hear.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Do not "hear, hear" till we get through. Then the hon. member will find that it was not merely the operation. He continues:

—they will be put under a disability that their great competitor is not under at all. Should we do that they might well say: you shackle us in the management of the road; you refuse to give us that latitude and freedom of management that every successful business must have; you therefore will have to take the responsibility of failure—we do not. That would be the position they would logically assume. I venture to say that no board of directors, no president and general manager who would be big enough for the tremendous task of operating that system to-day would undertake to assume such responsibility under conditions that would be brought about were this amendment adopted.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Hear, hear—operation only.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): My hon. friend may not be in such a hilarious mood when I get through. He says:

I know there must be such information at that time as will enable parliament properly to judge as to the general management of the system and to say whether or not the Board of Directors that we have put in charge have in the main properly discharged the responsibility placed upon them. That information must be given; but if this resolution passes, it is certain that much that is unfortunate will happen, but very improbable that what is most desirable will actually result. This resolution means simply a return to the old system of political control; it stops nowhere short of that end.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Hear, hear.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): What is the situation here? This government committed the control and the operation of the Canadian National Railways to Sir Henry Thornton and his board of directors. Now, I think Sir Henry Thornton enjoys the confidence of the people of this country since he has assumed the management of that road. I think the care with which he has approached the solution of all the internal problems which face this country in regard to this railway, and the evident interest which he has taken in regard to all these matters indicates that we are justified, as members of this government, in believing that Sir Henry Thornton, to-day has the confidence of the Canadian people. Sir Henry Thornton, coming from the other side, knows that Canada cannot be a hermit nation, and that the great success of the Canadian Pacific Railway has been due to the fact that, on account of their ocean steamships, they are the great highway of the world between the eastern and western hemispheres, and that the ramifications of that system on the Continent, as any hon. member who has ever been over there will realize, furnish the very life blood of the Canadian Pacific Railway. If under Sir Henry Thornton's management we are to attain that success in government ownership which every man in this country, if he is a true patriot ought to hope for, is it not natural for Sir Henry Thornton to say "As a means to that end, on the continent of Europe, I must obtain some business connections which will enable me to be, at least, a competitor with the Canadian Pacific Railway on that continent?" I venture to say that the doctrines laid

down by the right hon. member which I quote to-night, expressed to this House so definitely two years ago on this very question as to what ought to be the policy in dealing with the matter of operation, are in direct conflict with his statements to-night, because he declared at that time that these matters should not be the subject of communication to parliament before they were consummated.

And what more? Let me submit, Mr. Chairman, the lines upon which the right hon. gentleman laid down the importance of maintaining the secrecy of business connections in the business management of a great enterprise. These are the lines which he laid down. My right hon. friend says to the Minister of Railways, by a succession of innuendoes, that Sir Henry Thornton had no business to consider the question of purchasing an hotel in Paris. It has been stated by the right hon. member and reiterated for two days that the law declared that that was so, and he had no such power, and now he cannot put his finger upon the law. Hon. gentlemen on the other side and, in particular, my right hon. friend have stressed the name of Mr. Aronovici, as if some virtue was to be obtained by reiterating the name of a man who had been the purchasing agent of one of the greatest English railways as negotiating this matter on behalf of the president of the National Railways. My hon. friend says, as regards this general appropriation which the Minister of Railways is asking from parliament this year for the operation of railways in Canada: "Oh, we want to have that reduced until we get that information," information similar to that which two years ago he declared, if it were given, would have meant putting the railways under political control. Information of this character he now wants to have. I think the Minister of Railways was quite right when he pointed out to the committee shortly before dinner what was at the bottom of this whole question. Either my right hon. friend was right or half right in 1921 when he laid down the simple business rule that, in the management of a great enterprise, it was only right and proper that a certain amount of secrecy should attach to negotiations until they were concluded, or he is wrong now. Sir Henry Thornton enjoys the confidence of the Canadian people. He has started upon this proposition in connection with obtaining continental business. Either we are to trust his judgment in that regard or we are not. If it is not a good thing for him to look abroad across the channel and endeavour to find avenues by which men and women of the Continent who want to travel across the ocean to Canada, or beyond Canada to cross the Pacific also, can do so; if it is not sound business for him to do that, then the position is a very singular one. This must be sound business, and if in the carrying out of that idea of sound business, he is to be asked, in the course of negotiations, to satisfy the curiosity of my right hon. friend and his deskmate as regards everyone to whom he has talked, everything he has talked about and all these things that have taken place during the consideration of the proposition, surely that is not wise. We on this side of the House trust and believe in Sir Henry Thornton. We think it is in the interest of the Canadian people that he should be given an opportunity to make good. He has been in Canada for a matter of only some four, five or six months, and already there is evidence of renewed impulse to the railways and renewed confidence amongst the Canadian people. As regards this matter we say to this committee that we think it should trust to Sir Henry Thornton's judgment. We believe results will justify his action, and we think the motion of the hon. gentleman in regard to the reduction of this item and the attitude of the right hon. gentleman are, as they were declared to be by the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Cannon), purely a matter of playing politics.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Will the minister inform the committee whether, in his opinion, this is a capital expenditure or not?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I say this to my hon. friend that there has been no expenditure in regard to this matter.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I say further that my hon. friend probably did not catch my point. Notwithstanding the hilariousness of those leaders of his, I challenge them to show where in the act there is any authority for what they have been stating. They are absolutely unable to do so.

Mr. BROWN: It is with some hesitation that I enter into a discussion of this subject. As to whether the expenditure in question was a wise one or not, I shall not with the present information I have at hand, presume to pronounce an opinion. Certainly I should not presume to pronounce an opinion upon the legal aspect of the question; neither will I, in the course of my few remarks, impute to any person motives such as the playing of politics or any other motive than the welfare of the country. I have no desire to play politics regarding this

10 p.m.

matter if I ever was inclined to such a course. I have, however, been intensely anxious to come to a proper conclusion regarding this question, and if called upon to cast a vote, to cast a vote that will be justified in my own mind, and that I can justify to my constituents and the people of Canada generally. It has been urged upon us that if we vote against this expenditure which has been made, we are casting a vote against the interest of the Canadian National Railways. Whether that statement be true or not, it would not be fair to say to any persons that they are deliberately doing so. I would like to take it for granted that all hon. members in this House are desirous of seeing the Canadian National Railways a success. Yet it is quite possible that injury may be done to that system even if we do not do so by deliberate intent.

This question has brought to us one of the most difficult problems connected with our National Railways; that is the question as to how far we can give to those to whom we have entrusted the management of our railways similar powers to those possessed by Mr. Beatty and his associates in the management of the great Canadian Pacific railway, and at the same time secure for the shareholders represented by their representatives here in parliament, those rights which naturally reside in the shareholders of a great company. I think I am right in saying that that is the most difficult problem which we have to face, to know just at what point to draw the line between giving a free hand to those managing our railway system, and at the same time reserving our rights as representatives of the owners of the system.

Perhaps even to define this by statute would be one of our most difficult problems, and I am quite willing to say this that, perhaps, the present statute, if it is interpreted by the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen), that there is a distinction between capital expenditure and operating charges, gives the wisest distinction that can be made. Whether that distinction is made in the law as it stands, I am not, as I said before, going to pronounce an opinion. Granting, however, that that is a correct interpretation of the law, I think I can imagine that an occasion might arise where even the letter of the law might need to be violated. I think I can imagine that a situation might arise that would necessitate a violation of the strict letter of the law. The extent to which we might condone such a violation would of course have to be determined by the circumstances of the case as they arose.

When the government made the announcement to the country that they were going to give Sir Henry Thornton a free hand in the management of the railways, I think the whole country from the Atlantic to the Pacific gave their approval to such a declaration. To me there is in the whole situation in Canada to-day nothing that I look upon as more necessary to our ultimate well-being than that our government railways should be made a success. We desire the success of the Canadian National Railways; but success will depend on many different factors; it will depend on the loyalty with which the people of Canada support those roads, and I believe there is in the country an increasing feeling of loyalty towards that institution.

I believe it is quite correct to say that if we go among the people we shall find a growing sentiment that they feel "This is something that belongs to us." And I think there is a growing feeling of optimism, a feeling that success can ultimately be achieved. But while a number of factors enter into the success of the road, it seems to me the outstanding factor will be the capacity and the capability of the man we put at the head of the system. In other words, we have to rely upon Sir Henry Thornton. Now, the question that must necessarily come up in our minds is, to what extent are we willing to trust the man that we have placed at the head of the system. As I look upon the situation to-day I think I am willing to take this position, that if Sir Henry Thornton does not make a success of this system, then it is inevitably doomed to failure. I believe we are now just at that critical stage, that it is a case of succeed or fail, and if Sir Henry Thornton does not make a success of our Canadian National Railways I doubt the possibility of getting any other man to do so. That is, if I correctly estimate Sir Henry Thornton, he is a man that would not very long put up with too much nagging. And the man who would put up with much nagging would not likely be the type of man that would make a success of this system.

I believe there is danger in a man becoming unduly autocratic, there is danger in his going too far in the reckless expenditure of the people's money. I realize that danger, and I do not need any person in this House or outside to impress upon me the danger that confronts us in that direction. But to my mind the greatest danger that faces our National Railway system to-day is undue political interference. That, to my mind is infinitely a more imminent danger than any other that can possibly arise. With that thought in my mind, and holding the views I have expressed, I am disposed, with our present limited knowledge of this transaction,

to give Sir Henry Thornton a fairly free hand. The time will come when fuller information will no doubt be disclosed to us. At the moment I am not disposed to condone this particular transaction, I think it is quite evident that in some aspects it merits our disapprobation, but at the same time, holding as I do that the greatest danger confronting our National Railways is undue political interference, I feel disposed to give Sir Henry Thornton the benefit of every reasonable doubt. I think if Sir Henry Thornton is the man that we take him to be he is capable of rising to his great opportunities. I do not know if he is likely to hear what I say or take any notice of it if he does, but I think he has the greatest opportunity that any man ever had in the commercial or industrial world. He has to take hold of this National Railway system, handicapped it is true by tremendous over-capitalization, and to make it a success. We pay him a salary, and properly so, that gives him the possibility of enjoying everything in life that any man needs to enjoy, and we offer him, as I say, an opportunity of doing the biggest thing that any man has ever done in the commercial or industrial world—an opportunity of doing something, not for himself but for the good of the Canadian people. If Sir Henry Thornton rises to the opportunity that is given to him, as I believe he is a big enough man to do, he can establish for himself a name before which the names of Ford, Rockefeller and other men who have accumulated great fortunes for themselves will look small indeed.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Can the hon. member tell me how much Sir Henry Thornton has at stake in the Canadian National Railway system compared with the people of Canada?

Mr. BROWN: His reputation. The opportunity has been given to him not only to sustain his reputation but to make a still greater reputation for himself, a reputation that will be the greatest that any man has ever achieved in the commercial and industrial world. That is what I think he has at stake. While it may be possible—I do not know at present—that he has been led into a transaction which is in violation of the strict letter of the law, for myself I propose to withhold judgment on the merits of this particular case until full information is given to us.

In regard to the amendment itself, the minister has stated that its acceptance would not affect the transaction in any way at all, but would simply mean curtailing the expenditure of the board for the coming year and crippling their work to the extent of $2,000,000. If that be the correct statement of the case, holding as we from the West do, the necessity for the immediate construction of many branch lines—there are many sections out there in need of railway facilities—for my part, even if I were disposed to support the amendment on other grounds, I could not consent to do so now and in any way cripple the management of the Canadian National Railways for the coming year.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I only rise to remark that I think my hon. friend, the Acting Minister of National Defence (Mr. Macdonald) has overlooked one important point in his argument as to whether this expenditure was or was not authorized under the act as an expenditure which might be made by Sir Henry Thornton and his board of directors, irrespective altogether of the Governor in Council or of the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham). Let me point out that when parliament sees fit to make grants for railways or for anything else it usually does so in specific, definite language, surrounded by certain conditions. I note that in the estimate now before the committee out of which this particular $2,000,000 must come, as well as in the similar estimate last year, the language is very definite and very express.

Last year the vote was under three separate headings: 136 for the Canadian National Railways, 137 for the Grand Trunk Railway Company and 138 for the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. This year the amounts are consolidated under a single item owing to the consolidation of the three railways. But I find that in the three votes last year the limitations, restrictions and conditions were identical with those which accompany this vote to-day. What are they? Under vote 136 last year an amount of $42,000,000 was granted:

> (a) To pay operating deficits;
> (b) Acquisition of property, materials and supplies;
> (c) Interest and sinking funds on notes;
> (d) Principal and interest of maturing or matured loans;
> (e) Construction and betterments;
> (f) Co-ordination or consolidation of railway lines and facilities.

Now, if the section had stopped there, there might have been some force in the argument of the Minister of Railways. But it did not stop there. The next clause is:

> The amount herein authorized may be applied from time to time, in the discretion of the Governor in Council by way of bonus, in cash or by way of guarantee, or partly one way partly the other.

Money voted by this parliament to this road for the acquisition of property may be expended how? By Sir Henry Thornton? No; at the discretion of the Governor in Council. That is the act passed by the House last year—it is the statute I am reading from; and I find almost identical language in the vote this year. Turn to page 31, vote 139, the one we are now discussing. The language is a little different; in this case the restriction and the limitation are in the first clause. It says:

> The amount herein authorized may be applied from time to time, in the discretion of the Governor in Council.

Not in the discretion of the minister; not in the discretion of Sir Henry Thornton. And what is that money for?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): That is not the act.

Mr. GUTHRIE: It is the estimate I am reading from, which becomes an act when it is passed by parliament. I read a moment ago from the statute, not from the estimates of last year; the latter are in the Appropriation Act. It is chapter 53 of the acts of last session to which I referred.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): It is not in the Canadian National Railway Act.

Mr. GUTHRIE: No, in the Appropriation Act, in which the limitation is expressly defined. Now, I take the vote of this year and I find not identically the same language, but language that is similar and of the same effect. I read from item 139, at the top of page 32 of the Estimates. The language is:

> The amount herein authorized may be applied from time to time, in the discretion of the Governor in Council.

And what was that amount for? How may that money be used? Turn to page 31: "(a) Operating deficits; (b) acquisition of property." That would cover the present case; it is the same express limitation of last year. Now, such a limitation upon the expenditure of that money, can it be argued for a moment that Sir Henry Thornton can take that amount out of the treasury without the authority of an order in council or the consent of the minister? It passes my comprehension how that can be done. Let me just touch upon the other question. The powers of the Canadian National Railway Board as it exists are set forth in the Act of 1919. Only such powers as are set forth in that act can be exercised by that company; it gets them all there; it has no existence whatever apart from that statute. What did we give to the company? I shall not read the sections, but we gave them the management and the operation of the lines of railway; that is the meaning of section 11. Then follow the restrictions: They cannot acquire new lines of railway without going to the Governor in Council for authority. They cannot amalgamate with other companies, they cannot issue securities, without going to the Governor in Council for authority. All they can do is to look after the management and operation of the road. I quite agree with the Minister of Railways in his interpretation of the act; I heard him on two occasions plainly give it as his opinion this was a capital expenditure and that capital expenditure could not regularly be made without the matter having first come before the minister and the Governor in Council. Well, apart from the National Railway Act, what about the vote of this parliament? Are the express terms and conditions under which parliament voted that money to be absolutely disregarded by the head of this railway board? Is he to be supreme? Is he to be above parliament or the votes of parliament? Is the limitation which we impose by act of parliament when we vote the money to be of no effect? I do not know whether the purchase was wise or was unwise; it is beyond me. I know I heard with a great deal of satisfaction the minister say to-day that the thing would not occur again. It is easy to see from the attitude of the minister that had he been consulted in the matter the transaction would never have gone through in the manner in which it did. But what I maintain is that there has been a breach of the letter and of the spirit of the National Railway Act; there has been a breach of the limitations imposed by this parliament when we voted the money. It was a wrong thing for Sir Henry Thornton to do. If in the opinion of the committee he should be excused, that is another question, but I do not think the offence should be condoned. I believe some reprimand should be offered under all these circumstances. For my part I am willing to leave the reprimand entirely in the hands of the Minister of Railways. I think he both feels and sees the real situation and realizes that there is something very wrong in the whole transaction.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Mr. Chairman, I do not know that anybody could contribute much that is new or informative to this debate. The remarks of the Prime Minister this afternoon and those of the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Brown) just a little while ago represent my views upon this matter, and I

think each of them has plotted out the course that parliament should follow in this particular case. The leader of the Opposition (Mr Meighen) and the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Guthrie) asserted on several occasions this evening that there was no legal warrant for the purchase made by Sir Henry Thornton, president of the National Railways. Even if there were not legal authority for the course pursued, I doubt if the country generally would be much exercised over that fact; if the expenditure itself was sound, parliament and the country would condone the transaction But I wish to say with the same amount of confidence that was shown by the leader of the Opposition and by the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) that the action taken is well within the statute. Whether it is wise to incur expenditures of this magnitude without direct contact with the government may be, of course, a question for debate. Now, section 23 has been referred to several times. Clearly that clause is not relevant to the issue; it merely gives the company power to construct and operate railways under the authority of the Governor in Council. That is not the case we are discussing. There is another section, 29, which authorizes the company to purchase the securities or shares of going businesses which are incidental to the work of a railway, such as hotel businesses or electric power businesses. That is not this case, and that section is not applicable. Section 11 is perhaps the most important section, and it has been referred to by the hon. member for South Wellington. May I read that again:

> The Governor in Council may from time to time by order in council entrust to the company the management and operation of any lines of railway or parts thereof.

That section entrusts to the company the power of operating and managing the Canadian National Railways. That company therefore has the same powers that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has in the operation of its property. It has all the powers that any other railway company in Canada has, and I ask hon. gentlemen if it is not well within the legal and statutory powers of boards of directors of railway companies to rent offices, to build offices for the company's purposes. The directors of this company have exactly the same powers that the directors of any other railway company in Canada has, and I submit with confidence there can be no question as to the powers of the directors of a company to purchase buildings for the company's own purposes. I do not think that is open to question.

Then there is another section, section 16 which provides:

> Notwithstanding anything in the Government Railways Act or the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act, all expenses incurred in connection with the operation or management of the Canadian Government Railways, under the provisions of this act, shall be paid out of the receipts and revenues of the Canadian Government Railways.

Now the question is if the acquisition of a building in Paris for the purposes of the company's offices is necessary to the prudent and aggressive management of the company. Surely such expenditure would come within that section, and a deficit would require to be liquidated by a vote of this parliament. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has referred to the estimates to be voted in connection with the Canadian National Railways this session. I submit that whether this transaction is lawful or not is to be determined by the statute of 1919 in reference to the Canadian National Railways, and not by the verbiage accompanying a proposed vote in parliament. It is true that when it comes into the Appropriation Act it has the effect of a statute, but even in that instance it provides for the payment of the deficit, and if the purchase of this property is responsible for incurring a portion of that deficit then I think the vote which the hon. member read supports the contention which I have made.

Now just a few words as to the transaction itself. The purchase of this building may indicate a great deal of courage, excellent judgment and prevision on the part of Sir Henry Thornton. It may be a bold and splendid conception and one that will ultimately prove of value to the country and to our railway system. The transaction may conform with the usual and best business practices known to us to-day, and yet it is one that is liable to misinterpretation and misrepresentation, and that, Mr. Chairman, is one of the difficulties of government ownership and government operation. It will always be difficult for the Canadian National Railways to do the right thing in connection with the big things in a proper way because a critical public and a critical parliament will not accord to them the same freedom of action and of judgment that is usually accorded to business men and to the directors and managers of a big concern.

Now what are the facts? So far as I can gather them by a reading of Hansard chiefly, I would suppose the facts to be somewhat as follows: Sir Henry Thornton, the president of the Canadian National Railways, believed it was in the interests of the company

to have an office well located in the city of Paris, to be the centre possibly of their European operations. I gather also that it was their intention to lease from somebody else this particular building, and that at a certain stage negotiations were on for the purchase of this property by a syndicate. It transpired that another purchaser was in the field whom they feared might purchase the property and prevent the Canadian National Railways from obtaining it for rental purposes. In consequence of that Sir Henry Thornton had to act quickly, and from the current funds of the Canadian National Railways he advanced $2,000,000 to purchase this property, not to hold the property, but to give him temporary ownership while he undertook the organization of a syndicate outside to take over the property and lease to the company such portion of it as they desired for the purposes of the company. I see my friend angularly opposite to me smiling.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It is a great joke.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): But these things are done every day by reputable business men, by the ablest business men in the world.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: With public money?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I will come to that in a minute. They do it every day, and if it is sound in their case why is it unsound in this particular instance? Let me proceed a little further. I stated that when Sir Henry Thornton secured possession of the property he contemplated the organization of a purchasing syndicate to take it over and to lease from them a portion of the building for the purposes of the company. That is done every day, and I say that there is nothing objectionable in it, and if he did not do it, who else would do it? I admit that the whole circumstances permit the suspicious mind to create a false picture of this whole transaction. Hon. gentlemen want some more information. What further information do they want? What further information would be of any good to them?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: We have not any yet.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Am I not right in saying that they are praying they will not receive any because it might spoil the whole purpose of their argument of yesterday and to-day? If the facts disclosed that this proposed purchasing syndicate belonged to the city of New York they would say, why not have organized a Canadian syndicate? The fact probably is that you could not organize a syndicate in Canada at the present time to engage in such a transaction. You probably would require to go to a large city where very large sums of money for investment purposes were available. If the syndicate was a Canadian syndicate, what would happen? Somebody in it would be found to be the thirty-second cousin of someone connected with the railway or the forty-second cousin of some member on this side of the House or of a member of the government. Already the leader of the Opposition is playing upon the name of the man in whose name the property is now held, and I fancy one could make an interesting and destructive political speech on that fact alone. If the leader of the New York syndicate had the Hebraic name of Moses as my right hon. friend has suggested, that might afford ample ground for political pamphlets and many political speeches.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that if Sir Henry Thornton believed it was in the interests of the company to own a property in Paris he pursued the only course open to him. I am not sure whether it is advisable to have an office in Paris at the present time. Perhaps it is. I am not to be judge of that. Sir Henry Thornton is the adviser of this country in this particular matter, and I submit that we must accept his judgment. And probably the idea is a sound one. It may be a very big idea and worthy of being carried out. If the Canadian National Railways have an active organization in Paris it may be worth 100 or 500 commercial agents in Europe. It may not only be the representative there of the railway system itself, but it will be the agent of the men of business in this country, and will be an active propagandist for the development of our trade in European countries. I would urge upon hon. gentlemen not to disparage, and damage and destroy a transaction that seems a perfectly natural one and one that is engaged in almost every day by large railway or industrial companies. I assume—I am bound to assume, and I think every hon. member in the House should assume—that Sir Henry Thornton has acted in good faith in this matter and really has at heart the interest of the National Railways and nothing else. He does not anticipate a permanent capital investment; evidently he will shortly be recouped the temporary advance which he secured through the bank on behalf of the railways, and the railway treasury will then be repaid the advance. I assume again that Sir Henry Thornton will be in a position to see that it is carried through.

Now it may be, Mr. Chairman, as I said before, and as I think the Minister of Railways said, that in transactions of this size it would be better that before the transaction is launched or completed, full negotiation and discussion should take place with the government, or at least with the Minister of Railways. I feel, however, that Sir Henry Thornton deemed it to be an expenditure which should be made. In his judgment it is one that will enure to the advantage of the railways and to the country, and as it was only a temporary expenditure I think he should be supported. It would be very unfortunate if every transaction of the Canadian National Railways became the matter of a discussion in parliament. I do not deny the right of the opposition to engage in the criticism they have indulged in yesterday and to-day. They, perhaps, have only done their duty. They may have rendered a public service. They have, however, already said all they can say upon the question, and I do not think they are performing their duty in any better way than they have already done by moving an amendment and asking for a vote upon this particular item.

Mr. BAXTER: Having spoken before I almost regret to address the committee again upon this subject. I assure them that I would not do so if it were not for the very peculiar positions taken by my hon. friend the Acting Minister of National Defence, and by my very good and hon. friend the member for Halifax who has just spoken. With reference to the latter, permit me to express the hope that when he shall be called to that eminent position to which the newspapers are at present appointing him, he will display perhaps not a more judicial attitude, but that at least the law administered by him will be of a much better brand than that which he has propounded to the committee tonight. I know that neither the Acting Minister of National Defence nor the member for Halifax are at all oblivious of the decision of the court of Exchequer Chamber in the very well known law case of the Ashbury Company vs. Riché. What was that? An incorporation, under a British statute of a company to carry on railway operations, and when they undertook to buy a railway in Switzerland it was held beyond their powers. And yet had the court of Exchequer Chamber had the benefit of the eloquence of the Acting Minister of National Defence they would have been told in thunder tones that you could not find a line in the statute forbidding it. And no man of any standing as a practising barrister would expect to find a line in the statute forbidding it. That is only what I must characterize as simply a bit of bluff put forward to help the government out of a difficult position. It is not law, it is bluff. That is what we got from the Acting Minister of National Defence to-night. Now, the case that I have spoken of stands. It is law. It is not a matter of politics, it is a rule to which all people in the British Empire must submit in the construction of a matter of this kind; and that rule applies just as much to the construction of the act relating to the Canadian National Railways as it does to anything else. In this case there is a company incorporated, and what is it incorporated for? I know that other hon. and learned gentlemen have addressed the committee on the subject, and at a good deal of length, and I do not propose to take up very much time, but I am going to point out something that I think has not been pointed out yet. We use a preamble in the statutes for the purpose of explaining, and circumscribing, and interpreting the rest of the statute, and in that very preamble—the preface, the reason that is given to this legislation—we are told that:

—it is expedient to provide for the incorporation of a company under which—

What now?

—the railways, works and undertakings of the companies comprised in the Canadian Northern system may be consolidated—

Now, that is present or past. It is something that has existed and still exists—

—and together with the Canadian Government Railways operated as a National Railway system.

Does that indicate anything other than Canada? Does that suggest the carrying on of a railway in France? Could you have built a railway from Calais to Paris under that legislation? Did anybody ever think of such a thing? The court of Exchequer Chamber burst that soap bubble fifty years ago. It has been blown again to-night to serve a very obvious purpose. Now then we have a company formed, and I am not going into the details of that except to say that it is not a one man company such as we sometimes hear spoken of. It is a railway board of directors, or is supposed to be so, and the gentleman who is chairman is only one member of it; but the astonishing thing—leaving all other legal considerations out of the question—is that the Minister of Railways has not been able to point out to this House that the purchase, or transaction, or agreement, or whatever I may call this nebulous thing that has taken place, whatever it is, is not the act of the board of directors itself, not the act of the company; it is the act of one individual

unsupported by a resolution, unsupported by even the shadow of the company, and not reported to the minister. That is clear beyond the necessity of any further demonstration. It cannot be denied that if the minister could have had a resolution of the board of directors and brought it here he would have had some footing. But he has got nothing but the solitary personal act—however good the intention may have been, and I am not going to discuss that—nothing but the solitary personal act of Sir Henry Thornton uncommunicated to the minister and, as far as the evidence before this committee is concerned, uncommunicated to any one of his colleagues. That is what this House is asked to ratify and endorse as the usual, the ordinary and proper mode of conducting the business of the National Railways.

Is the committee prepared to accept that? Is the government prepared to stand back of it? I sympathize with and admire that attitude of the Minister of Railways, who clothing his statement in such language as is necessary to soften the blow, has practically told Sir Henry Thornton that this thing is not to occur again, and has assured the House that it will not occur again with his sanction. What am I to say of the group of apologists on the other side of the House, who have quoted everything from discussions in connection with matters pertaining to the National Railway, have quoted from my right hon. friend's remarks, and have almost given to a speech of his in the House a few years ago the solemnity of an act of parliament, and that from the same gentleman who denied that the act of 1921, because it dealt with finance, was an act of parliament, and treated it as only a resolution—a strange case of mental confusion or moral obliquity, I do not know which. When we turn to section 11, to which the hon. senior member for Halifax has referred, we find the following:

> The Governor in Council may from time to time by order in council entrust to the company the management and operation of any lines of railway or parts thereof, and any property or works of whatsoever description.

And so forth. We find nothing there about new construction. Hon. members will find a section that has not been referred to, that permits the powers of expropriation to be exercised.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): May I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. BAXTER: Certainly.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): If the cost of this building in Paris were $10,000 and not $2,000,000, would my hon. friend think that the Canadian National Railway would not have legal authority to buy that for its own purposes?

Mr. BAXTER: What purposes?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): The company's purposes.

Mr. BAXTER: Well I hope, when justice is administered in the Exchequer Court, that it will not be regulated by the number of dollars involved in the transaction, and that one matter will not be considered legal because only $10,000 is involved, and another matter considered illegal because $1,000,000 is involved. It would not be legal on account of the small amount involved. I cannot draw such a distinction.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): The hon. member does not get my point. I wanted to test the soundness of his argument, and I think he might admit that it is not a sound argument. Does he seriously mean to say that the Canadian National Railway, without the authority of the Governor in Council, could not go to the city of Paris or to London and buy a building for $5,000 or $10,000 for its own purposes?

Mr. BAXTER: Leave the amount out of the question altogether. I thought the hon. member was drawing a distinction as to the amount. I say they have no legal authority to buy one square foot of land in Paris or anywhere else under this act.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Could they lease an office, buy furniture and put it in?

Mr. BAXTER: No, they cannot carry on business.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I think my hon. friend, at the close of the sitting of the House this evening, should sit down and reason out the matter.

Mr. BAXTER: I will take the words of the Acting Minister of National Defence (Mr. Macdonald), and I will employ them to better reasoning than he employed them. When considering the charter of the company, I will take what I find within the four corners of the act constituting the company, in order to find some provision authorizing a particular thing to be done. If it is not there, it follows that the thing is not authorized. I have not read every line of the act, but I have seen nothing that instances foreign countries as places where business may be carried on. I find in the act provision for expropriation, and I thought they might be referred to, because I find the plan may be signed by the minister or the

president or vice-president of the company. But if members were reading the act, and thought that it followed from the language that they could acquire property by expropriation—but of course that would be within Canada—without the consent of the Governor in Council, they would still be wrong, because the Railway Act permiting expropriation for railway purposes requires the preliminary consent of the minister before even the plan can be filed. If you read this act from end to end you will find it does not contain a single provision looking to the making of capital expenditure by this board, or the acquisition of property or anything of that kind, without the consent of the Governor in Council. Section 23 has been referred to and I need hardly repeat it, but it says:

> With the approval of the Governor in Council and upon any location sanctioned by the Minister of Railways and Canals—

Will any hon. member say that that means in England, Scotland, Ireland or France?

> —the company may from time to time construct and operate railway lines, branches and extensions or railway facilities or property of any description in respect to the construction whereof respectively, parliament may hereafter authorize the necessary expenditure or the guarantee of an issue of the company's securities.

When has parliament authorized the expenditure, assuming the company could lawfully expend money in France or in England? And when has the approval of the Governor General in Council been given?

As to the particular transaction, I do not know whether it is a building or not. The thing has become so absolutely nebulous that it may be a sort of dirigible balloon that is floating over Paris. I cannot get much accurate information. The need of this country is the handling of freight, passenger traffic is carried ordinarily at a loss by the railways, and the freight sustains the passenger traffic. All that I can see of this nebulous proposition is that somebody wants to advertise for passenger business. I cannot conceive what freight is going to be brought to the National Railways by this expenditure. We cannot, however, get any information. We are not even told the particular purpose. We are not told how many rooms the railway is expected to occupy, or whether it is for freight or passenger business. That sort of thing cannot be a secret. If it were to be a secret it would have to be equally a secret that this is an hotel. Perhaps it is not. I sympathize with the position the minister is placed in when he can tell us so little about it, but I must make a protest against the misinterpretation of the statutes by the Acting Minister of National Defence and against the attempt to influence members who do not profess to make law their vocation in life, to misrepresent the application of legal principles to the whole subject, particularly for the purpose of political excuse or political advantage.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: In view of the fact that an amendment has been introduced, I wish to state my position with regard to that amendment. Last night I endeavoured to state my position on the general question. I have no desire whatever to cover that ground again. As I listened a few minutes ago to the rather laboured defence put forward by the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) it seemed that there was full justification for a protest against the action that has been taken by Sir Henry Thornton. The senior member for Halifax suggested that the expenditure was but a temporary one, and on that ground no exception should be taken. It seems to me his argument might be used to carry him a great deal further than this particular case If, for example, in encouraging this tourist traffic from Paris, it might be considered advisable that some sort of a race track should be started or an amusement park or a seaside resort be opened, in that case it would seem to be quite justifiable that Sir Henry Thornton should take one or two million dollars to organize a syndicate to start some such enterprise as that. In carrying on the work of the railway or providing freight traffic for the railways from, we will say, Prince Rupert eastward, it would be quite justifiable, according to the same line of argument, that Sir Henry Thornton should organize a fish company up in Prince Rupert; at least he might take one or two million dollars temporarily with the idea of organizing some syndicate with the understanding that if it were successful, he would put the money back again. The argument is no defence for an action of this kind and makes it all the more necessary that some protest should be made by the House to check such a practice as this. The hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Cannon) suggested that anyone who would vote in favour of the amendment was simply playing politics. Some of us here fortunately have a short parliamentary record, and we do not need to worry very much about what we did in previous years. I should like to suggest that we have a right, a duty to act on the merits of this question irrespective of who introduced the amendment or any motive that may lie behind it. It was also suggested by the hon. member for Dorchester that anyone who supported the amendment proposed, would be

going back on the principle of public ownership.

Mr. CANNON: My hon. friend might have understood that, but I do not think I said so.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: That is what I understood. I may have misunderstood. I should, however, like to say that in supporting the amendment proposed, I believe I am doing my best to uphold the principle of public ownership. I believe most firmly in public ownership; but I am not going to be deceived by mere words. I do not want to see set up in this country a public ownership that means very little more than an irresponsible dictatorship. That, it seems to me, is what very readily we may see grow up if we allow this kind of practice to continue.

So far as we have had evidence, produced this evening or at previous sessions of the House, there has been no consent by the minister or by the government, and as the hon. member for St. John City (Mr. Baxter) points out, we have not even had evidence to show that the board itself gave its endorsation to the action taken by Sir Henry Thornton. Under these circumstances, I do not see that we have any other course than to vote in favour of the proposed amendment. A previous resolution was turned down on the ground of being out of order; if there were some other way in which we could show our disapproval, possibly we might feel that we like to take that course; but under the circumstances it seems that the only way of doing so is to vote for the amendment, and that I propose to do.

Mr. McCONICA: I had not intended to discuss this question, but it seems to me that we might review the situation as has developed. Sir Henry Thornton and the board of directors apparently decided that they wanted a home in Paris. Was that a wise decision? I do not know. I do not think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Woodsworth) who has just taken his seat, knows. I do not think any man in this House knows. I believe the judgment of the board of directors and of Sir Henry Thornton on that question is entitled to greater weight than my judgment. I can conceive that such a thing would be desirable, and I think it would be in the interest of the railroad system. But I do not know much about it. What did he do? He took the advice of an eminent barrister how to go about this matter, the advice of a gentleman whose name has been given us in this House to-day, a gentleman who knew the law, and who knew the facts. He was advised by this gentleman that a certain course of procedure was entirely regular and legal, and he adopted that course. Hon. gentlemen have been complaining that they do not know what has taken place; but without knowing the facts, they are giving us their knowledge of what the law is. The gentleman under whose advice this action was taken knew the facts, and when the matter is one of legal opinion, it is very well to apply the law to the facts if you want to get a sound opinion.

Mr. LAPOINTE: That sounds sound.

Mr. McCONICA: Then what did he do? He arranged to guarantee a loan in Paris and hypothecated, as it were, $2,000,000 of the money of the railway company. If the amount had been $2,000, there would not have been any question that he had a right to do this. If he had made an arrangement by which he might rent an office in Paris or in Luseland, Saskatchewan, the village from which I hail, it would have been within his right and power to do so. The size of the transaction does not make any difference as regards the principle involved if parliament votes money and puts it in the bank. What is the situation? As regards this parliament, or as regards this $2,000,000, no action which we men take can undo what has been done in this case. The performance is over. Shall we interfere when we cannot possibly do any good? Shall we compel the minister to disclose all the transaction and the situation of the parties, and possibly jeopardize the whole performance in order that hon. gentlemen may know some things which they do not know? This thing will keep. We are going to have another session of parliament one of these days. If it is found that an irregular transaction has been made or a losing game has been played, then we can haul Sir Henry Thornton over the coals. I do not see why we should break right into the midst of this transaction and perhaps jeopardize negotiations, when we have already incurred our part of the responsibility, when our money has been put up and when, if we spill the beans, we shall be the only losers, so far as I can understand the matter. Why not let events take their course in connection with this transaction in the sincere hope that it will be all right, as I believe it will be? Sir Henry Thornton has been put in charge of this great railway system. He is spending millions upon millions of dollars. We are trusting him to buy locomotives, coal, cars, rails, and to carry on the greatest business transaction on earth to-day. Have we confidence enough in him to believe he can make a deal to rent offices in Paris? If he is not competent to carry this transaction through in what he has

been advised is a perfectly legal and proper manner, then he has no business to be in the place he occupies and we should get rid of him. If he cannot carry through this transaction he cannot run the railroad. I for one have implicit confidence in his ability as a railroad man, and in his integrity as a gentleman, and I believe that the acquisition of this property will in the end prove to be a benefit to the railroad and to the country.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is the system of audit at present applied to the Canadian Government Railways?

Mr. GRAHAM: It is the same system that we have always had.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: As I recollect, there used to be a pre-audit in connection with large matters. Is my memory wrong?

Mr. GRAHAM: I am informed that that system has not been changed since my hon. friend was Minister of Finance.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I want to find out if you have to get the auditor's O.K. on your cheque in connection with large expenditures.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am informed that that is only in connection with matters where the money is advanced by the government. The same system was in vogue under my hon. friend.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Do I understand that the pre-audit only applies to actual government payments?

Mr. GRAHAM: By the Auditor General, yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What protection is there, who can get a cheque?

Mr. GRAHAM: The railway has its own auditors, also an outside firm of very competent auditors.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: But I think my hon. friend knows perfectly well that the usual railway operation is that while payments in the discharge of ordinary business can be made—and I am forgetting all about the legal question—when you have an extraordinary payment it can only be made by the board of directors. That being so, how was this money got out without vote or justification?

Mr. GRAHAM: I am told by the deputy minister that we have the exact system used by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and as required by the Interstate Commerce Commission. All the railways are operated under that system.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Does one man get out a cheque under this system?

Mr. GRAHAM: It is approved by the proper officer in the department, then it is checked by the comptroller and the treasurer. There is no change in the system.

Amendment (Mr. Stevens) negatived: Yeas, 19; Nays, 78.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Marcil): The amendment is lost. Shall the resolution carry?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then, Mr. Chairman, in connection with the resolution, I want the minister to give me the details under (a), the operating deficits for each of the four companies for last year, and the amount spent.

Mr. GRAHAM: I presume my hon. friend wants the figures for last year?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am asking for the vote this year and then last year.

Mr. GRAHAM: I gave him this year's.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: May I have it again, please.

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes.

Operating deficits on Canadian Government Railways, as estimated, $3,000,000.
Canadian Northern Railway, $2,500,000.
Grand Trunk Railway, (nothing).
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, $4,500,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Now, the vote of last year.

Mr. GRAHAM: This is all in Hansard of some weeks ago.

Canadian Government Railways, $2,496,721.91.
Canadian Northern Railway, $2,946,729.72.
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, $4,292,866.41.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That is the actual deficit. Will my friend give me the vote last year?

Mr. GRAHAM: I have not got that.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I asked specially for that information and it was sent over by the deputy, but I was told I had to return it again for use here.

Mr. GRAHAM: The estimate for last year was:

Canadian Government Railways, $7,000,000.
Canadian Northern Railway, $5,000,000.
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, $8,000,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then the next, acquisition of property.

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not seem to have it in that form.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am trying to keep it just as simple as possible. I am referring to his own vote.

Mr. GRAHAM: The amount for acquisition of property this year is $2,902,641.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That would be for all the systems?

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes. We do not seem to have it in the same form for last year.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think so. The deputy will know whether the form has been changed.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am informed that the form is not quite what it was last year.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: If my memory is not wrong, my hon. friend is incorrect in that. The statute reads exactly the same, and the vote was practically the same. These figures are no good at all unless we can have them as they ought to be—comparative figures.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am told that the amount was $2,800,000 for last year. Owing to the amalgamation we have one item this year where we had four before, and by adding the four together we get the amount I have mentioned.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: May I have the figures of the four votes for last year, please?

Mr. GRAHAM: I am told that it was under vote 115 of last year.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think we had better clear that up, because I do not want either to get wrong myself or to start the minister wrong. Now, I have before me item 115 of last year, and as I read it, it is not the item I was referring to. If the minister looks at item 136 of last year he will find that parliament was asked to vote—whether there is anything in it or not I do not know, but I propose to find out—for "acquisition of property, materials and supplies" exactly as we have it this year in the main vote, The item that is now pointed out to me, 115, has to do with miscellaneous railway equipment. Of course, it may be an overlapping. I notice the wording is as follows:

> The assistance herein provided may be by way of advances to the Canadian National Rolling Stock Limited or to any company comprised in the Canadian Northern Railway system, or the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway system, or by way of equipment or materials acquired by the minister.

What I want is the amount of the appropriation last year under item (b) of vote 136 of last year. It is exactly the same wording as in the item of this year.

[Mr. Graham.]

Mr. GRAHAM: Does my hon. friend want the details of last year?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am not asking for the details. I am merely asking for the amounts that parliament was asked to give last year according to the various details of last year's vote. There ought to be no mystery about this.

Mr. GRAHAM: What my hon. friend wants, then, is a comparison between the amounts appropriated in 1922 and in 1923 for the different purposes set out in the item. I have not the details here, but I will get them for my hon. friend. The difficulty is that last year the amounts were in different votes, while this year they are in one.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: To a certain extent that is quite true, but there cannot be a great deal of difficulty, because the wording in each case is the same and all that has to be done is to keep to the same designations of these different details right through.

Mr. GRAHAM: We will work it out for my hon. friend and let him have it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I also want to know what was spent on each one of these items under last year's vote. That must be there too.

Mr. GRAHAM: There is a little difficulty owing to the two systems but we can work it out. I will see that my hon. friend gets it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: When shall I get it?

Mr. GRAHAM: We will have it for the first of the week.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What does my hon. friend want to do? We have not the information now. What does he suggest? Is there any other item he wants to pass so that the matter could be discussed on that item. This is the last item I believe, and I am afraid the item cannot carry till I get the figures. I shall very likely want to discuss the figures, and this is the only item on which I could discuss the matter.

Mr. GRAHAM: We have several items for Railways and Canals on any one of which my hon. friend could have this discussion.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Which one? I thought we had put them all through.

Mr. GRAHAM: There are several items I know of for Railways and Canals and my hon. friend will be at perfect liberty to discuss

this on any one of those. We have spent two days on this item and I should like to get it through.

Mr. BELAND: Items 139 and 140 have not passed.

Mr. GRAHAM: We are on item 139 now.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Item 140 relates to the merchant marine. That is a different thing.

Mr. GRAHAM: We will not maintain that. We have several votes that have not passed yet.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think they are all passed. We put through several last night for my hon. friend.

Mr. GRAHAM: There are two votes for Canals that are not passed yet, the vote for maintenance and the Welland ship canal vote. I will keep that for my hon. friend.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: How can this matter be discussed on an item for canals?

Mr. GRAHAM: By consent it could be discussed, of course.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: As to that I would say that at an earlier date this session we had a minister who was absolutely anxious, at least so he said, that a certain matter should be discussed, but when the time came he was ruled out of order.

Mr. GRAHAM: I think it would not be done again in this case, if we have a distinct understanding.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then we have a distinct understanding that letting this item pass will not preclude the fullest discussion upon the item that my hon. friend picks out, No. 118.

Mr. GRAHAM: Which item is that?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Item 118. My hon. friend tells me that is open. Then notwithstanding the rules of the House the fullest discussion can take place in connection with these items which my hon. friend now wants to put through, and which I for the purpose of expediting business will not object to passing so long as we have that distinct understanding.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The government would ask the House to give its consent to have that done.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not know that that is enough.

Mr. MACKENZE KING: We cannot do more.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: We have had the government asking for consent before, and I remember the position in which the hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Clark) found himself. A similar pledge was given in that case but it could not be carried out. Someone objected. It is quite easy for someone to object to this understanding being carried out. It could easily be blocked. It has been done before.

Mr. GRAHAM: Further than that I might say that there will be Supplementary Estimates on which it would be fully open for my hon. friend to discuss anything in connection with this item. There can be no question about that.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Perhaps the best thing I can do is to rely on my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals. The understanding is that we let this item go through with the full right to reserve discussion.

Item agreed to.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the House adjourned at 11.29 p.m.

Monday, June 11, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

CANADIAN PRESS LIMITED

Mr. HEALY:

1. How much money has been paid to the Canadian Press, Limited, since its organization, by the Dominion government?

2. How much of the amounts advanced have been used for (a) leased wires; (b) cable service; (c) other purposes?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING: $311,499.99 has been paid to Canadian Press, Limited, made up of $287,499.99 from the grant of $50,000 voted each year since 1917-18 to aid in paying leased wire rentals, and $24,000 on account of the annual grant of $8,000 for cable services, paid since 1920-21 to Canadian Press, Limited, and formerly to the Canadian Associated Press. Statements of disbursements which indicate that the government grants have been allocated to these purposes are submitted regularly.

COST OF LIVING

Mr. CHURCH:

1. Is it the intention of the government to hold an inquiry into the present high cost of living in Canada, especially into fuel, food, rents, clothing, bread, and

other necessities of life, to include cigarettes, cigars and tobacco and restaurant prices?

2. If the government does not propose to hold such an inquiry, will they empower, this session by law, municipalities, or grand juries lawfully convened throughout Canada, to hold such inquiries so as to protect the public from extortion, and will such concurrent jurisdiction be given in such a local way to deal with the problems?

3. Will the government see that the consumer will get the benefit of any reductions in taxes set out in the budget, and what will be done to protect the consumer accordingly?

Right Hon. MACKENZIE KING:

1. No.

2. No.

3. This question does not seem to be of a character that the government could be expected to answer.

Mr. SPEAKER: In my judgment the third question is out of order.

MR. W. A. DRYDEN

Mr. MAYBEE:

1. What amount of money, if any, has been paid by the present government to W. A. Dryden, of Ontario county, Ontario?

2. What was the money paid for?

3. What trips, if any, has Mr. Dryden made at the expense of the Dominion since the present government took office?

4. What benefits have the Dominion obtained from Mr. Dryden's trips at the public expense?

Hon. Mr. MOTHERWELL:

1. $2,552.26.

2. Expenses to South America, to investigate live stock conditions, markets, etc., July 17-September 26, 1922, $2,126.76; judging live stock at fairs, February 14, 1922, $32; judging live stock at fairs, February 2, 1923, $32.50; purchase of two shorthorn bulls, March 5, 1923, $360.

3. From July 17 to September 26, 1922, Mr. Dryden visited the South American countries of Brazil, Uruguay and Argentina, for the purpose of looking into live stock conditions in those countries, and the possibilities of a market there for Canadian breeding stock.

4. For some few years Canada's export trade in pure-bred animals to the United States has been gradually falling off, until about a year ago it practically disappeared. A considerable number of breeders made representations to the government to the effect that a market might be found in certain South American countries, particularly Brazil and Argentina, if the Canadian government were willing to undertake the expense of certain shipments, particularly of beef cattle and sheep, to those countries. It was thought advisable to investigate the possibilities of these markets before participating financially in any such enterprise, and, accordingly, Mr. Dryden, whose experience as an importer and exporter of beef cattle and sheep is very well known, was asked to make a trip to South America, visiting particularly these two countries, and, incidentally, Uruguay and Paraguay, to look into these possibilities.

The report prepared by Mr. Dryden indicates his views of the possibilities of the development of such a trade and has been of very considerable value to Canada in indicating the live stock requirements of these countries, and in discussing at first hand the possibilities of the development of such a trade, which, unfortunately, seem to be rather small.

LITTLE GEORGE

Mr. LAVIGUEUR

1. Was the sentence of deportation carried out against Little George? If so, when? If not, why?

2. Is the said Little George the same person who was tried for murder at Quebec, and whose three companions were hanged?

3. Who are the officers of the Immigration department who had charge of Little George when he made his mysterious escape?

4. (a) What means were taken to capture this man, and (b) is it the intention of the department to continue the search?

Hon. Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil):

1. No. Escaped.

2. Yes.

3. Guard Carbray.

4. (a) Information at once transmitted to local, permanent and federal police. (b) Yes.

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—LAND

Mr. LUCAS:

1. What amount of land is held by the Canadian Pacific Railway along its own lines?

2. What amount of land is held by the Canadian Pacific Railway along Canadian National lines?

3. What amount of land has Canadian Pacific Railway Company sold along its own lines in the past five years, and what was the average price per acre obtained?

4. What amount of land has the Canadian Pacific Railway Company sold along Canadian National lines in the past five years and what was the average price per acre obtained?

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

LIQUOR RETURNS

Mr. GOOD:

1. The requirements and procedure regarding liquor (spirits, wine and beer) exported from Canada (a) when drawback is allowed; (b) when liquor is duty paid.

2. A statement by years for the last ten years giving (a) the quantity of liquor manufactured in Canada; (b) the quantity of liquor imported into Canada; (c) the quantity of liquor exported from Canada (1) with

drawback, (2) duty paid; (d) the quantity of liquor entered for consumption in Canada; (e) the gross revenue collected, customs and excise; (f) the gross amount rebated, customs and excise.

MR. W. A. DRYDEN—MR. DUNCAN MARSHALL

Mr. MAYBEE:

For a copy of all communications passing between W. A. Dryden of Ontario country, Ontario, and the government of Canada or any member thereof, or any deputy minister thereof, and also all reports made by either W. A. Dryden, or Duncan Marshall, to the Government or any department thereof.

ST. LAWRENCE SHIP CHANNEL

Mr. CHURCH:

For a copy of all letters, reports, agreements, telegrams, orders in council, and other correspondence, exchanged between the government of Canada and the government of the United States in reference to the international Deep Waterways report, and a proposed agreement for the St. Lawrence Ship channel, since the last session of parliament, 1922.

PURCHASE OF BAIT

Mr. FORKE:

For a copy of all communications in connection with the prohibition of American vessels purchasing bait from netters and trap owners in the Maritime Provinces.

CANADIAN MERCANTILE MARINE

Sir HENRY DRAYTON (West York) moved:

For a copy of all correspondence, telegrams, papers, writings and documents of any kind, passing between any member or department of the government and the Canadian National Railways or Canadian mercantile marine managers or directors or officers, since January 1st, 1922, relating in any way to the vessels of the Canadian mercantile marine, their use or suitability, or making in any way recommendations as to sale or other disposition of said vessels.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I would ask my hon. friend to let this motion stand until the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) has had a chance to express his view in regard to it.

Motion stands.

INTERIM SUPPLY—SPECIAL BILL

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I desire to have the co-operation of the House in the passing of a special Supply Bill. It will be remembered that at an earier stage of the session we adopted resolutions and a bill providing one-sixth of the year's supplies. The two months for which the supply was voted are now expired, and especially in relation to the civil service it is very urgent that we make a further arrangement. I am proposing, and I have mentioned this to my hon .friend the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton), that we adopt the necessary resolutions for a further supply of one-sixth, being two months. I therefore move:

That one-sixth of each of the resolutions reported from the Committee of Supply from the 20th February last to the 8th June instant inclusive, granting to His Majesty amounts voted of the Main Estimates, and forming a total of $34,349,528, be now concurred in.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I have no objection whatever, as I have already told my hon. friend, to his getting his interim supply. He has to have it; the business of the country has to be carried on. The motion will pass subject, of course, to the usual terms, with which my hon. friend is very familiar, that is, that while the money is granted the principle of any vote or the amount of any vote is still open to challenge by the House.

Mr. FIELDING: Surely.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. FIELDING: I beg to move:

Resolved that one-third of the Resolution reported from Committee of Supply on the 13th April, 1923, providing a provisional bonus allowance for the Inside and Outside Services of the Civil Service for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1924, and forming a total of $1,833,333.33, be now concurred in.

In this case we did not have the one-sixth vote. We are now voting one-third.

Motion agreed to.

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

Mr. FIELDING: I beg to move:

That a sum not exceeding $10,375,530.25 being one-sixth of the amount of each of the several items not yet voted, as set forth in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March, 31, 1924, laid before the House of Commons at the present session of parliament, excluding the amount of the second item of Resolution No. 141, "Ottawa, New Departmental Building, $500,000" be granted to His Majesty, on account, for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1924.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That does not seem to be in accordance with the first resolution as read. The first resolution as read said "one-sixth."

Mr. FIELDING: Oh yes, the Clerks are simply carrying out their duty. The figures will be correct, I am sure.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The first resolution as read said an extra sixth of the whole supply.

Mr. FIELDING: We are taking one-sixth of concurrence and the sixth mentioned here. I think the figures are quite right.

Motion agreed to.

The House in committee of Ways and Means, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved:

Resolved that towards making good the supply granted to His Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1924, the sum of $46,558,391.58 be granted out of the consolidated revenue fund of Canada.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I assume that is the calculation of the one-sixth.

Mr. FIELDING: I assume so. I have left it to the officials. I am sure the figures can be relied on.

Motion agreed to.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Fielding thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 202 for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending March 31, 1924.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first and second time, considered in committee, read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY—DISMISSAL OF Mlle. BOULAY

On the motion of Hon. W. S. Fielding (Minister of Finance) for Committee of Supply.

Hon. J. B. M. BAXTER (St. John City and Counties of St. John and Albert): Mr. Speaker, I take advantage of the presence of our friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Murphy) whom we are all glad to see back in the House with us again, to bring to his attention and to that of the House one of those incidents which, unfortunately, occur from time to time in the administration of public business. I refer to the case of the dismissal of a lady, Mademoiselle Boulay, who was serving apparently with perfect satisfaction to the community, as postmistress in the town of Sayabec. She had the misfortune to be the daughter of a gentleman who formerly represented the constituency of Matane. Mademoiselle Boulay is no longer the postmistress, and I hold in my hand a notification from the Civil Service Commission which shows that a gentleman named Eugène Lacroix has been appointed to that position. At this stage of the session I regret the amount of time that will be necessary even to refer to the most salient portions of the correspondence which will show how Mademoiselle Boulay ceased to be an office holder under this act, and how Mr. Lacroix, apparently through the medium of the Civil Service Commission, became her successor.

[Mr. Fielding.]

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Postmaster General): May I interrupt my hon. friend? Does he intend to bring in a motion on this matter? My reason for interrupting is that this is the first intimation I have had of the matter. I have received no notice of it, and I am uninformed at the moment as to the particulars. If my hon. friend is going to terminate his remarks with a motion I wish to ask him if he would have the courtesy to defer it until we go into supply again, say to-morrow. Up to the present I have not had an opportunity to familiarize myself with any of the details.

Mr. BAXTER: I had no intention of concluding my remarks with a motion unless it were necessary as a matter of formal procedure. The hon. member for Matane (Mr. Pelletier) is fully acquainted with the circumstances, and I had him sent for so that he might be present, there being an understanding between us that I would not take the matter up in his absence. With the assurance given by the minister, if he feels that he would be in any way embarrassed by taking the matter up to-day, I will defer it until to-morrow.

Mr. MURPHY: I think I would prefer if the hon. gentleman would allow the matter to stand until to-morrow.

Mr. BAXTER: Very well.

Mr. MICHAUD: Is this a matter of urgent importance? Can it wait for twenty-four hours?

Mr. BAXTER: I have agreed to it being deferred.

Motion agreed to and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

PENSIONS

Pensions—European War and active militia, $32,500,000.

Hon. H. S. BELAND (Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment): Before this appropriation is passed I think it would be advisable that I should supply the committee with a few figures, showing the number of pensioners in Canada. The pensioners are divided into two classes. One class is made up of disability pensioners, and the other class of dependents. On 31st March, 1923, there were 43,263 disability pensioners; on the same date there were 19,794 dependent pensioners; making 63,057 pensioners in all. The amount paid during the fiscal year ending March 31, 1923, for European war pensions was $32,032,074. If we include the Fenian Raid pensions, which are also paid by the Pension

board, and the general pensions and long service militia pensions, the total expenditure for this purpose for the year 1922-23 was $32,612,242.36. I should be glad, Mr. Chairman, to supply any information which I have before me at the present time and which may be of interest to hon. members. I will give more details in this connection and will give the number of disability pensioners and permanent pensioners in the different districts. They are:

	Disability Pensioners	Permanent Pensioners
Quebec	3,229	903
Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island	2,213	606
Eastern Ontario	2,062	571
Central Ontario	9,559	2,522
Western Ontario	2,846	751
Manitoba	4,173	1,183
Saskatchewan	2,837	936
Alberta	3,673	972
British Columbia	5,410	1,333
New Brunswick	1,268	398

Mr. MANION: Does the second item refer to the militia pensions?

Mr. BELAND: No, the second figure refers to pensions which have been declared permanent by the Board of Pension Commissioners.

Mr. MANION: Do those figures include the dependents as well, or just the direct pensioners?

Mr. BELAND: No, they do not include dependents. The total number of people who receive benefits from the pensions, is very large. There are 146,373 people in Canada coming under the benefit of pensions. That includes disability pensioners, and their dependents, and dependent pensioners and their dependents.

Mr. MANION: I take it that there will be a good deal of discussion of the question of pensions, and I think it will be rather difficult to keep separate the matters that refer to pensions and to Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment work. In other words there are cases which, if they were admitted to treatment under the Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment for disabilities at the front, would, generally speaking, be eligible for pensions. Therefore, there may be some difficulty in separating them. I know that the few remarks I am going to make a little later on will probably combine them. Has the minister any objection to a certain amount of intermingling of these estimates? I suppose what is said in this discussion will not be repeated on the Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment estimates. It is very difficult to keep them separate. I make this statement in order to allow the chairman to take a lenient view of it.

Mr. BELAND: At the time I had the honour to submit to the House the estimate in connection with the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment I gave a statement of the number of soldiers under treatment. When a soldier is in the hospital his pension is paid to him just the same, and the amount is made up to the amount he would receive if he received full pay and allowance. The amounts I have mentioned refer only to pensions which are awarded by the Board of Pension Commissioners for Canada. This amount has no reference whatever to the treatment of patients, or the maintenance of hospitals, or the examination of pensioners, or the examination of soldiers who desire to receive treatment, it simply covers the amount of money awarded to pensioners in Canada, and nothing else.

Mr. TOLMIE: I wish to say a few words in connection with the pensions matter, as the people of my constituency are particularly interested in this work. The Pensions Act has been administered now for a number of years, and we have had an opportunity of discovering a good many flaws in the administration. I do not know that anyone in particular is to blame, but the spirit of the act, I think, has not been carried out in the way that was intended when it was passed. It has been unsatisfactory, not only to those that are directly affected by the working of the act, but also to the public who from one end of Canada to the other, are highly desirous to render the fullest possible service and full justice particularly to those men who went overseas and so nobly fought the battle for this country. We can never hope to compensate them fully for what they have done for us. But we should make every effort possible, to the extent even of our last dollar, to do justice to those men, and not only to see that they are paid proper pensions for their disabilities, but, in addition to that, to aim to restore to them their usefulness, and in that way add to their peace of mind. It is complained by these men that the Pension Act is inconsistent in some ways. In some cases it is said the pensions are entirely inadequate when the disability is taken into consideration. Then again it is complained that in the case of, say, two men affected almost in the same way and to the same extent with regard to their ability to earn a living, one man is paid a much higher pension than the other. It has been claimed also that a man who has had severe head injuries, suffering from extreme nervousness, unable to concentrate his mind on his work, suffering from headaches and dizziness, and unable on that account to hold any position,

is given a pension of $5 per month. It is said that one of the principal sufferers is the man who carried on overseas, the man who, though affected with sickness, probably suffering to a certain extent from gas or other causes, still persisted in carrying on his work, with the result that when he arrived on this side, and began to really suffer from the effects of the war, he was unable to show any history of having been under treatment on the other side. Anyone looking at the question from an ordinary business standpoint and under ordinary business conditions, would accept that as evidence that this man suffered from a disability. But his case is turned down because he is unable to show documentary proof of what occurred. Many men, it is claimed, are suffering from an injustice in this country as a result. I will read just one or two cases referred to by certain men in Victoria who have made a careful study of the situation.

This is the case of a man who enlisted on August 10, 1914, and was a prisoner of war in Germany from April 24, 1915, to March, 1918, when he was sent to Holland. He arrived in England December 19, 1918. He had, of course, no medical history sheet. On his arrival in England his only anxiety was to get back to Canada, and for that purpose he declared himself fit. As a matter of fact, the man was greatly run down and had suffered in Germany from severe pains in the abdomen lasting several weeks at a time. He was discharged from the army on May 3, 1919, at Victoria. He suffered continually from gastric trouble. In February, 1922, he went to the Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment; he was given treatment, but was refused pay and allowances. On applying for pension for which, of course, it should not have been necessary for him to apply, as he should have been examined for pension, he was told that he could not receive a pension because he could not supply medical evidence of his illness in Germany. Subsequently he filed a declaration by a Lieutenant McDowall, who was his officer and who was a prisoner with him in Germany, whose evidence substantiated his statement as to the nature of his illness while a prisoner. This evidence was refused, and he is not yet in receipt of a pension. He is now a physical wreck.

Here is another case of a private who enlisted in Victoria, June 1, 1916. He went to France December 1, 1916, and served twenty-seven months in the trenches. All the time he was not in good health, but he carried on. He was discharged December 19, 1919, as A1. He took up land under the Soldier Settlement Board, but he broke down before going on to the land. He is married and as he says, he thanks God he has no children. He is in very straitened circumstances, and is in very poor health. He has applied to the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment from time to time, but he has been refused any amelioration. On December 20, 1919, two months after his discharge, he was admitted to the Jubilee hospital, suffering from gastric ulcers and toxic poisoning, and was extremely ill. The doctor placed him on treatment with pay and allowances. Ottawa refused pay and allowances and subsequently even treatment. On February 10, 1922, after an interval of continuous suffering and treatment by private doctors, who all say that his condition is due to war service, he again applied to the Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, and the local doctor placed him again in hospital. During this hospital period the Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment doctor had all his teeth removed save six, Dr. Arnold, Medical Director of the Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, directed that he should receive no pay and allowances, and pension also was refused by him. The treatment then continued. On October 18, 1922, the sub-unit office in Victoria asked the Vancouver office for a denture to supply the place of removed teeth. On October 28, 1922, Dr. Proctor, of Vancouver, Medical Director of the "J" Unit, refused to give any denture and ordered that all treatment must cease. The man was then placed in the charity ward, and he subsequently received treatment from the local doctors, out of charity. Here we have the fact of a gallant soldier who wished to carry on and not make a fuss, having his very gallantry used to his detriment by the Pension board, because he reported A1 to get back to Canada. No Pension board ever examined this man. The case was entirely decided by doctors. The man is still suffering severely, but he is doing his best. Naturally enough he cannot compete in the labour market.

The third and last case I have is that of a widow whose first husband was a member of the 16th Battalion. He was killed in action and a pension was granted to his wife and one child. On December 19, 1916, this lady remarried a pay sergeant in the 50th Highlanders who, owing to bad sight, was not allowed to go to either England or France. By him she had one child. Whilst at Willows camp, Victoria, this sergeant contracted pneumonia, and subsequently contracted influenza, and he had to leave the service. Later on he contracted tuberculosis and died of tuberculosis in February, 1922. According to doctors' statements in Victoria, this showed a clear

case of continuity from the tuberculosis to the pneumonia contracted on service. Nevertheless she was refused a pension because she cannot produce evidence that her husband contracted tuberculosis whilst on service, or any evidence of the nature or possible cause of the disability which led to his death. This information should have been on the man's military papers and medical history sheet; but no such documents in his case can be found, and the evidence goes to show that they were probably burnt up in the fire which took place at the Work Point barracks. The widow is at present living on charity, with her two children. She still draws a small pension for the first child.

These are cases, not only of lives lost, but of lives ruined as the result of the war. If it was not the intention of the Pension Act to meet just such cases as I have cited, what did we pass that act through the House for? In my opinion, it was passed for the purpose of relieving just such cases as these, and in the administration of the act more elasticity will have to be given or great injustice will be done to men who deserve much better treatment. These complaints are coming in, not by ones or twos, but by hundreds, and I am informed that if the resolution proposed by the minister takes the form of legislation later on, no fewer than 10,000 cases on appeal will be presented for his decision. It is quite clear then that the act under present conditions is not fulfilling its mission. The people have waited and asked for reform; they have been very patient; they have given a great deal of time for the carrying out of the administration of this act so as to enable little discrepancies to be overcome. But results have not been reassuring as might be expected, and consequently we find that the people in some sections now are getting very much excited over the condition of affairs. On June 29 last, a very representative mass meeting was held in Victoria, British Columbia. At that meeting the following bodies were represented: Liberal Association, Independent Order of Foresters, Trades and Labour Council, the Council of the municipality of Oak Bay, the Council of the municipality of Esquimalt, the Kumtuks Club, Gyro Club, Rotary Club, Kiwanis Club, Army and Navy Veterans, Women's Conservative Association, Grand Army of United Veterans, Salvation Army, Navy League, Chamber of Commerce, Conservative Association, Women's Canadian Club, Canadian Club, Young Mens Christian Association, Saanich Council, Tubercular Veterans Association and British Campaigners. Among those present were the Bishop of Columbia, and Father Wood representing St. Andrews Cathedral. This meeting was also a very representative one of the principal citizens of Victoria, and at it the following resolution was passed by a unanimous standing vote:

> Whereas the findings of the Royal Commission on Pensions constitute a grave indictment of the Pension board in their administration of the Pension board and shows that the members thereof are unfitted to fairly administer the act:
>
> Resolved, that in the opinion of this meeting of representative public men and women of Victoria, the government forthwith take the necessary steps to remove the members of the Pension board from office:
>
> And further, be it resolved that copies of this resolution be sent to the Premier, members of the Cabinet and members for British Columbia in the Senate and House of Commons.

This was a non-political gathering, and I am very well acquainted with a large number of those who were present on that occasion. The gentleman who acted as chairman is the editor of the Liberal newspaper in Victoria. The resolution was moved by the Lord Bishop of British Columbia and seconded by the secretary of the Trades and Labour Council. Since that time I have received a wire from the Canadian Club, the Chamber of Commerce, the Rotary, the Kiwanis and the Gyro Clubs, besides soldier organizations, which have all either endorsed the resolution or forwarded similar resolutions asking for reform. This will indicate that the feeling is general throughout that section of Canada, and it clearly shows that there is a very urgent demand for immediate reform. The principal speaker of the evening on the occasion in question was Major Twigg, a soldier who had been overseas and a lawyer of considerable ability. He claimed that seventy-five per cent of the returned soldier cases in which applications were made for pensions never reached the board at all but were settled by doctors, and that in many cases, where fifty per cent disability had been recommended by doctors, only twenty per cent was allowed by the board. He declared that there was apparent an effort to practise economy at the expense of the men. I quote the following from a newspaper report of the meeting:

> Mr. Twigg took up various phases of the pensions question. A woman whose husband died from cancer five minutes before the official end of the war, said he, would be given a pension by the Board; while one whose husband died five minutes after the hour set down would not. The pension board took the stand that the statute was there and had to be enforced, and asked whether he thought that the board was following out the intention of parliament in regard to the above-mentioned situation, the head of the board had said, "I think so."

Another quotation from the address of Major Twigg is as follows:

> Mr. Twigg cited the case of a man gassed at Ypres. He had been a big husky chap before the war. Gassed, he had reported to the doctor that he could not stop coughing. The doctor said, "Everybody's coughing; carry on," and the man had carried on, no record being made on his medical history sheet. Bronchial pneumonia developed, and the man spent a long period in hospitals. Finally he asked for a pension. He was refused treatment, refused pay and allowances, and refused pensions because no mention of his being gassed had been made on the medical history sheet. The man was now dying because of the decision of the pension board, and the worry accompanying his efforts to care for his family. The men who carried on without running to the doctor every time anything was the matter with them were the ones who suffered in the matter of pensions. The men who always went to the doctor had medical history sheet evidence. Pension after pension had been refused because men had no evidence on their medical history sheet to prove that their disabilities had come from service.

Major Twigg also claimed that although the 1920 amendments were held by the board to refer to the permanent force, in reality they were manipulated to cover men who had been overseas. It was claimed that this was at the bottom of the agitation throughout Canada. Speaking of the proposed resolution Major Twigg reminded the audience that it was not so much that the law was at fault as that the administration was to blame. This criticism of the Pension board was dispassionately presented. And, as I have stated, I am acquainted with a great many of those who were at the meeting and know them to be leading citizens and not firebrands. Their one aim was to do justice to the returned soldiers. We must remember that the returned soldier did not stop to bargain with us when called upon to go overseas but gallantly joined the forces. He set aside all business or other arrangements, his hopes were all sidetracked, and he subordinated his ambition and his desires to the impulse to render service to his country. We feel therefore that these men, having left their dependents at home under these circumstances, should receive justice now at the hands of the country. In my opinion they are entitled to the very last dollar which it is reasonably within our ability to pay them. When a gathering of the kind I have described passes a drastic resolution such as I have read, it indicates how acute the conditions are and how necessary it is that immediate action should be taken.

I can quite understand the difficulties of a board of this character, who have a vast variety of cases presented to them and who naturally desire to keep within the law. But if they have not the power now, then they certainly should be given that power, to apply a certain degree of elasticity to their administration of the act. In my opinion what is required is good judgment tempered with sympathy and mercy in all cases.

It is quite apparent from what I have quoted that the Pension Act is not achieving just exactly what we had expected, and the matter is too serious to be allowed to drift any longer. I am very glad indeed to note that the minister has presented to the House certain resolutions which promise to afford relief in the directions complained of; and so far as I can see, before the question has been debated, I think they should tend to make the situation very much better than it is now.

As regards the administration of the act, clearly it was the desire of the House representing the people of Canada, when that act was passed, to take care of just such cases as I have mentioned, and hundreds of others that have been sidetracked simply because they could not comply with some little technicality in the law. It would be far better to give the act a much broader interpretation, even at the expense possibly of overpaying some fellows who might be inclined to fake, than
4 p.m. by too great stringency to rob hundreds of men and their dependents of the pensions that are justly due them under the law as it stands now. We cannot be too merciful or too sympathetic or considerate in cases of this kind. As I have said before, these young men when they joined the colours to go overseas parted with their family connections and renounced the prospects that they had seen ahead of them. No doubt many of them had had a vision of that point of efficiency, after certain years of hard work, at which they would be able to establish themselves, to marry and settle down in homes of their own. Many of them have come back badly maimed, some physically, others mentally, with the result that they find themselves unable to make a living and with all their hopes for a bright and happy future entirely gone by the board. These cases should receive the most careful attention, and I am sure it is the wish of the Canadian people from one end of the country to the other to render them justice in the fullest possible measure.

Mr. ROBICHAUD (Translation): Mr. Chairman, if there is an instance where the distribution of the public funds should be carried out with the utmost fairness, it is certainly when the question arises of granting to those disabled in the Great War a pecuniary help in compensation for the sacrifices they made for civilization. Ever since my

Difficulties in interpretation have arisen election to this House, numerous claims have been submitted to me by the dependents of the heroes who gave up their lives on the battlefields, and by those who have come to end their days in this country, burdened with infirmities due to wounds received in the war. Many have given me to understand that their cases had not been taken up by the Commission in charge of the distribution of these public funds. I have here the claim of a mother of a family from the County of Gloucester, whose son, her only support, lost his life on the battlefields. After making inquiries, the Secretary of the Commission on Pensions, informed me that the case of Mrs. Albert—that is her name—had not reached the Commission. In the second paragraph of this letter, which is signed by Mr. Davis, we come across the following lines:

No application for pension was filed on behalf of Mrs. Albert prior to your letter of the 10th of March last. Immediately that was received the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment was requested to obtain a properly completed application to investigate and report upon the case. This request is dated March 14th.

You may judge, Mr. Chairman, by this communication received from the Secretary of the Commission, that the full responsibility and care devolve upon the soldiers' dependents to acquaint the Commission of their rights.

It seems to me that in the remote parts of the country, as for instance in the back parishes of my county, these dependents should receive the necessary information so as to facilitate the task of placing their claims before the Commission.

In another instance, a farmer of my county, a Mr. Comeau, belonging to the parish of Petit Rocher is liable to lose his farm, which is already heavily mortgaged. An official came to him and made him sign a declaration that the crop on his farm was sufficient for the support of his family and that moreover he had, each year, a net balance of $300. When I made inquiries in regard to the matter, I was able to ascertain that instead of a net balance of $300 per year, this farmer had only sold $300 worth of products during the year. He had to meet from the above income rather heavy taxes as well as the interest on his mortgage. He is advancing in age, his health is on the decline and he will soon become a public charge unless help is extended to him. Now, how does it happen that these farmers, these heads of families having given what is most precious to them, their sons, in defence of this country, should be required to sign documents void of truth? I have made inquiries on the subject, and if I am well informed, it appears that these good people are at the mercy of these investigators and are not in a position to understand the purport of the statement which is required of them. That is why I have requested from the hon. minister, and I again make this request from my seat, that a French-speaking official, be sent into my county so as to make an inquiry into each case and thus do what is right towards those whose sacrifice was great in the war.

The correspondence received on the subject is very voluminous. I might read it out and give the committee an idea of the different claims that I have received, however, I hope this will not be necessary, and that with the hon. minister's help and the commissioners' good will, the demands of ex-service men, having taken part in the Great War or their dependents will be taken under consideration and that justice will be dealt out to them. I strongly insist that each interested person should receive the necessary forms and instructions so as to enable him to put in his claims. It seems to me unfair to insert in the statutes of our country laws governing the disabled in the Great War and to force upon these good people the burden of putting into practice the different regulations enacted in their favour by the Dominion government. If for example, circular letters were addressed to each of these soldiers or their dependents, explaining or giving a synopsis of the act, it would help in making the administration of the act easier. I trust that this suggestion will be taken into serious consideration and that the disabled in the Great War not only from my county but from all the counties of Canada will be thoroughly informed on this matter and that in future we may witness a little more fairness in the distribution of the public funds.

Mr. MacLAREN: Mr. Chairman, the condition this year in respect to the consideration of the pensions estimates is very different from what it was last session. Since last session a royal commission has been appointed to look into the matter of pensions and soldiers' civil re-establishment; that commission has made two reports to the minister and we understand that the minister will present amendments to the Pension Act and the Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment Act bearing on the recommendations embodied in those reports. When the resolutions come before the committee these matters may more suitably be discussed; indeed, it is difficult to say anything regarding pensions without to some extent discussing the changes it is proposed to make by the amendments. But in the meantime I would like to say this

in connection with the Pension Act. These difficulties in interpretation have given rise to much dissatisfaction and trouble among returned men and disturbance in the country generally, and therefore I would suggest to the minister that one matter of outstanding importance in the amendments to the act that he will bring before us is that there be absolute clearness in their wording. One great advantage it seems to me in having these amendments brought down is that there is now a great hope of our obtaining a substantial settlement of the difficulties that have so disturbed the overseas men and the country in the matter of pensions and soldiers' civil re-establishment. I think that we have before us a distinct prospect of an opportunity to end all the principal difficulties. No amendment, of course, will ever ensure to us a complete and satisfactory solution of all the difficulties, but I do think there is an opportunity now of producing a condition of satisfaction and contentment among the returned men that we have not yet reached, and certainly one way will be to avoid any such difficulties as we have had in the past in interpreting the meaning of the act.

I might also say that so far as I have been able to learn the opinions of the returned men, should the subject of the recommendations of the royal commission be carried out by the minister in his resolution which he will bring before the House, it will secure a condition of satisfaction and contentment among the returned men.

While we are on the subject of pensions I would like to take this opportunity of referring to the difficulties which a number of applicants for pensions have in getting their cases fully investigated and their claims adequately met. I have been recently informed that through the efforts of the Great War Veterans' Association about six hundred cases have received substantial pension adjustment in the past twelve months. If that be the case, and I have been assured that it is, it shows that there is a difficulty in applicants securing a full investigation of their claims at the outset, and that it has required a further effort and assistance through an organization to have their claims fully and forcibly presented so that they have now obtained a better treatment than they were accorded at the outset. This number does not include minor adjustments that have been obtained, but as I said before, there are six hundred applicants who after their cases had been taken up through the organization of the Great War Veterans' Association have received substantial pension adjustments. That is a point which I bring forward as one of those important in the future, so that we may enable those who claim pensions to obtain what is their due with a reasonable amount of facility. I have no doubt there are many claims presented of an exaggerated character, but clearly these are not of that character because they have been granted finally.

There is one particular case that I wish to bring to the attention of the committee which bears on the same subject. It is that of a nursing sister who in her early childhood had a severe injury to her hip, from which she duly recovered. She was passed as fit in Canada and again passed as fit in England, and proceeded to France. She was in the Expeditionary Force from the 12th April, 1915, to the 1st July, 1919. During this time she served in France for three years and nine months, an unusually long period for service in France, and rendered excellent service. While in France her hip became troublesome, but not sufficiently to interfere with her duties, and she carried on. On her return to Canada she served as a nurse in one of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment hospitals, but after a time her hip became still more troublesome and she was obliged to leave the service. The Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment decided that it was not advisable for her to continue further her duties, suffering as she was from the condition of her hip, having the view that it would increase further her disability. She received a vocational training in typewriting. She received also four per cent disability, for an aggravation of disability, which amounted to $100. You will observe that she was discharged from the hospital as unfit for duty. Her application for pension was declined. On one letter sent to the Pension board asking for pension was a marginal note from one of the medical advisers stating:

> This lady was in charge of the surgical ward of which I was the medical officer in charge in the fall of 1915, and to my personal knowledge had an obvious disability. (Difficulty in walking.)

You will observe that the term "obvious disability" occurs in the act. It is one of those conditions which preclude one from obtaining a pension; that is, if anyone goes to France suffering from an obvious disability, that is the bar against receiving a pension. Now this statement is made on the margin of her letter, and I cannot help thinking that that is a bar against receiving a pension.

of that kind. It is a very important statement in the records of this case, and I think it might well have been a formal statement of evidence. However, there were two interpretations which might be put upon it: One was that the medical officer had seen the sister with a disability, and that it had occurred during service in France, and therefore that it was evidence in favour of her getting a pension. The other was, that it was an obvious disability which she brought with her to France, and therefore precluded her from pension. Apparently the latter view was the one taken. I would submit that here is a case where evidence of such a character was put on the file without any indication being given to the applicant.—the applicant knew nothing about it. The Board of Pension Commissioners do not write to the claimant stating "Here is a statement, do you wish to submit further evidence of your condition on arrival in France." That had not been done. In other words in this case the nursing sister has not had the opportunity of meeting evidence of the character referred to, if she were in a position to do so. As a matter of fact she can produce medical certificates showing that she was fit when she proceeded to France. I quote that as an instance where, I think, the case has not received full investigation. It is also an illustration of the necessity of informing the applicant for a a pension when additional facts are forthcoming so that the applicant can take proper action in the matter if he or she is in a position to do so. At the present moment I do not propose saying anything further on the question of pensions beyond this: I think it is clear that in the amendments which the House will adopt later on, we should provide that claims for pensions should be thoroughly investigated and carefully looked into for the protection of the claimants, as well as for the protection of the country.

Mr. MICHAUD (Translation): Mr. Chairman, I wish to add a few remarks to those just made by my hon. friend from Gloucester (Mr. Robichaud). On different occasions we have had to complain of the employees or agents sent by the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment to our purely Acadian centres, in parts where English is not understood, and the good people of these counties found difficulty in submitting their cases to those agents. I trust that the hon. minister will take under consideration our requests and that in the future we shall have in that part of the country agents who at least understand the French language. With reference to pensions, many cases were referred to in this House. Among those I have here, there is one which I especially wish to submit to you. It is the case of Mr. Ferguson, of the town of Campbellton, who is now blind and unable to earn his living.. He has to support his wife and receives no help whatsoever, except from one of his daughters, who is soon to be married. Mr. Ferguson is really in need of his country's help. His son, the only child who could have supported him, died on the battlefields. I would therefore ask the minister to consider again this case, for I have already had the opportunity of submitting it to the commission on two different occasions. I hope that the minister will grant my request and that we shall obtain fair play in this particular case.

Mr. MANION: At this late date in the session, and at this stage of the proceedings, I do not wish to take up very much of the time of the House. Nevertheless, there are a few remarks that I wish to make in regard to pensions which I think are appropriate upon this occasion. It is a very difficult position to be in to discuss the workings of the Board of Pension Commissioners, for the reason that one who looks at the affairs of the country—at the tens of thousands of people who are receiving pensions, and at the millions of dollars which are annually being spent upon pensions—must feel that the task of the pension commissioners is a very difficult one. I do not wish in any way, under those circumstances, to be in the least unfair to the Pension board. I wish to preface my remarks by recognizing that they have a very difficult position, that they often have brought before them unfair and unreasonable demands and requests which are difficult to give effect to and which if given effect to on many occasions the commissioners would feel that they were not doing justice by the country. At the same time, I have had many dealings with the Board of Pension Commisioners in the past year, and in other years, and—speaking entirely for myself and not on behalf of any organization—at times it has appeared to me that the commisisoners have shown a little too great a desire for efficiency, and, perhaps, too little sympathy toward the cases coming before them. By sympathy I do not mean a foolish sentimentality, but that spirit of sympathy which is really meant to be inherent in the Pension Act. In other words, it has appeared to me sometimes that there is too much of an inclination on the part of the board and its officers to live up to the letter,

rather than the spirit of the law. In saying that I wish to point out that there is no personal gain for the commissioners in refusing a pension to any man. No doubt, as is mentioned in the report of the royal commission, the pension commissioners could make themselves very popular to-day among the returned soldiers by granting pensions without proper consideration. At the same time they have appeared to me at times to be a little too strict; and I submit, Mr. Chairman, that it is better for them to err on the side of leniency than that injustices should at any time be done to the returned men. I submit, Sir, it is better, to my mind, that ten people should get pensions that do not deserve them, or that ten people should get treatment in the hospitals who do not deserve that treatment, than that one just case should be refused. I submit, in support of my statement as to a lack of sympathy—I do not say an entire lack of sympathy by any means, but at times there has been a certain lack of sympathy—the report of the royal commission. Again and again in this report the commissioners point out very much the very same conclusion as I myself arrived at before I ever read the report. For example at page 128—I do not wish to quote the statement itself because I do not desire to extend my remarks—they point out that very fact—that at times the Pension board has been "unsympathetic in its attitude." That is a synopsis of what they say; at different places in the report they point that out. I believe what the people of this country want is fairness towards the men, and after fairness has been carried out in every possible way then they want economy, but not till then. My hon friend who has just taken his seat (Mr. MacLaren) pointed out the fact that the changed decisions proved very often that the case had not been properly considered by the board. I had a case recently where the decision was changed. The applicant in that case was a British Columbia man and his brother was a friend of mine. For that reason I took up the case but left it entirely with the Board of Pension Commissioners. I gave the board nothing but the man's own statement and the statements of medical men who had seen him. The board turned the applicant down repeatedly, but frankly his representations were so persistent, that at last I got to the stage where I threw his letters in the wastepaper basket. I heard about the case the other day. I received notice from the Board of Pension Commissioners, after I had excused them to him to the best of my ability, that they had granted him a pension. Well, there is something wrong, it seems to me, in a case like that, when they took so long to come to a decision. I do not know what it is, but it would appear to me that there was an error made in that case, which put me in a wrong light with the man, because I did not argue the case from any personal knowledge which I occasionally do, on account of having had a medical training and meeting a good many returned men. In that case I did not use these arguments at all, because I did not know the case. But it must have been about two years after I took up the case that the decision was changed and he got a pension. That illustrates to me that there was something wrong in handling the case in the first place. Whose fault it was I do not know. I think that case should have been given a little more consideration earlier, and that it should not have been delayed for a period of pretty nearly two years.

I might refer to another feature in this report on pensions—and I am not fond of recriminating—that practically all the severe tightening of the reins which has taken place has occurred within the last year, and I say that because I well remember that during the last election the Prime Minister, particularly—and I regret that he is not in his seat when I say this—travelled around the country pointing out that if he came to power the returned men would receive better treatment than they had been receiving. As a matter of fact, according to this report, whatever tightening up of the reins has taken place has practically taken place within the last year. I have read of very many cases quoted by the Ralston report in which that statement is borne out, but I do not wish to take up time now in reading them.

I will illustrate my other remarks by reference to another case, though in a sense it deals more with the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment than the Department of Pensions. I took the case up about a year ago with the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment. The name of the man was Charles McAvella. He had lived in my rdiing, but not in my city. He Came to me, and after looking over the man and listening to his history, I ascertained that he had a severe disease of the bone of the leg, what is called in medical parlance osteomyelitis He had been injured while in uniform, serving in Port Arthur. He was in the hospital a couple of weeks, got better, went overseas, served a couple of years, and was discharged

as fit; and then a year later the disease broke out. He used up all the money he had, something like $2,500, in medical attendance in Winnipeg and other places. He was a married man and a fine type of fellow. He was finally up against it and he asked help from the department, and was refused on the ground—and it was very fair ground in a general way, as a large percentage of the reasoning was in favour of their decision—that there was no connection between the original injury which had taken place four or five years before and the present condition, which made him a permanent cripple—and he will be a cripple the rest of his life, even if he does not lose his leg. I was approached by some of his friends and I took up the matter with the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, and in my opinion there was a marked possibility of connection between the original injury and the present condition. I wrote to the board and they replied to me that they had already made a decision, they had other medical opinion stating that his condition was not due to the injury. I had a good deal of sympathy with him, because I felt there was a fair chance that his condition was due to the injury. I took him before a well-known medical man, Dr. M. B. Dean, who has been practising in my city twenty years, and he wrote out an opinion taking absolutely the same attitude as I have taken. In spite of that, the treatment was refused. I gave up the fight, but recently the Port Arthur Great War Veterans' Association wrote me and told me this man was in the hospital, depending absolutely on charity, and they thought the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment should reconsider its decision. I again took up the matter, and the minister possibly might remember, in the multitude of letters which he receives, that I wrote him in regard to it, and I have a couple of letters on file from him. The reason I mention this matter is because the minister made a statement based on the information given him by his officials which statement was wrong. The statement was to this effect: I find that all medical reports agree that his present disability could not reasonably be attributed to his service.

I do not blame the minister. He was simply reporting what his officers told him. That statement was made to the minister, despite the fact that I put on record the opinion of a very good medical man—to say nothing of my own opinion, although I do not know that I offered my opinion medically; I know that I sent in the report of Dr. M. B. Dean, as a medical opinion. In spite of that the officers of the department advised the minister, as he informed me, that no medical opinion agreeing that his present disability could reasonably be attributed to his service had been received. That was an absolute misstatement of fact. I then wrote to two doctors in Toronto, and I have on file the opinion of one of them. I gave him the facts of this case and when I mention his name I think all hon. members in this House will know of him, because he is probably the most outstanding surgeon in Canada. I refer to Herbert A. Bruce of Toronto. I told him the facts of the case, and I have his letter, a copy of which I shall send to the minister. He said:

> Although the case you refer to evidently had no suppuration at the time of the original injury, I think one would be justified in considering that there is a very reasonable probability of the present osteomyelitis being due to the former injury.

I would consider Dr. Bruce's opinion a better opinion than that of any man in the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment; I would consider it a better opinion than that of any doctor or adviser on the pension board—certainly as good anyway. I think I am safe in saying that. He was for many years professor of surgery in the University of Toronto, and he has not only a national but an international reputation. The minister might ask me why I did not send the letter to him. The reason I did not send it is that at the bottom of the letter he points out—and very courteously too—

> I intend to discuss the case with Dr. Arnold shortly. We will go a long way to meet your views.

I was waiting for a further reply. I might well have sent it across to the minister, but I thought it was a good document to illustrate my contention that at times the Board of Pension Commissioners and the officers of the Department of Soldiers' Re-establishment live up a little too much to the letter of the law;—I am endeavouring to be as moderate in my language as I possibly can, because I consider they have a difficult position, and I do not wish to make it more difficult. I know they have a very hard row to hoe, and I do not wish to make it any harder or to put this country in for millions of unnecessary expense. But I believe that in many cases the Board of Pension Commissioners and the officers of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment could give treatment or pension at not very great increase in cost to the people of the country, and give better satisfaction than has been given in cases such as the one I have mentioned. I make this statement in the House because

I wish to impress these facts not only upon the minister, but upon the commissioners and other officers in the fairest way I possibly can, and yet I wish to impress them strongly enough, so that possibly they may have some effect in bringing about a great deal more satisfaction than has been evidenced by some of the complaints made by the Great War Veterans' Associations and the various soldier organizations. I am doing it with that object entirely and no other.

I wish to offer two other suggestions before I close, and I make these suggestions because the minister will present shortly recommendations of change in the Pension Act. I offer two suggestions which have been put up to me by a returned officer, which, I think, are very good suggestions, and which I think might possibly be dealt with by the minister when bringing in his amendments to the Pension Act.

He pointed out that if the widow of a man who was killed at the front is receiving a pension and she marries again, her pension automatically ceases. That is all right. He says: "Supposing her second husband dies within a reasonable time, she does not get a pension again," and he points out that in the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act, which is on the statute books to-day, even in such a case as that a woman on application would have an opportunity of being replaced on the pension list. I have thought the matter over, and I can see no real argument against the same condition being applied to the Pension Act in the case of the widow of the man who has served overseas. This would appear to me to be a just request. He quotes the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act, section 56, subsection 2, and I will quote it:

> If the widow remarries, her pension shall be suspended from the day following that of her remarriage. If in the event of her again becoming a widow her pension may be restored if she is otherwise qualified.

I quote that for the information of the minister. That is a suggestion that should, at least, receive consideration.

The other case, which to my mind is more unjust, I have taken up in this House before. It is the case of a woman who lived with her husband, a returned man, who is seriously injured, and who is receiving a pension because of his injuries, or she and her family are receiving pensions because of his injuries. He for some reason—let us suppose it is because he gets into trouble with the police—leaves the country. He does not dare to come back, or for some reason he does not come back. He deserts her; no matter what the reason may be; he leaves her at any rate. Because he does not return at the end of six months and appear before the medical board to be examined, her pension and that of her children are cut off, the idea being that since the man does not return,—it is not a permanent pension, according to the expression used by the minister and therefore it is cut off. I believe some method must be worked out to do justice to women and children who are placed in that situation. I am sure it is not the desire of anybody in this country that the wife and children of a man who served overseas and who was seriously injured over there should suffer, if we can possibly prevent that, even at a great deal of expense to this country. I want to lay that case before the minister in order that he and his officials, when he brings in these amendments, may consider the possibility of bringing in some amendment to cover such a case as that.

Those are all the suggestions I have at the present moment. I did not mean to speak quite so long; but I have laid the facts before the minister because they are of great importance, and I hope they will be of some benefit to him and his commissioners and to the men who went overseas and their dependents.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: As representing a constituency in which there are resident a very large number of returned men, I should like simply to endorse what has been just said by the hon. member for Fort William and Rainy River (Mr. Manion). It seems to me that we should have the most generous treatment possible as regards the returned men. It is not necessary to go into the recommendations of the pension commission. The returned men feel very strongly on this matter, and I think they have just ground for feeling that their cases have often not received from the present board the consideration that is due to them. Just as illustrating the feeling of the returned men across the country, I should like to read a resolution which was passed by the Manitoba Provincial Executive of the Great War Veterans on May 12, 1923:

> This command views with great dismay and surprise the action of the Board of Pension Commissioners with reference to the report of the first part of the investigation into pensions made by the Royal Commission on the charges made by the Great War Veterans' Association. In view of the conduct and attitude of the board, indicating that it does not intend to carry out the administrative recommendations of the Royal Commission and in view of the previous mental attitude of the board, which shows, combined with its present conduct, that it is unfitted to administer the Pension Act,

Therefore be it resolved that the government ask for the resignation of the whole board, including the secretary, and if the resignation is not received that the government remove the board and secretary by statutory action.

I read that simply to place before the committee what seems to be the considered opinion of a very important section of the returned men. Unless the Pension board can in some way obtain another ideal of their duty, as the last speaker has said, can, perhaps, not so much emphasize the exact letter of the law as rather to endeavour to give expression to the spirit of the Canadian people in dealing with these returned men, I do not know whether they are the men to administer even the amendments which we hope will be forthcoming in the near future. We are a little bit at a loss at this time in not having the recommendations of the minister before us. When those come, I hope they will be found to make such changes in the act as to leave no doubt as to its interpretation, and that this may be along the line of more generous treatment to those men.

Mr. LADNER: The question before the committee is, perhaps, one of the most important matters which could engage our attention this session. It is important because it relates to a time when very strong and passionate emotions were aroused during the war, and appeals, such as we have not listened to for many years, were made to the manhood of Canada to respond to the call of their country and to place their all on the altar of this Dominion and of this Empire. Almost nine years have passed by since the commencement of that terrible conflict; five years have passed since the war has been concluded, and to-day we are still dealing with many of the pension cases, doubtful cases which, either by the administration of the Pension board or by the enactments of parliament, are found to be suffering an injustice. We are now, of course, considering pension estimates. There will come a time very shortly when the minister brings down his bill in amendment to the Pension Act, when we can discuss the concrete proposals for remedying the injustices and for arranging to adjust the many cases which have come before every member of this House.

In my observations of proceedings in this House during the past two years, it has seemed to me that on matters of this kind, a little too much apathy and a little too much reluctance has been shown by the members in taking the initiative as leaders of public thought in this country, and that soldiers' organizations and the public at large instead have been obliged to stir up the members of this House to bring about remedies and to force the appointment of a royal commission. Various reasons may be given for that. A parliamentary committee sat last year, and if my recollection is correct, all the recommendations of that committee were not carried out, although many should have been carried out at that time. What is the result? The result to-day—and it is a fact which no hon. member will deny—is that from Vancouver to Halifax there is dissatisfaction on this question of pensions, on the administration of the act, and on the state of the law as we find it. I do not think there is any hon. member in this House who will deny that statement: we are all receiving letters and resolutions of one kind and another advocating extreme measures to remedy the situation. What has been responsible for this dissatisfaction? In my judgment, the impression has got abroad —and that there is some truth in it, I do not doubt—that this dissatisfaction is due to a lack of sympathy on the part of the Board of Pension Commissioners. And I make that statement, not rashly, but after having had personal dealings with the board. I do not suggest that they have not acted conscientiously and in the light of their best judgment, but the results show that many cases are decided in which the element of sympathy is absolutely lacking. Then the charge is made that the administration of the act has been at fault, or that unsound procedure has been followed; and I believe that the Ralston commission, as there is ample evidence to show, fairly well upholds these contentions.

There is also an objection to the law as originally framed. When the act was passed there was established a principle that practically amounted to a contract between the soldier body of the country and the country itself, but the law has been so changed as to deprive many men or their dependents of the pensions they should otherwise receive. Last year it was my good fortune to have the opportunity of participating in the debates in this House when pension matters were under consideration. At that time, as will be seen at page 3453 of Hansard, I suggested to the House in committee certain specific amendments dealing with the very difficulties with which this House is faced to-day. My amendments related to section 11 and section 25, subsection 3. I sought to induce the House to re-establish the insurance principle so that one part of our soldier body would not be awarded pensions on one principle while another section of that body were

given pensions on a different principle but one much less advantageous. In the reports a difference is made between what is known as the insurance principle and the "due to service" principle. So that after September 20 you find a line of demarcation. Before that day men and their dependents had a much greater opportunity of getting pensions than they have had thereafter. Last year, therefore, I asked the House and the government to accept the insurance principle, and to that end I moved an amendment to section 11 for the purpose of re-establishing the law as it was in 1919. Unfortunately, however neither the government nor the House saw fit to accept that amendment. The Ralston commission, after extensive investigation, has now brought down its report favouring the re-establishment of the insurance principle. My purpose in dwelling on the subject to-day is to urge upon the government and the minister not only the expediency, but the wisdom and justice—indeed, the sacred duty of themselves and of parliament—to adopt an amendment at this session to bring about this end.

I wish to call the attention of the minister to the fact that, in accordance with the report of last year, section 33, subsection 1, was amended in order to remedy an unfortunate evil which then existed. But the Senate rejected the amendment. This section as it stands to-day apparently prevents the payment of pensions to widows who were married subsequently to the appearance of disability causing death. The Board of Pension Commissioners has taken the stand that no latitude in the interpretation of the section is permissible. I would point out, however, that provision could reasonably be made in some instances where disability was incurred during service but did not become apparent until after marriage. I would also remind the House that a parliamentary committee during the session of 1922 recommended to the House a very satisfactory amendment to the section. The report of the committee was adopted and an amending bill to that end was passed in the latter part of the session. But the amendment was deleted in the Senate and the bill was referred back to the House and adopted in the form amended in the other Chamber. I trust that the minister on this occasion will remedy that situation.

I would call to the attention of the government their own obligation in connection with these different amendments and in relation to recommendations that have been embodied in the Ralston report. Prior to the election of 1921 the Great War Veterans' Association submitted to the various leaders of the parties engaged in that contest specific questions which those gentlemen were asked to answer in order that the great soldier body might know to what extent the leaders and their respective parties would go if returned to power. At that time the right hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) was one of those who received these questions. He made a general answer in which he gave expression to a statement the thought and sentiment of which finds great favour with me, and which I think creates an obligation on the part of the government that I trust they will realize and discharge at this session. Speaking at Cobalt on November 20, 1921, the right hon. gentleman is reported to have said:

5 p.m.

> "Our duty to the returned men, their dependents, and the dependents of those who have not come back, is clear," Mr. King stated. "It is a demand that we treat their requests with generosity, which is more than mere justice. To the men who sacrificed their all in the fight for freedom we owe all the freedom we have to-day; though we default the interest on the national debt (which would mean national bankruptcy), we cannot afford to let one of our returned men or their dependents suffer."

That is a very fine and noble sentiment. But sentiment is not very useful to men and women in this country who are to-day walking the streets without the wherewithal to provide the necessities of life. The responsibility for improving this situation actually rests upon the government to-day, in view of the statement I have just quoted, and I suggest to the government and to the minister that, when the amendments to the Pensions Act are brought down, they remember their sacred pledge given on that occasion, and take advantage of the recommendations which have been made after investigation in the Ralston report. I trust that we may have amendments to the act which will do justice to the many cases, knowledge of which every member of the House has in his possession, which have not been provided for either because of some technicality in the law, or of faulty procedure in the administration of the act, or of some inefficiency in the department. I am not of course for a moment making any general charge in that regard. But there are instances where cases have been decided differently on the same set of facts.

I wish to take advantage of this occasion to offer to the minister some suggestions that have been made to me by different organizations. The first is that the pensions of orphans be increased from $30 to $45 per month. A number of organizations believe that increase is necessary, and I personally

think the additional expenditure involved would not be so serious as to weigh against the advantages which would accrue to the children by the increase. Another matter—I am citing these because they are not ordinarily reviewed in the discussion of this question—is this: It is urged that provision be made to meet the cost of burial of widows, widowed mothers and pensioned children. These requests have been submitted to the department, and I wish to urge upon the government the justice of accepting them; I know the minister is very sympathetic and will look into them carefully. Another question which can properly be considered here is one which was dealt with by the special committee on pensions last session, namely, the helplessness allowance for soldiers who have become totally blinded as the result of service overseas. These men, in addition to their pension, receive a helplessness allowance. Those who are able to go out upon the streets are in need of a guide. The practise of the department is to allow these men, I think, $25 a month or a little more, which is not sufficient to provide that necessary assistance, and the result is that when these men walk upon the streets—I know of concrete cases in Vancouver, they fall over wheelbarrows, trip over ropes and excavations where the streets are being repaired, and in general suffer many inconveniences and difficulties through their disabilities. Their complaint is best set out in the words of one of the men, Mr. A. Baron Taylor, in a letter addressed to myself, to which communications from some of these organizations are attached. He says:

> I certainly think that we are entitled to at least two-thirds of the maximum—
>
> The maximum is $75 a month.
>
> —for it is acknowledged that blindness is the most pitiable of war disabilities, yet we receive less than one-half the maximum allowance, despite the fact that each may be blessed with trench foot pains or shattered nerves. I trust that I have made the situation clear on this point.
>
> Another thing that vitally affects some of us is the fact that our wives, on becoming widows, receive no pension because of marrying after the disability was incurred. This, to me, is a gross insult to both parties concerned, for it immediately puts the sacred marriage on a commercial base and has the tendency to class the wife as a prostitute. Will you kindly remember these points when the debate reopens.

I consider it my duty to make a plea on behalf of these men who are suffering from this disability and for whom the helplessness allowance is not sufficient to provide the assistance they so much need.

Mr. POWER: Is it not a fact that the helplessness allowance is $750 a year?

Mr. LADNER: That is the maximum, given to a man, for example, who is blind and who has both arms off or both legs off. That is a case where an attendant is required all the time, at the man's side; but when a blinded man is able to walk out upon the streets he gets only a portion of that allowance. My contention is that the purpose is to provide the necessary help for a blinded man to enable him to get along the street. I do not think the allowance should be cut in two simply because a man is able to walk outside instead of being always fed from a tray, and so on; the idea is to enable him to get along the street in comparative safety.

Mr. POWER: Has a certain scale been established—so much for a walking patient and so much for a patient confined to the house?

Mr. LADNER: Yes, they draw distinctions between certain classes of patients.

Mr. BELAND: Does my hon. friend not think that a pensioner who receives $900 a year and besides that a helplessness allowance of $750 is able to provide someone to attend upon him in the house and accompany him when he goes out in the street?

Mr. LADNER: Quite so, but that is not the point of my contention.

Mr. BELAND: I do not catch the hon. gentleman's point, then.

Mr. LADNER: The blinded man who is able to walk along the street does not receive the full helplessness allowance of $750.

Mr. BELAND: He may receive it.

Mr. LADNER: The information I have is that he receives about $25 a month or slightly more. This man says in his letter that he wants to get a least two-thirds of the maximum. He ought to know—he is one of them.

Mr. POWER: What is his disability?

Mr. LADNER: Total blindness; and he is connected with some organization. He says:

> I certainly think that we are entitled to at least two-thirds of the maximum.

And so on. As I say, I understand they get about $25 a month.

Mr. BELAND: The helplessness allowance is left to the discretion of the Board of Pension Commissioners. As my hon. friend knows, it may be not less than $250 a year and not more than $750. It is for the board to judge what allowance should be awarded

to a man who is helpless on account of blindness. I understand they must award the maximum in the case of a man receiving the full pension of $75 a month, or $900 a year; that would be an additional $750 a year to enable him to have assistance in the house as well as outside. We have married men working in the department for $750 a year. I am sure it is possible for a full pensioner to secure the services that he requires when he receives the amounts I have stated, particularly when it is a case of not preparing his meals but serving them and accompanying him on the street. I may say that the regulations of the department provide for free transportation to totally blinded soldiers twice or three times a year. I am only stating the condition as it is; of course, my hon. friend may be able to suggest better treatment.

Mr. LADNER: This matter was thoroughly discussed before the special committee of last year: I was not on the committee but I was present, and followed these points closely. The difficulty is that the board do exercise their judgment, but they exercise it on this basis: They say that if a man is totally blind and is not, for instance, able to look after himself at all—cannot get his food for himself but has to sit in a chair and have an attendant constantly waiting upon him—the disability is more severe than that of a blinded man who can walk outside and proceed along the street. They maintain that a man who can walk around the street, even though totally blind, should not receive the maximum allowance. Now, that is an argument; it is logical; it is a lawyer's argument. And the trouble with the Pension board is that they have carried logic and the law so far into their administration that injustices have resulted and do result. My suggestion is that what they should regard is not this relationship between one man who is totally incapacitated and another man who can walk about the streets, but the need that the man has in order to accomplish the purpose of his activities. For example in the one case he requires help to feed him. He has to sit down and he requires someone to look after him, and they pay him $75 a month. In the other case the man should have the right to walk about the streets even if it is necessary to pay two-thirds of the allowance or $50 a month as they say here, to get a child or somebody to guide him by the hand. The main consideration of the Pension board in that case should be the taking of the man on to the streets, and if they have to pay $50 a month to get someone to do it they should pay it. In other words they have figured out the relationship between the two on the wrong principle. If the Pension board say that that is the legal interpretation, and they must persist in doing it and will not do it in any other way—and I have found them uncommonly stubborn in matters of that kind—what is the remedy? The responsibility is on the government and parliament to say: If you will administer the law that way, we will have to change our laws so that you will administer them in some other way. I am bringing this matter to the attention of the minister to-day because I certainly intend to deal with it later at another opportunity.

I would like before taking my seat to refer to one or two actual cases. A number of men have spoken of such cases, and it is a splendid way to illustrate the operation of the act. All of us have a great many of these cases. In this particular case I am not specially attaching any blame to the minister of the department, but I am attaching blame to the Pension board, and its administration, to its lack of sympathy. The facts show the need of certain amendments in the law. I have one case which I might cite by way of an example largely because the applicant is resident in Ottawa and the evidence was available in Ottawa. It is the case of Mrs. Florence G. White, whose husband died of malignant cancer at Christie Street hospital in Toronto, in July, 1921. It was a case of carcinoma, I believe the doctors call it. This man served overseas. He was a married man with a family. He went overseas and in June or July of 1918 he was shot down while flying over the German lines. In falling he was hurt somewhat. He was made a prisoner in Germany and I believe he had to eat many things there which in a number of other cases have been known to cause cancer. As a result of his experiences he came back to Canada and about the time of his discharge he returned to his position in the Marine department in this city. He came back to Canada in June, 1919, was discharged July 16, and returned to the Marine department August 6. At the time of his return to Canada he informed a number of people, responsible people whose word is worth something, that he was constantly suffering pain in the region of his abdomen where the cancer developed, and from a pull of the leg when he was going upstairs. The doctors of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment diagnosed it as appendicitis and treated this case of malignant cancer as appendicitis. They took him to hospital, and finally he had to relinquish his position with the department. First of all, he had taken a few days off from

his job, informing a high official in the government that he was constantly suffering from this pain and would like to be released. All these facts were sworn to in affidavits and filed with the Pension board. This man went to St. Luke's hospital in June, 1920, and the doctors of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment operated on him and found that instead of appendicitis he had cancer. They had to get consent before a subsequent operation could be performed, and he was sewed up temporarily and was later on operated on again and finally died. That was, of course, a case of attributability due to the change in the pension law.

Mr. BELAND: When did he die?

Mr. LADNER: In July, 1921. We proved by a number of the very best witnesses you could possibly find all the facts that were relevant and were available to be proved, showing that the man suffered from pain, and the position, and everything absolutely dovetailed with the cancer pains which afterwards became more severe.

Mr. POWER: Was he discharged as fit or unfit?

Mr. LADNER: I do not know the exact category in which he was discharged. At any rate, I believe reference was made in one of the reports to the pains. Of course, the pains might have been something else. After this the case was presented to the Board of Pension Commissioners, but unfortunately all the facts which a lawyer would know were relevant and pertinent to proving the case were not given to the Pension board. The matter was brought to my attention and I got affidavits and prepared a statement of the case and placed it before the board. I found that the board refused to reconsider their position, and I also found out as a lawyer of some years' experience in my practice the real procedure that the Pension board carried out and the reason why a great number of injustices have been done in this country. You have on that board a lawyer, a doctor or two doctors, and somebody else. I laid the evidence before this body which exercises final judicial authority. I said: There are the facts for the plaintiff's case, here you have the facts for the department; now on what grounds do you refuse to reconsider this case? On one particular point on which three different people swore to a fact which bore directly upon the case, one of the commissioners said to me, "Why, Mr. Ladner, that is not so." I said: "How do you know it is not so?" He replied: "As a doctor I know that things like that practically never happen." He took the inference of his medical mind to perform the duty of a judicial mind, with the result that he simply refused to listen to anything in the way of these facts sworn to in the affidavits and said, "In my opinion this did not happen." It appears that carcinoma or cancer does not often happen from a blow but from some other cause, but it might easily have happened in Germany when he was a prisoner there. But the board refused to reconsider the case. I then took all the facts and a new statement of the case and placed it before the pension section of the parliamentary committee of last session. Some hon. members present will remember the case. We had quite a heated discussion. We had present Col. Thompson, Dr. Burgess, Mr. Paton and a number of other officials. The evidence was all gone over again, and I pointed out that the board were in fact exercising a judicial function and that they should carry out their duties in accordance with established principles of evidence, that they should not go by inference, guesswork or medical theories, but by the evidence before them, and on that score we had the evidence. The committee on pensions appreciated that point and came to the decision that the board was wrong and that it should reverse its finding and grant the pension. A communication was formally sent to them but the medical member of the board said "We have made up our minds on this case and we are going to stick to it, we will not change." Now, in my opinion, as a lawyer of some years standing and practice before the bar—having heard the members of the committee discuss this case, having seen the prepared evidence—we actually had the applicant, her mother, her son and another witness present before the committee to give verbal evidence and be subject to a cross-examination if desired—in my opinion the committee absolutely failed, and the Pension board absolutely failed, to carry out the fundamentals of judicial procedure; and in that respect I must commend the minister for suggesting in the resolution he has brought forward that something in the nature of appeal boards should be provided to which people such as this applicant can go, so that their whole life's work and interest shall not be finally determined by somebody who obstinately clings to his own view of the case. Take the case of a Chinaman in the matter of an ordinary contract or debt or the case of an ordinary vegetable man out West and there is a contract involved of, say, $150, why that man can go to the Supreme Court of Canada and there are at his disposal the finest trained judiciary of the country, and all the common law precedents,

and he can have justice. But when a case goes before the Pension board it is pronounced upon by men some without legal training. They come to their conclusion and whatever reasons to the contrary are advanced those reasons are overborne and it is hopeless to do anything further for the applicants. In that respect I for one am frank to say that I would like to see a change in the law by which it would be possible to get justice done outside the Pension board as it is administered to-day.

In this case,—the White case—what were the consequences? This lady is a widow with a child at school. She had had two serious operations. She was denied by the doctors the right of carrying on her occupation as a nurse, she had no other means of earning a livelihood, she had to take her son from school and put him to work and she herself had to earn whatever she could. The husband in this case gave his life for his country, and yet the son is denied the opportunity of getting the education which he otherwise might have got. So that in the administration and practices of the Pension board we not only have the actual consequences of a pension not being paid, but also the effects of that action upon the families concerned for a generation and perhaps two generations to come. Now, Mr. Chairman, there are other cases that I might cite but I will merely mention the names because the particulars are all on file. There is the case from Vancouver of Captain H. A. Langford in which all the particulars have been placed before the department. There is another case, that of E. N. Couch, living in South Vancouver, which is quite involved and which depends largely upon the question of attributability.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that the question of pensions is a matter which should engage the attention of every single member of this House. I do not believe that we as members have the right to feel any apathy with respect to it, and I hope that when the amendments to the Pension Act come down they will contain practically all of the recommendations that are embodied in the Ralston report, and that a means will be found of rectifying the injustices which have been disclosed in the actual administration and in the procedure of the Pension board.

Mr. MILLAR: I shall be very brief in my observations to the committee at this time, but at a later date when the amendments to the Pension Act are discussed I may have more to say. I suppose that Canada has been a little negligent of the welfare of her returned soldiers. In this respect history is only repeating itself. That seems to have been the case in all countries and after all wars. Nevertheless in comparison with other countries and with other periods, I think Canada, perhaps, has a good record. Still, I believe there have been some cases of injustice, and perhaps that is to be expected

The hon. member for Fort William and Rainy River (Mr. Manion) has referred to the position of the Pension board. I can understand that in dealing with returned soldiers distributed all over Canada, and receiving reports from a great distance and from doctors whom the board does not know, and some of whom are very persistent in advancing claims on behalf of their patients, the board feel that they must be very firm in order to protect the country from being imposed upon. In the constituency I have the honour to represent there are no very large centres of population, and perhaps, that is the reason why very few specific charges against the board have reached me. Yet in a general way there have been several complaints, and it would certainly seem that there are a goodly number of men who have not been well treated. It seems rather sad too when such a spectacle as was witnessed by the people of my own town last week occurred. That was the sight of two returned men, each of whom had lost a leg, on their way at the present time from Calgary to Ottawa in order to lay their complaint before the proper officials there.

Reference has been made to the fact that during the last few years the reins have been somewhat tightened, but that, I think, is only to be expected. I do not think we can attribute the fact to the change of government. The same thing has occurred in connection with the Soldier Settlement board. Having been imposed upon in the early years of their history it is quite natural that the pendulum should have swung in the other direction and, perhaps, swung too far. Probably that is what has taken place in connection with the Pension board. I should like to say that I have received several telegrams in which the desire is expressed that the recommendations of the Ralston commission be put into effect. I think if I read a few words from one of these communications it will express what is conveyed in the others. I find in one telegram these words:

> To get immediate action taken which will give effect to the findings of the Royal commission, as we have in this province a large number of urgent, necessitous cases affected thereby.

I only wish to say further in connection with the returned soldiers—particularly those who are maimed or crippled—that while it is

time that Canada practise every economy I do not think this is a direction in which it should be done. I should like to see the most generous treatment towards these men—in fact the treatment should be very generous before I could demur in any way to the expenditure for this purpose.

Mr. MacKELVIE: This, perhaps may be the appropriate time to interject a remark or two of a slightly different tenor regarding the operations of the Pension board—and I may add the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment as well. Everybody's judgment, to be of any value in cases of this kind, must be based on observation; and while for the last three years I have had a very considerable number of cases to take before these two boards I am very much pleased indeed this afternoon to be able to state unreservedly to the House, that not only have I received from them the most courteous treatment and prompt consideration but my experience has been that they have leaned always towards a sympathetic interpretation of the law. I can only say what I have found myself. In the last week I had occasion to take up a case with the Pension board, and there was some doubt in my own mind as to how they should act. Greatly to my delight, and somewhat to my surprise, the matter was settled almost immediately. A telegram was despatched to my constituency conveying certain instructions, and the claims of the applicant were met and met very promptly.

I would hold up both hands for any change in the act which would give a more generous treatment, if possible, to our returned men, and I would support unreservedly any features of the Ralston report which have that end in view. I wish to say that none of the criticisms which have been levelled against the administration of the Pension board in my opinion is well grounded. This may not be a popular view to express; I know that a great many people take a different view. Many associations of soldiers seem to imagine that they are receiving entirely unsympathetic treatment. I can only judge by what I know, and I have not found that to be the case. The same remark applies to the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment. I have carried some appeals to that body to a successful conclusion and in a manner that gave me satisfaction. Most of my work in connection with the Soldier Settlement Board has been carried on through the secretary, Mr. Paton, and I have found him an efficient officer. He has been always most obliging, and has rendered me service quite equal to that which I could reasonably expect from any government official of any department. I would like to see the act enlarged in any possible way that will give better and more generous treatment to those who so richly deserve it, but I do not like to have this discussion closed without saying a word in commendation of men whom I have found to be very efficient and courteous.

Mr. SHAW: Numerous complaints which have been forwarded to members of parliament during the course of the last two or three years must, I am sure, have been received with some sense of apprehension. I believe that it was for the purpose of securing finality in connection with pension problems that last year this parliament authorized a twofold investigation; an investigation first for the purpose of inquiring into certain definite charges made, and, secondly, for the purpose of investigating, examining and figuring out the best possible way to meet any grievances that might exist.

In this connection I am satisfied that the people of Canada desire that the fullest justice should be done to the returned soldiers. I think that the people of Canada, too, have some reason to be grateful to the soldiers' organizations which have brought before the public at large the questions involved. I think that Mr. MacNeil, who has given so generously of his time and of his efforts, deserves the thanks of the people of Canada for bringing, as he has ably done, before the commission the consideration of various problems which were under their purview.

With regard to the first part of the investigation, it appears that the Ralston commission have found the charges well-founded, except in so far as the charges covering the matter of conspiracy and lack of good faith were concerned. With regard to the second part of the report, I regret that it has not been distributed so that it is impossible to know, except from newspaper reports, the nature of the recommendations which have been made. I am hopeful—and I am sure the minister in presenting his pensions recommendations to the House, will see to it—that these will have as their purpose the desire to give the fullest justice to returned soldiers. I am satisfied the people of Canada will be satisfied with nothing else. We need, I think, speed and efficiency in consideration of these problems. We need justice in their disposition. It occurs to me that, perhaps, something may be accomplished if we strive for, not only simplification of the work of the pension department, but also unification. I

have been somewhat surprised by the formula through which the pension applicant must go before he can have his case determined. I do not know whether it has occurred to the minister—I presume it has—but it seems to me there should be some method by which these two principal organizations that we have now, the Pension board on the one hand and the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment on the other, might well be placed under one head, in order that the work might be co-ordinated, and that there might be greater speed. I think this might assist, to some slight extent in securing the justice which the people of Canada desire should be given to every pension applicant. I propose to have something further to say when the legislation comes before the House.

Mr. MANION: What percentage of those who are blind receive the full allowance of $750 per annum?

Mr. BELAND: I am not in a position to supply the information as to the exact number of blind soldiers who receive the full amount but I would think a large majority, if not all, receive it. I must congratulate hon. members first of all upon the moderate tone which has prevailed during the discussion. It was expected indeed that the discussion would be conducted in that spirit.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Is it intended to close the discussion with the minister's remarks?

Mr. BELAND: My hon. friend might speak now. I would rather wait till all the members have expressed their views before I sum them up, as it were, and indicate what the action of the government is likely to be.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I will make a few remarks in this connection, but when the legislation comes up I desire to speak more fully. I think I am speaking as one who perhaps has dealt with more cases than most individual members in the House. I hold in my hand the papers relating to the cases I have dealt with during this session. I think the bundle of papers I have here would be a fair representation of the work of one member with the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment. These cases cover ex-service men from California to the Yukon and from the Pacific to the Atlantic. There may be one reason why I, perhaps, receive more applications than other members, and that is the fact that I was largely in touch with the medical work at the front. The number of cases will speak for the work of the board.

I am not out to "knock" the board altogether. I can criticize it and criticize it severely, but I doubt if you could get any other board that would do any better, because one of the most difficult duties I know of, connected with the administration of any department of the government is the endeavour to give satisfaction to the ex-service men.

I would like to bring one or two matters to the attention of the minister to-day and the first is the difficulties in connection with these cases. Eighty per cent of these cases of complaint are due to poor presentation of the case at the beginning. The ex-service man has had some medical officer, who is not thoroughly acquainted with ex-service conditions or with the pension system in general to deal with his case. In these cases I find that the large majority of the difficulties are due to a poor presentation of the case at the beginning. Can the board or department escape criticism in connection with these cases? I do not think they can, because my criticism of the board is, perhaps, largely lack of sympathy, that they do not assist a man in the presentation of his case. Let me exemplify that in one or two cases.

I came in touch with an ex-service man named Dumais, who had cancer in the pelvic region. He received no assistance whatever from the board. When I met the man I said to him: "Have you any history of sickness during your service?" "No, nothing whatever; I was never in a hospital during my service." "Have you any history of an injury?" "No." I said, "Think." He said, "I never thought of it before; during my service a horse kicked me exactly in this place, and I lay in my lines for three days without making any report." It seems strange that during all this time no person in the department suggested to him the history of an accident. Unfortunately that man died six days after I spoke to him. He had no relief; he had no benefit whatever. I am positive that the history of that man's cancer began with the injury he received on service. That is only one of a number of cases in which the board failed, and in those cases they failed to sympathize with the men's condition.

Let me give another example where, I think, they have fallen down and where any board might fall down, but I am giving this as a practical illustration how they can pull up on those cases. There is in the city of Kingston a man who has a history of illness, gas and so on all through the service. This man is now in a mental condition. He drives a cart. He gets off the cart and the

cart goes one way and he goes the other. That mental condition, I am satisfied, is due to the man's service and conditions affecting him overseas. He may have been in a slightly demented condition before; but he was accepted in that condition, and he went overseas. What did the department do? They were not satisfied as to the report of the medical officer at Kingston; and bear in mind that there are eight or nine medical men there. If they are not fit to carry out their duties, they should be removed and somebody else put in their place. That has been done lately; but that is not a criticism. They took this man from Kingston to Toronto, and they put him before a man who examined him for one day, and who said: "There is nothing wrong with that fellow," and the only explanation given to the man or rather to his wife is: "Cannot you go out and work and help?" That is the kind of sympathy that men are getting in some cases from officers connected with the department.

There is a third criticism that I have of the board. A man who has a slight disability comes before them; they, perhaps, pension him along for a while, and later on they may bring him up before one of those specialists they speak about. They say to the man: "We will give you $200 to settle your case." That is ridiculous, and it is the harshest way of dealing with a man that I know of. They are simply trying to clear off the country's responsibility to this man by paying him $100 or $200. If a man has a disability at all, his pension should continue with that disability. If he has no disability, he should be told that he has none, instead of an effort being made to buy him off. That sort of thing has been done too much by both governments, and I am not going to criticize one government more than the other. When the man was discharged he was brought up for examination and one question that was put to him was "Are you satisfied?" They expected to clear off the responsibility of the government or the state or the country to that ex-service man by the answer to that question. Fortunately that has fallen down. The department, however, are doing the same thing to-day; they are trying to buy men off with $100 or $200, because they think these men have no disability at all. They should be straight and above board with these men and meet them and say: "You have no disability; we are representing the state in this matter; we have no responsibility in your case, and therefore we are going to discharge you."

Mr. POWER: Is the hon. gentleman not aware that commutation of pensions was brought in at the request of the soldiers' organizations and in spite of the Pension board some two or three years ago?

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I am not going to accept that as a reason for buying off a man. I do not care who brought this in, whether it was soldiers' organizations or anyone else. My contention is that this is not a fair way of dealing with a man. Commutation of pension is a different thing altogether from giving this trivial pittance to a man to buy him off. A man may commute his pension; that has been done, and the country has suffered because a man has come back afterwards. That, however, is a different question. What I am speaking of is the effort to buy a man off saying: "Sign this and we are done with you." He may come back later on, and they put this document up to him and say "You signed this and we are done with you.

These are two or three difficulties with which I have to deal in connection with cases that have come before me. I may say that I have secured satisfaction for ex-service men in 70 per cent of the cases with which I have had to deal, and that is pretty fair dealing; but in all of those cases the board had decided against the man in one way or another. When the case was properly put up, this requiring the work of a medical man to go thoroughly over the case, review it and bring it to a certain point, the man would get reasonable consideration; but this is work that, perhaps, somebody else should not have to do. All the same, I criticize the board along the lines I have mentioned but I doubt if any other board would do any better.

On the other hand, we have just as many criticisms with regards to people who are receiving pensions but who are not entitled to them and for that reason we should be very careful not to throw the board down so that the state or the country may suffer. What we want is a fair deal, a good honest board. What is my recommendation to this end? It is that if you want satisfaction in these cases, you must have men who can give you satisfaction, and I do not believe the medical men doing the work to-day are big enough for the job. You must go out and get the biggest men in the country and pay them decent salaries. If you do that, I think the country will be satisfied and will say: "Well, they have done all they can anyway to meet these men." I know men are on the board for service overseas and so on; but the biggest medical men in Canada were overseas

and I think their services could be secured. You must make sure that you get big enough men to deal properly with the questions that are brought before them by doctors from the smaller places, and you must pay them reasonable salaries. That is my main criticism, and I think this criticism that comes from many centres will be met if you secure big men as advisers to the board and pay them reasonable salaries.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. ANDERSON: I have just a few words to say with regard to the item before the committee. I am fully aware of the very difficult position which the Pension board occupies. The members of this board have to consider very many serious cases, a number of which I have cognizance of myself. I agree with the remark of my hon. friend who spoke this afternoon (Mr. Ladner), that if the board is a judicial body it does not always act in a judicial manner. Numerous cases come before the board for consideration, and I have noticed within the last year or so that it has been becoming increasingly difficult for any man to get consideration at their hands. I am not in any way adversely criticising the board, but there are a few discrepancies in the act which I think the present minister might very well take into consideration.

I want to submit two or three cases that show that in some cases the board has been somewhat unjust to pensioners. I would refer the minister first of all to pensioner No. 666,734 who had a permanent disability of five per cent recorded on initial examination. This meant a pension for himself and family of $7.50 a month. On September 28, 1920, he was informed by the board that he could have his pension commuted to a lump sum of $300 in cash. This, of course, is not a large amount, in comparison with the enormous sums which this House considers at various times but it is nevertheless of considerable significance to the individual who gets it. In this case the complaint is not in regard to the meagreness of the amount involved, but the apparent injustice that has been done the pensioner. The sum of $300 was allowed him as a commutation for a five per cent permanent disability pension. I wish the minister clearly to understand that the disability was recorded as permanent. This man decided that he would not commute the pension but would continue to draw $84 per annum or thereabouts instead of taking the single payment of $300. In 1922, in the month of January, or eighteen months afterwards, he was summoned to Toronto, where he was examined, and was informed that his disability would be reduced to three per cent. Naturally, he was very much surprised at this, because his discharge papers distinctly showed that he had a five per cent permanent disability. The fact, however, was that the disability was reduced to three per cent and he was told that he would be given a cash payment of $75 and be discharged. Now, the man was not at all unfair. He said he would be perfectly willing, if the board would grant it, to accept the balance to make up $300. He stated to the board that he had refused the commutation of $300 in the mistaken belief that he had a five per cent permanent disability which would entitle him to a pension for the rest of his life. The matter was taken up by the board who granted him another hearing in Toronto; and that second board confirmed the previous decision reducing the disability to three per cent. I had the man examined in Milton by local doctors who gave him a certificate of over five per cent disability. But the board came to the conclusion that local men did not understand the case. They therefore decided to appoint a man of their own in Toronto, a specialist named Clarence Starr, who examined the pensioner and gave him a certificate of between five and ten per cent, thus increasing the amount of disability which he had in his favour in the first instance. The matter was then placed before the board for reconsideration. After considering it, they decided that the initial examination on which the man was granted five per cent permanent disability, carrying the commutation award of $300 in cash, was wrong. They refused any relief. This is a case in which the board absolutely refused to accept the certificate of independent medical men who examined the man, and rejected the certificate of their own appointee in Toronto, a specialist, I might almost say, of national standing. The point I want to impress upon the minister is this: Instead of basing their decision on the evidence submitted to them, they acted, so to speak, as witnesses in their own behalf and gave a verdict on their own evidence. They were not fair to the man in refusing to accept the independent evidence submitted to them, and in constituting themselves, not, as they were in fact, a judicial body, but witnesses in a cause.

I have another case to bring to the attention of the minister; the regimental number is 438489. I do not make any statement against the board in regard to this case, which is a very unfortunate one. It is that of a soldier who went overseas, served in the Canadian Expeditionary Force during the whole war, came back to the city of Port Arthur and took ill there in the summer of 1922. There was no possible way of connecting his illness with his service; at least they could get no evidence to connect it. The point is that this man was suffering from cerebro-spinal meningitis of infectious origin. In fact, it was stated to be of syphilitic origin. He was sent to an asylum in Toronto and his wife was left penniless in Port Arthur. She was sent down to her sister in the county of Halton; that is how the case came to my attention. The sister was the wife of a returned soldier who had no means of supporting this woman; he was on a small farm which he had purchased under the federal land settlement scheme. The woman was dying of tuberculosis. Both these persons have since died, and they received nothing whatever from the government to assist them, although the husband had served during the whole of the war and the wife had gone to work in order to maintain herself in his absence. I must say that the Pension board has nothing to do with this case, but there is something wrong with the Pension Act or the Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment Act when it allows a pensioner and the wife of a pensioner to depend on charity for their subsistence. This was a very unfortunate case, the wife dying of tuberculosis and the husband dying of syphilitic spinal meningitis, having previously been dependent entirely on charity.

Mr. BELAND: I may point out that under clause 12 of the act the board has discretion in such a case to award a pension if the soldier or his dependents are in a dependent condition.

Mr. ANDERSON: I took this case up with the Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment board here in Ottawa and also with the Pension board. I pointed out the peculiar circumstances in which these people were situated, and directed attention to the fact that they had failed to get any assistance whatever. The Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment board claimed that he did not come under their jurisdiction and that they could do nothing in the way of treatment, and the Pension board absolutely refused to grant a pension. They said the matter did not come under their purview; that they were unable under the Pension Act to give any assistance to this very dependent wife who, suffering from tuberculosis, was dying at the time. I cannot quite understand the statement of the minister, having regard to statements of the Pension board in this case.

Mr. BELAND: I may say in this connection that the department has treated and is treating now many soldiers suffering from syphilitic affections. That is so far as the department is concerned; so far as pension is concerned, naturally that would come under the Pension board. I will read to my hon. friend section 12 of the act:

> A pension shall not be awarded when the death or disability of the member of the forces was due to improper conduct as herein defined; provided that the commission may—

The commission "may".

> —when the applicant is in a dependent condition, award such pension as it deems fit in the circumstances.

So the board has full discretionary power in a case of that kind to award a pension to the widow or to the wife of the soldier.

Mr. ANDERSON: The case was placed squarely before the board, and they claimed that his disability was not due to his service, and that he was therefore not entitled to any pension; and the same was said of the dependent wife. Of course, they do not need it now; there is none of the family left.

Another case I wish to bring to the attention of the minister has to do with regimental number 663,242, pension number 106,-363. This man served overseas as a private, returned, was rated as having a pensionable disability and was receiving a pension of $7 a month. He has not been able to do a single day's work since he returned toward the end of 1918: during all this time he has been dependent on his family. He had apparently a peculiar disability, one in connection with which no pathological change could be found. Having received his pension up to January, 1922, he was asked to go to Toronto for treatment. He remained in hospital in Toronto from January, 1922, until May 5, 1922, receiving treatment. He was then discharged from hospital; the doctor told him he could do nothing further for him. Shortly after returning to his home he was notified that his pension had been discontinued. In October I made a further application on his behalf and on October 9 he was returned to the hospital in Toronto for treatment. He remained there for four days, from the 9th to the 13th of October, when, claiming that he could not stand the treatment he was being given, he voluntarily left the hospital and went home.

A report was then sent in to the Pension board, but they still refused to reinstate his pension. I have taken the matter up with the board on several occasions and they maintain that this man's pension cannot be reinstated unless he submits to further examination and treatment. The claim is made that although this man has been under the doctor's care for over a year, there has been an absolute failure to diagnose his case and to establish any pensionable disability, although the Pension board admit that he is entitled to a pension. Simply because he refuses to return for examination and treatment he is prevented from drawing that pension. I have tried to prevail upon him to return for treatment and consideration of his case, but he refuses to do so, and consequently he is penalized on that ground.

Mr. BELAND: For what reason does he refuse treatment?

Mr. ANDERSON: Because, he says, the treatment he received has not done him any good and the treatment he received on the last occasion he was there was so severe that he was unable to stand it. He claims that when he left the hospital he was scarcely able to walk owing to the pain which had been induced by the treatments given. His family now refuse to allow him to return. I think this is a case that might well be looked into by the minister and given serious consideration.

I have one other case to submit—and I may say that these are only a few of the cases which have come to my attention. A soldier who enlisted in 1914 was sent to Valcartier camp and was there only a short time when he contracted cerebro-spinal meningitis and was sent to hospital. During the attack of cerebro-spinal meningitis he contracted pneumonia. He was in hospital there during all the time the soldiers were at Valcartier, and for some time after they left. I cannot give his number; there was no record of his number or of his service; it was very difficult to find out anything about him so far as the records of the department were concerned. This man was a member of the 5th Field Company, Canadian Engineers. This is a letter from Mr. W. L. Malcolm:

> He proceeded with us to Valcartier camp on or about August 16, 1914. While at the camp and while under my command Sapper W. L. Mullin contracted spinal meningitis, later followed by pneumonia. He was in hospital in Quebec for a very long period, being there after the camp at Valcartier had been cleared. Later I understood that he returned to Acton, but of his later movements I am not aware.

This man, then, had meningitis, on the statement of his commanding officer. When this matter was first taken up before the commission, they declined to accept the evidence that was presented of spinal meningitis, but finally I got this letter from Colonel Malcolm. The letter is dated December 21, 1922, and says:

> The history of meningitis while on service is not confirmed by records, nor at the time it occurred is there any record of there being a spinal meningitis epidemic. It is true an outburst occurred subsequently in the ranks of the C.E.F.

I remember distinctly hearing that there was an outbreak of spinal meningitis while the soldiers were at Valcartier camp. This does not agree with the statement of the Pension board, but later on apparently they got further evidence and they said:

> This man enlisted on August 17, 1914. He took sick on September 24, 1914, at Valcartier camp and was admitted to hospital on the same date with a diagnosis of cerebro-spinal meningitis. He left hospital against the advice of the medical officer in charge and signed a waiver releasing the public from any responsibility for further care or treatment, or liability claim.

On that statement signed by this soldier the Pension board in the first instance based their statement that he was not eligible for pension. During the time after his discharge on the 15th of January, 1915, he was living in the town of Acton and was under treatment by a doctor there who has since died. There was a period of four or five years with no record of this man's disease from any medical officer so far as could be discovered. In 1921, on August 9, six years and seven months later, this man was taken very seriously ill. Previous to being taken ill he had been married, in 1918, I think it was. He had applied for life insurance, and when making his application for life insurance the examining physician discovered that he had a mitral insufficiency, that is a heart lesion, resulting as he said from endo-carditis. In 1921, six years after this man's discharge, he had a very serious attack of endo-carditis. He was attacked with embolism and was examined by three physicians, and died after consultation. Application was made by his widow for a pension and each of these three physicians, well known in that vicinity, gave a certificate that this man died from cerebral embolism produced by heart lesion which they claimed was the result of cerebro-spinal meningitis suffered in 1914. This was brought to the attention of the board, but the board refused a pension on the ground that cerebro-spinal meningitis rarely if ever caused a heart lesion but they forgot that this soldier also suffered from an attack of pneumonia at the same time as he was stricken with spinal meningitis. Now it is a well-known fact that spinal meningitis is an infectious

disease and that it sometimes results in the formation of pus, particularly about the ear. We know also that pneumonia very frequently results in impaired heart action, particularly pneumonia that results from some specific poison. After pneumonia, during an attack of la grippe, a heart lesion is quite frequent because pneumonia that results from a specific poison is not ordinary pneumonia, and it leaves the patient with an impaired and faulty heart action which, if it is severe enough, may result in embolism causing sudden death. The minister will understand that. Cerebro-spinal meningitis we know from history rarely causes a heart lesion, that is endo-carditis, but it has been known to occur. These gentlemen of the board absolutely refused to accept the certificates of the three medical attendants who saw this man and refused a pension on the ground that his disability and his death were not due to anything that occurred during service, that his disability did not result from his service to the country and they claim that from 1915 when he returned home up to the time this disease was discovered by the doctor examining him for insurance there is a period of something like five years as to which there is no evidence that the man suffered from anything. But the point is that the doctor who attended him during those years is dead, and we cannot present evidence for that period, but there is the evidence of the three medical gentlemen who attended him at the time of his death. The doctors of the Pension board, who never saw this man, and who knew nothing about the circumstances except what is furnished by the evidence, refused to accept that evidence as a judicial board and say their own deductions are better than the opinions of the man who saw this case.

Those are the points I wish to bring to the attention of the minister. I think the board at the present time is not giving the soldier that sympathetic consideration and treatment which parliament intended when the act was passed. They are entirely dependent upon a technical reading of the act. They are administering the letter of the law and missing its spirit, and I think if there is anything needed by which these men could see their duty a little more plainly, if these little technicalities were removed from the act, it would be much more easy for the Pension board and a great deal more satisfactory for the soldier, particularly the man who desires to get consideration some time after his discharge from the army on account of a disability appearing after his discharge.

There is one other point I wish to bring to the consideration of the minister and it is this: Many of these men were discharged from the army without a proper medical examination, and many of them were discharged as physically fit who had some disability resulting from war service and which is unknown to the department. They were, of course, naturally anxious to get to their homes, and they did anything to get away, waived examination and allowed themselves to be called medically fit, and then later on when they returned to civil life they found they were not physically fit. Just as this man did at Valcartier. He was in a hurry to get home and signed this waiver releasing the country from all liability in regard to him. He came home and died, I think, as a result of his war service.

There is another peculiar feature about this case which I wish to bring to the attention of the minister for his consideration. The difficulty was to prove that this man's disability was due to war service. If we proved that his death was due to his military service but that his disability was known previous to his marriage, that entirely eliminated the widow from any chance of getting a pension. That question was brought up in the House more than a year ago, and we amended the act at that time to alter that condition in the Pension Act, but I understand that the amendment was thrown out in the Senate; at least I am so informed, I do not know whether it is correct or not. But after looking over this case and trying to convince the board that his death was due to service, I tried to bridge that gap between 1915 and 1921. I finally did find a doctor who had seen him during this period, and I got a certificate stating that he had examined this man—he was not sure of the date—and had found that he had an endo-carditis and valvular lesion of the heart. I placed the case before the Pension board, and they said that as the man's ailment was known previously to the marriage and that the woman married the man although aware of the fact she was not entitled to come under the provisions of the Pension Act; therefore she cannot get a pension. If such is the case I wish the minister particularly to consider that point, and to have the law amended so that a widow with a small family under such circumstances may be assisted in her own name.

In other respects I may say the Pension board have treated me with the utmost courtesy, and I have no criticism to offer excepting this, that I think they are adhering entirely too closely to the technicalities of the law, rather than interpreting the law according to the spirit. Not only should they interpret the law in a liberal manner, but

they should give the applicant the benefit of the doubt and not throw the onus of proving the claim entirely upon the returned soldier. Over and over again the board have stated that where evidence can be produced to show the man is entitled to a pension they will consider his case, but until proof of that can be submitted they will not grant him a board. I do not think it is the soldier's place to do that. I think that when a returned soldier, believing he has a disability, makes application for a pension it is the duty of the commissioners when that case is brought to them, to look into the matter and grant a board to inquire into the circumstances, thus deciding for themselves whether he is or is not entitled to a pension. Certainly the onus of proving the claim should not rest upon the returned soldier.

Mr. MacLEAN (Prince, P.E.I.): A great many cases have been submitted to the Pension board which we, from our viewpoint, regard as very reasonable. Some of these cases have received attention but others have been overlooked. I have in mind the case of a big, strong, healthy young man who went overseas, was wounded in the thighs and back and is now receiving the small pension of $11.50 per month. Shortly after his return home his eyesight began to fail and to-day he is totally blind. The case of this man has received attention from the board. He has been taken to Halifax and has undergone different examinations, but still the Pension board seem to be of the opinion that his blindness cannot be attributed directly to his overseas service. His claim for an increase in pension has therefore been turned down. This is one very outstanding case among a large number that I have been written to about, and I wish to thank the minister for the splendid assistance he has given me. In some cases, as I say, we have been able to get the pension claims adjusted. In other cases if we have not been equally successful the minister has done everything in his power to meet the situation. The board seem to act strictly according to the letter of the law, and, as has been stated here by different speakers, seem to evidence a lack of sympathy in some cases. Possibly we cannot blame the board for this as it may be their duty to act strictly in accordance with the provisions of the act. Nevertheless, I feel that in some cases such as I have mentioned there ought to be a means of redress; and I certainly hope that the appeal board that is to be appointed will give proper attention to deserving cases which everyone feels should be thoroughly looked into. The blind man to whom I have referred has a wife and two children. I have a letter on my desk with respect to the case, but perhaps it would not be fitting at the present moment to take up the time of the House by reading it. Let me say that the people of the vicinity have had to go round and collect subscriptions to help this man and his family. It may be as well to point out that this poor fellow risked his life in our behalf. He is certainly deserving of greater consideration than he has yet received, and I trust that his case will be suitably dealt with.

I have also in mind another case. It is that of a woman whose two sons were killed overseas. Shortly afterwards her husband died. Although she has been left what we call a fairly good farm down in our province she is unable to work it, and derives no profit from this source. Her case has also been looked upon by the Pension board as not deserving of any consideration owing to the fact that she owns this property. I merely wish to put myself on record as saying that I trust that in the future such cases as these will be given greater consideration. I again thank the minister for his courtesy in assisting me in the great many cases I have brought before him.

Mr. CLARK: During the discussion this afternoon we heard a great deal of criticism with regard to the administration of the Pension Act. I have had some experience in presenting cases to the Pension board, and I have never undertaken a more difficult task than that of interpreting the law and presenting properly cases of applicants for pension. The member for Kingston (Mr. Ross) made some reference this afternoon to the medical services. Personally I think he touched upon the point which requires attention and which contains the only cure if a cure exists as the law stands, namely, that we must have the best medical men this country possesses to perform the work connected with the Pension Act.

In the Canadian Pension Act we have a clause which is different from the Imperial Pension Act, a clause which has given rise to the difficulty. I do not think I exaggerate when I say that nine-tenths of the complaints that have occurred in Canada have arisen under that particular section, namely, that in order to secure a pension a man's disability must be attributable to service. In Great Britain if a man was discharged and had nothing on his medical history sheet which indicated that he had disability connected with his war service that was the end of it, and if disability arose in the future no attention was paid

to it. In our country the law is quite different. If disability arises subsequent to discharge, although there is nothing on the medical history sheet to indicate that the disability was in any way connected with service, if it subsequently transpires that that disability which has arisen is attributable to service then the man gets a pension. This is purely a medical question. The Pension board —I do not care who they are—must be largely guided, and in ninety-nine per cent of the cases must be bound, by the conclusions of the medical men who investigate that particular point as to whether or not the disability is attributable to service. Now, I venture to say that as long as there are service men alive in this country there is going to be dissatisfaction under the Pension Act, unless the country is prepared to wipe out that clause altogether and allow any man who has had service overseas to come in and claim pension when disability arises, whether it is attributable to service or whether it is not. If you are going to leave the clause in the act that it must be shown that the disability is attributable to service, there will be dissatisfaction in this country amongst service men just as long as there are service men alive, because each applicant will be convinced that his disability is attributable to service. We might as well recognize that. The Ralston commission has proposed a cure for this dissatisfaction, namely an appeal board. I hesitate to differ with the royal commission that has had the advantage of evidence taken from coast to coast, and has had months to consider the matter. I am judging now by some of the applications for my support that are made by various men in this country who want jobs as members of these appeal boards. The minister can readily understand that I will have no influence in having members appointed on these appeal boards. Some of the applicants I would not recommend to the minister, and others I would. I can readily see the position the minister is going to be placed in when these applications begin to pour in from all over the country for jobs in nine different districts as members of these appeal boards and as advocates for the returned soldiers. I do not think that scheme is going to be a cure. I regret to think that it is not going to be a cure. I recognize, however, the situation which has been described by every speaker and the difficulties which have arisen under this particular section, and I personally think the most effective remedy is to improve our medical service until we evolve a medical service that will be so efficient that mistakes will be reduced to a minimum. I do not think we can eradicate mistakes, but we can minimize them. Now I am not criticizing the medical service in the country, because I think the officials are doing their utmost, but they are dealing with these cases every day, and they adopt the official attitude which one is bound to adopt when he is dealing with such cases day after day, and the sympathetic touch with the returned men is lost, and these cases are very often dealt with in such a way that they do not get to the root of the trouble, and do not really determine whether the case is attributable to service or not.

The minister has determined to establish appeal boards, and I would hate to think that I would have any influence in stopping anything that is going to be of benefit to the returned soldier or going to assist in eliminating or minimizing the dissatisfaction that exists. We have a judiciary in this country which to-day is not overworked; in fact, every province in this country has been enacting statutes which have reduced the volume of work whch our judges throughout the length of the country have to do. For instance, there are county court judges in every county throughout Canada. If the minister is going to have an advocate appointed in each of the eight or nine districts to advocate the claims of returned soldiers, why can the advocate not go before one of the county court judges who has been appointed by the Dominion and advocate his claim? They will certainly receive considerate and sympathetic treatment before our judges, because I do not think any body of men that we could pick out in the country would be more sympathetic than these judges. I think we would get justice just as readily from them as we will from appeal boards which are established, and which, as I am bound to say, will take on a political flavour, which would be a very serious matter in the interests of the returned men, if political appointments are going to be made, and I do not see how it is going to be avoided.

Mr. CARROLL: Last year I think the committee dealing with pensions made a recommendation to the House that an appeal board should be constituted at Ottawa, and I understand it has been constituted. Does the hon. member know whether anything has come of it?

Mr. CLARK: I have never run into it.

Mr. BELAND: Better ask me the question. I can answer it.

Mr. CLARK: Many cases have been presented and I want to make concrete suggestions as to amendments to the present Pension Act. I will refer to two cases which I have brought before the Pension board, and will ask for consideration. I am perfectly satisfied with the decision of the board in both cases, but they have convinced me that the law is such that they cannot do anything. Members have complained that these men carry out the law. What would be said of them, if they did not carry out the law? They are bound by the statutes we have passed. I think where these difficulties arise, and we have cases which are not provided for by law, it becomes our duty to bring in concrete suggestions by way of amendment, to meet these different cases. That is what I propose to suggest now in reference to these two cases. One of these is the case of a woman whose marriage certificate I have in my possession. She was married in England, in good faith, and came back to Canada with her husband. Her husband died and she made application for pension; but it then appeared that the man was previously married, and his real widow, who had a family also, made application for the pension, and the pension was granted to the real widow. Now this is not an isolated case, although it is the only one I have in my possession, but it is the type of case, which undoubtedly should be provided for. The first widow would no doubt have been entitled to her pension, but there is no reason in the world why the second wife should not be provided for in the act.

Mr. BELAND Would the hon. member suggest that the two widows should each receive a pension in this case? I am simply asking for the hon. member's opinion.

Mr. CLARK: Decidedly, I would say so, provided there was no immoral conduct on the part of either; but it so happens in this particular case the country would not be required to pay two pensions, because the first wife has since re-married; therefore, she has lost her pension, and the pension is now being paid to no one. But it is impossible under the law as it now stands to pay the pension to the second wife or widow.

The other is the case of Private McPhail, of Brandon, who died in Vancouver a short time ago. He was taken prisoner during the war and received very brutal treatment. He was wounded in the eye, and did not receive treatment for it for many days after he was taken prisoner. He came back to Canada completely wrecked in health and without his eyesight. He died the other day, and I have forgotten the nature of the disease from which he died, but in any case it was some six years after discharge. Up to the time of his death he was a 100 per cent pensioner, but having died more than five years after discharge his widow was not entitled to the pension, because the medical officers of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment maintain that the disability from which he died was not due to service. The old question of attributability comes up in this case as in nearly every case. So far as cases of this type are concerned, they can be met by an amendment to the Pension Act. I would suggest that where a man was a disability case to the extent of 100 per cent or even, perhaps, of less than 100 per cent, no matter how long after discharge that man died, his widow should receive a pension, because this is exactly the same as though the man were killed in France in service. The mere fact that he happens to live five or six helpless years will probably make the widow's case the harder. Far better for the widow had the man been killed outright, even though she received the total pension if he died six years or ten years afterwards. That is a case that might be taken under consideration. I have forgotten the number of the section; but the period is five years now, and where a man is a disability to the extent of 100 per cent, that provision should be wiped out, and no matter how long after discharge his death takes place, the widow should receive the full pension.

Those are two concrete suggestions that I have to offer to the minister, and I also hope, before he decides upon the exact nature of this appeal board, he take the matter under very serious consideration, because I do not foresee clear sailing by any manner of means under that appeal board. In fact, as I say, as long as we have in our act the provision that a man must show disability due to service, we shall have dissatisfaction in this country, at least just as long as any ex-service man lives.

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): I think the tone of the discussion that has taken place to-day is not attributable to anything in the estimate before the committee, which estimate is the ordinary vote of recent years to provide for payment of pensions; but the discussion is because of the interest which the public is taking to-day in the whole question of pensions payable to members of the
9 p.m. Canadian Expeditionary Force and their dependents. During the war promises were made to the soldiers that the disabled and their dependents and the de-

pendents of those who were killed would be cared for. I do not think the public has grown cold in the matter; I think the public had simply lost track of the situation until very recently and was not in touch with what was going on. In line with public sentiment that returned soldiers and their dependents who needed help should be helped, legislation to that end was passed. The legislation was intended to be generous; it went further than any previous legislation establishing pensions had ever gone. It was passed entirely on the insurance principle: that is, pensions were awarded for any disability incurred or aggravated on service; it did not matter whether the disability or death was due to service or not. In other words, the country insured the soldier against any disability incurred while on service, whether or not the service caused the disability. For instance, a soldier on leave might be run over by a tram car and injured or killed. That disability incurred during the period of his service would entitle him or his dependents to a pension just as much as if he had inhaled poison gas from the Hun trenches or been killed by a Hun bullet. The other principle of the two is that pension is payable only because disability is due to service, for instance, where a man was wounded or killed in action. The present investigation and interest in pensions are due to charges made against the Pension board by the Great War Veterans' Association. That association complained that in 1920 the "due to service" principle was introduced into the act on the recommendation of the Pension board, who represented to the parliamentary committee of that time that this principle would apply only to the permanent force and to those serving in peace time, and not to the Canadian Expeditionary Force. But according to the Great War Veterans' Association, notwithstanding those assurances, the principle was applied to the Canadian Expeditionary Force men and their dependents as well. In support of that, I propose to quote briefly to the committee some of the findings of the Ralston Commission. This is set out at page 44 of the first report:

> The 1919 Pension Act had reference essentially to those who had served in the war, and it included the few who remained in service after peace was declared, to clean up the debris of war. The permanent force was not included.
>
> The 1919 act provided that pensions were payable on the "insurance principle," that is, for any disability incurred during service, although not "due to service", but it was intended, by the second proviso to section 11, that when peace was declared, Canada would go back to the "due to service" principle.
>
> The Great War Veterans' Association claims that this change was not to affect discharged Canadian Expeditionary Force men, as to disabilities or deaths connected with their period of service, while the Pension board contends that it was to apply to all deaths or disabilities occurring after peace was declared, whether of discharged Canadian Expeditionary Force men or those still serving.
>
> The commission found that, in its opinion, the change was only to apply to those who continued in the service for peace time duty, and was not to affect discharged Canadian Expeditionary Force men as to disabilities or deaths connected with their period of service.
>
> The representatives of the returned men thought that the change was not to affect discharged Canadian Expeditionary Force men or their dependents.
>
> The representatives of the returned men asked, before the 1920 Parliamentary committee and elsewhere, whether the Canadian Expeditionary Force men or their dependents were affected by these amendments, and were told by representatives of the Pension board that they were not. They also undertook that if any further provision were necessary to safeguard the rights of these men and their dependents, it would be put in. The representatives of the Great War Veterans' Association accepted these assurances and the amendments were passed.
>
> In view of the commission's conclusion as to the true construction and intention of the 1919 act, it can be said now that these assurances were not carried out because the saving clause section 29, construed literally, did not protect the rights which discharged Canadian Expeditionary Force men and their dependents had acquired under section 11 of the 1919 act, but only saved disabilities or deaths occurring before September 1, 1920, as to everybody, Canadian Expeditionary Force or otherwise. After that date the new section 11 came into effect as to discharged Canadian Expeditionary Force men and their dependents, as well as to all others, and this meant that after that date, if the statute were interpreted strictly, two classes of cases which formerly had been dealt with on the "insurance principle" would be refused pension unless they could show that the death or disability was caused by military service.
>
> These classes would be—

And very wide classes they are:

> (1) The dependents of those who died after September 1, 1920, even though the death was due to something which was incurred on service, and even though the deceased had been receiving pension for the very trouble which caused the death.
>
> (2) The discharged Canadian Expeditionary Force man who had a disability which could be shown to be connected with his period of service, but who could not show that his condition at discharge was serious enough to constitute a disability.

Then the commission in general find in favour of the charges made by the Great War Veterans' Association, that is as to anything important in the charges, and the commission recommend legislation that will re-instate applicants, including their dependents, in their rights under the original act of 1919. There can be no doubt, I think, that the Pension board, within recent years at any rate, has constituted itself too much a watchdog of the treasury. They have looked on applicants for pensions with too much suspicion. They have, I believe, sought opportunities to refuse applications rather than to bring them reasonably within the act.

I do not think that the government wishes them to act in that way; I do not think that either parliament or the public wishes them to do so. I think they have taken the wrong cue. In the investigation before the parliamentary committee last session, on which I had the honour to serve, it was plain to me, as I think it was to the members of the committee, that the Pension board was carrying out the letter rather than the spirit of the law, or the intention of parliament—either of this or of preceding parliaments; and it was quite apparent to me, and I have no doubt it was equally obvious to the committee generally, that the board would persist in its policy of carrying out the letter of the law in that way regardless of the recommendations of any parliamentary committee. I understand, from press reports, that it is more than likely they will also disregard the recommendations of the Ralston commission. I believe the board could very much ameliorate present conditions by a little give and take in their administration of the act. They have tightened up too much.

This afternoon the member for Vancouver South (Mr Ladner) referred with some particularity to a case that came before the committee last session. I refer to what is known as the Percy White case. That matter was practically retried before the parliamentary committee last year. The board was represented before the committee and the applicant and her witnesses also appeared. Both sides were fully heard, and after hearing them and seeing them face to face the committee recommended that the pension be granted, and advised the board that in their opinion it had been wrong in refusing the pension. Surely that was reason enough for the board to relent and grant the pension. I do not think they are quite so conscience-bound as to be unable to do so if they really wished to be fair. But notwithstanding the representation of the parliamentary committee they refused to reconsider the matter. I do not say that the Pension board is always unfair or intentionally unfair, but in that case at least one of the members of the board was downright and intentionally unfair to the applicant. There is evidence on the file today of such unfairness on the part of at least one of the members of that body. There is evidence of personal antagonism to the applicant, who was a widow in ill-health, penniless and with an infant child to support. It is plain from the evidence that this member of the board so far forget himself as to ignore all demands of fair play and of gentlemanly instincts and to place on file grossly unfair notations, having no bearing whatever on the merits or demerits of the application, gratuitously insulting, and calculated to prejudice the board against the application. There is no question about that; if they have not been removed, the notations are there yet to speak for themselves. I do not propose to detail the evidence that was given before the parliamentary committee in that case; it was gone into sufficiently by the hon. member for Vancouver South this afternoon. I can only say that a flagrant injustice was done and is being persisted in; and that is only one of a number of similar cases which have not been remedied.

This new ruling of the board under which they tightened up in their policy became known to the Great War Veterans' Association only some six months after it had been made. For some unaccountable reason the board kept that ruling practically secret at head office until finally it got out in some way not accounted for. The evidence before the Ralston commission is that the board did not know how that minute was ever communicated to any of the district offices. They did not send it out officially; it leaked out mysteriously. Fortunately, however, it did get out and the Great War Veterans' Association then became aware of the principle on which the board was acting. This was the state of affairs in the closing hours of the 1922 session of parliament when Mr. MacNeil, the secretary of the association, realizing that something desperate had to be done to wake up the public, parliament and the government, sent his famous telegram. The telegram, I think, was worded extremely; there was no reason to suspect the Pension board of a secret conspiracy, which was the effect of the telegram. But there was every evidence to warrant Mr. MacNeil in assuming that secret regulations were being made—and as a matter of fact had been made, and had been withheld from the public—under which the board was acting. He had to startle the government into attending to that piece of public business; and he did so, with the result that the Ralston commission was appointed. After many sittings, a very thorough investigation and the hearing of much evidence and of many witnesses, the commission submitted a finding entirely favourable to the Great War Veterans' Association, recommending legislation which, if enacted, will leave very little to the discretion of the board. They recommend the establishment of central appeal boards.

It goes without saying that the position of members of the board is a difficult and delicate one to maintain. I have had exactly

the same experience as many members who have already spoken on this matter have had. I am free to observe that in regard to the specific cases which I have submitted to the board I have received nothing but the most courteous and proper treatment. I have half a dozen cases pending now before them and I expect the same treatment. But there is no reason why any special pleader should have to go to the board. They should decide all applications on their merits. No member of parliament should find it necessary to go to the board; nor should any applicant for a pension have to enlist the services of a member of this House, no matter how willingly they may be given. It should be all in the day's work of the board. The condition should not exist wherein the Pension board refuses an application and then, because some member of parliament or some other agent pleads the case further, reverses its decision. The decision should be right in the first instance. When we hear of cases being refused simply because they have not been properly presented, whose fault is it? Surely it is not the fault of the applicant; it is the fault of the board. The board should see to it that the evidence is all properly submitted and that the case is finally and fully presented before they give their decision.

I might mention one astounding case I have now in hand of a man who went to the war as a volunteer. He was a strong, healthy man in every respect, a six-footer. He was hit in the arm with shrapnel; the arm was shattered and has since not been of any use to him. He was sent from hospital to hospital till the armistice came and he was finally sent to Canada. He did not want to go to hospital in Canada and in his hurry to get his discharge he told them to mark him A-1. The disability was apparent, however; the arm was stiff, as it still is; he cannot raise it above his shoulder and cannot lift anything. They discharged him A-1, and in various ways he managed to get employment until the past winter when he was up against it. When I inquired of him I was astonished to find that he was getting no pension, I advised him to apply and he did so; but to my amazement pension has not been granted. I have not found out why; it may have been because of his eagerness to get his discharge. But it is such cases as these that are causing dissatisfaction. Although the act is not as perfect as it should be or as it can be, I think that a great deal of dissatisfaction could have been avoided had the board seen fit to adopt a more diplomatic attitude. On the contrary, they have in some cases adopted the most toplofty or infallible attitude; they could not err; they could not make a mistake; what they said was the law and must stand. That attitude is not calculated to make the administration of that department very popular. The people are becoming alive to the fact that legislation is necessary to meet the present state of affairs and to give the board power to do what they say they would like to do but are prevented by law from doing. When that legislation is finally framed and passed and becomes effective, there may not be much need of appeal boards; personally I hope there will not be at any rate. I must say I have not very much faith that relief will be afforded by a multiplicity of pension boards which, in effect, is the legislation recommended by the Ralston commission. They really recommend the establishment of a great number of district pension boards. If one pension board cannot do any better than it has been doing, I do not think nine or ten or twelve will bring about any greater degree of satisfaction. I have more faith in the judgment of courts of the land, experienced and trained as they are in the weighing of evidence and the administering of justice. Expense, after all, is not a matter to be very seriously considered if we can get satisfaction for the returned soldiers and their dependents. But in any case, before adopting in toto the recommendations of the Ralston commission, I would urge the government to take into account the suggestion which has been made to-day by other members as well as by myself, namely, that appeals from the decisions of the Pension board should go to the regularly constituted courts of the land, which, I affirm, are quite competent to deal with the situation.

Mr. BELAND: First of all, I should like to make clear the position the minister occupies with regard to the administration of the Pension Act. The Board of Pension Commissioners is constituted by a special clause of the Pension Act, and it is provided by that act that the decisions of the board shall be final. So that whatever may be the desire of any hon. member or of any member of the government; whatever may be the desire of the minister in charge of the department, to whom the board is bound to make a report, no decision of the board can in any way be altered or appealed from. The contention of the board is that they interpret the act as it has been enacted by this parliament. Reference was made by the last speaker (Mr. Black, Yukon), and also, I think, by the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Ladner) to the principle which ran through the whole

act of 1919. Nothing can be truer than their assertion in this regard. In 1919 a Pension Act was passed by this parliament providing for men who had served in the Canadian Expeditionary Force a pension for any disability incurred on service and also for any aggravation of a pre-existing disability, whether or not such disability was attributable to service. That was the condition that prevailed in 1920, when the act of 1919 was amended. It will be remembered that through an error peace was declared on the tenth of January, 1920; the real declaration of peace took place on the thirty-first of August, 1921. During the session of 1920 a special parliamentary committee dealt with pensions and re-establishment generally. It was thought during that session that peace had been declared; and if you read carefully the act of 1919 you will see that there is a special provision that after the declaration of peace pensions should be awarded in respect of death or disability when these were attributable to service. Now, in the session of 1920 an amendment was introduced to the Pension Act of 1919 repealing section 11, which was the vital section, and replacing it by the provision that pension should be awarded in respect of disability or death when such disability or death were the direct result of military service. I had at that time the advantage of being a member of the parliamentary committee, as I have been ever since the war with the exception of last year.

Mr. LADNER: The minister was on that committee. Will he say it was the intention of the committee or of parliament at that time that that change should apply to members or ex-members of the Canadian Expeditionary Force, or was it not the intention that the change should apply only to members of the permanent force?

Mr. BELAND: I was coming to that: I could not speak of it before I had mentioned the fact that the law had been amended. Before the parliamentary committee representatives of the Pension board were heard and they stated definitely that the new section would not affect the Canadian Expeditionary Force men but would be applicable only to men who remained on service after the declaration of peace, having in mind undoubtedly the men of the permanent force. That act was passed by parliament and things went on until 1921, when another special parliamentary committee had to deal with pension matters. Then the words "as such" were added to the 1920 clause 11, and the clause in 1921 after that addition would read about like this: Pensions shall be awarded when disabilities or death are attributable to military service as such. Again I think it was pointed out that that had reference only to men of the permanent force and that men of the Canadian Expeditionary Force would not be affected, that it did not change the practice with regard to them. Now the declaration of peace took place on the 31st day of August, 1921, and bearing in mind what the 1919 Pension Act said, that after the declaration of peace pensions would be awarded only in respect of disabilities or death attributable to war service, having also in mind the amendment of 1920 which did away with the insurance principle clause of 1919, and having also in mind this other amendment of 1921, the Pension board issued in the month of September, 1921, a minute in which it was stated that pensions henceforth would be awarded only when disabilities or death were attributable to military service. That altered to a large degree the practice that the Pension board had followed up to that time. I hope I make myself clear, but if I do not I would invite any question in order to make everybody absolutely satisfied that he understands the situation.

Mr. LADNER: On what authority was that minute of the Pension board issued?

Mr. BELAND: The Pension board does not require any authority at all to interpret the act. The act itself confides it to the discretion of the board to make their own interpretation, and moreover, my hon. friend being a lawyer and better versed in legal questions than I am knows as well as I do that if you read section 11 of the act as it was passed in 1920 it is plain that pensions can be awarded only when disabilities or death are attributable to military service. But as to what my hon. friend mentioned a moment ago, when this very limiting amendment was considered before the parliamentary committee it was then openly stated by the representatives of the board that this clause would apply only to men who remained on service after the declaration of peace and would not affect the members of the Canadian Expeditionary Force. This minute was issued in the month of September, 1921, under the authority of the Pension board, and they have that authority; it is given to them.

Mr. LADNER: Are they the final arbiters on the question of the interpretation of the law? Have they any method of referring, for instance to the Supreme Court?

Mr. BELAND: They are the final arbiters. There is an appeal from the Pension board to-day, but it is an appeal from the Pension board to the Pension board, and that is the only appeal there is.

Mr. MANION: Do they not often get the opinion of the Justice department in interpreting the act?

Mr. BELAND: They do, but they are not forced to do it. They may seek the opinion of the Department of Justice. In this instance they have sought the opinion of the Department of Justice on clause 11 as it now stands on the statute, and the Justice department, and I think properly so, replied that the board's interpretation of the letter of the act was correct. No one could say otherwise.

But what I have in mind, Mr. Chairman, are the declarations that were made before the parliamentary committee by the representatives of the Pension board to the effect that the new clause 11 would only apply to members of the permanent force, because as they said there is now no longer any Canadian Expeditionary Force. It was then made perfectly clear by the chairman of that committee, Mr. Cronyn, and by a number of hon. gentlemen who sat on that committee, and in particular by the hon. member for Parry Sound (Mr. Arthurs), that it would not affect the Canadian Expeditionary Force men. The clause as you read it in the act to-day does not refer at all to disabilities or death incurred on service, but only to disabilities or death which are the result of military service as such. Having said that much, I do not want to delay the committee much longer.

I may say that when the Pension board in 1921 issued that minute which placed upon their medical examiners the duty of awarding or recommending pension only to those who came within clause 11 of the new act of 1920, and 1921, the practice of the board and the practice of the medical examiners all over the country was naturally altered to a large degree. It was only a few months after that it was noticed that a stricter interpretation of what was thought to be the act was being applied by the Pension board and certain accusations were levelled against the Pension board. The rest of the story is known to every hon. member of this House. The accusations were investigated by a royal commission, which has taken a great deal of pains to get in contact with service men of every unit, and this royal commission has already submitted two reports bearing particularly upon pensions, appeals and insurance. The report has been placed in the hands of hon. members, and it is not for me to say what hon. members should think of it. As far as the charges against the Pension board of plot or conspiracy or ulterior motive are concerned, they have not been sustained. The royal commission has found, however, that the practice has been altered by the Pension board and that generally their policy had been unsympathetic, and that increased severity had taken place in the consideration of pension applications. If it could not be called undue severity, surely there was increased severity in dealing with applications for pensions. Now, the Ralston commission has submitted a number of recommendations in regard to the Pension Act. These recommendations I think will be carried out substantially by the bill which I shall introduce into the House, within two or three days, I hope. The resolution is already on the order paper which covers the main part of the bill.

Mr. LADNER: May I ask, will the bill include reverting to the insurance principle so that the remainder of the expeditionary force can enjoy the same advantage as those who acted prior to September 1920?

Mr. BELAND: Yes. I am not expected of course, to go into details at the present time. As minister in charge of the department I have been overwhelmed by complaints coming from ex-service men. I have a good deal of sympathy with most of my colleagues who have had two or three departments to administer during the last year. I think I might have as much sympathy for myself because I do not believe that the work performed by any other member of the government has been as arduous as the task that was mine during that time. I can fairly say that over 2,000 cases have been submitted to me for examination and for action. Those cases did not all have reference to pensions, but a large portion of them did. Others were treatment cases. Both classes in many instances, came together. Some hon. members, to-night or this afternoon, referred to their lack of success in submitting cases to the Pension board. Let me tell them that I have not been more fortunate than they have. Out of, I should say, about 1,000 cases, at least, of pensions submitted to the board for reconsideration I do not think that I have succeeded in more than 2 or 3 per cent. In other words the Pension board interpreted the act as they read it, and I do not believe that they will yield to any outside influence, which I think is something to their credit. I would not approve of their conduct if, in my cases though they might not be deserving, they should yield and award a pension. In many cases—I would not venture to state how many,

but in fifty cases at least—that I have submitted to the Pension board I believe that I would have given a different decision to the one they rendered. I may have been wrong but my impression was at that time that pensions should have been awarded in those particular cases. However, the Pension board thought in their wisdom that the act would not permit them to award a pension.

You do not, Mr. Chairman, expect me to go into the individual cases that have been submitted this afternoon by different hon. members. Most of them, I think, have come to my knowledge. Some are very interesting, some are peculiar, some are very rare. In a particular instance, I fancy, there is only one case such as that referred to by one hon. member, and I scarcely think the Pension Act should be amended on that account. If the sentiment of the people of Canada, if the sentiment of the House of Commons and parliament generally, is that the act has not been properly interpreted by the Pension board, the only recourse is to amend the act and provide for an appeal. I do not know of any court in the British Empire, outside of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, that is without an appeal. In Great Britain there are thirty different district boards specially appointed for the purpose of dealing with pensions and ex-soldiers. In the United States they had at first a very large number of district boards, but they have contracted this number gradually to fourteen. They now have fourteen district boards operating in the United States. There is an appeal from those district boards to another board in Washington, the exact evolution of which I forget. There is also an appeal from the decision of that second board, and finally an appeal from the third decision to the President of the United States.

Mr. LADNER: Would the minister mind saying whether those appeals are in the nature of a rehearing of the case and of the evidence, or are the cases tried in the courts just as cases are tried here before a trial judge, the case going to appeal with the same evidence subject to addition where evidence is omitted by mistake?

Mr. BELAND: I am not perfectly conversant with the regulations that govern appeals in the United States or in England. I presume that first of all those boards deal with the evidence which is on record and that a clear decision can be rendered immediately. When they are not satisfied that they have all the possible facts upon which the decision should hinge, they have power to inquire further. I think this is the only country in the world where there is no appeal from the decision of a Pension board.

It was most interesting to follow the discussion this afternoon and evening. The amendments which will be submitted will, I think, remedy the situation which is now so bitterly complained of as far as legislative action can do it. I know the appeal boards are somewhat clumsy. Although the machinery is pretty much involved the establishment of appeal boards will, I hope, give the men a large amount of satisfaction even if their claim is not sustained. These men will have in their vicinity or in their district a body of three persons to whom they will be entitled to present their side of the case personally, or through a representative of their own for which provision will be made by parliament, and if their appeal is not sustained, even if they do not receive any more money, they will have the satisfaction of knowing that all that could be done for them has been done. This recommendation of the royal commission, I think, is consequent upon insistent request from ex-service men all over the country. I have not read the record of evidence given before that commission because it is too voluminous—no man could undertake to do so unless he had a whole year to himself. I feel satisfied, however, that they have made the recommendation as a result of the request made by ex-service men of the highest type from Vancouver or Victoria to Halifax.

My hon. friend from Kingston (Mr. Ross) has suggested to the committee that perhaps the greatest difficulty lies in the fact that the presentation of the cases is not properly made. In this connection I am disposed to agree with him in a large measure. I think the men should have one of their own number whose duty it would be to take charge of the preparation and presentation of their claims to the board. That practice exists in England, and I think also in the United States. He is known in England as the Soldier Adviser, and this should be provided, I think, also in every unit. My hon. friend from Kingston also referred to the functions of the medical staff. No function is more important in dealing with pensions and applications for pensions than the medical staff. It is evident that in a large majority of cases it must be a matter of medical opinion, and the difficulty arises from the fact that medicine is a variable science. You can make an addition and everybody else will make it the same way and you can make a multiplication, and everybody will make it the same way, but the appreciation or the valuation of a disease or a disability, not being a mathe-

matical matter at all, medical opinion must vary as expressed by one medical man or by another medical man. My hon. friend from Kingston is of the opinion that we should secure the best medical and surgical opinion and services that can be secured in Canada. I agree with him in this regard. He has had considerable experience in those matters; but, undoubtedly, looking over the list of medical men who were selected originally by the government, I feel satisfied that we have at our disposal, with very few exceptions, the most prominent specialists in Canada, whether it be in surgery, in medicine proper, in the science of eye, ear, and throat diseases, or other ailments of the human body. I do not know personally all of the medical men, but I know most of them by reputation. In the cities of Vancouver, Winnipeg, Toronto, Montreal and Halifax, I think we have, if not all the best men, certainly some of them. The Pension board or any board at all that has to deal with pensions, will have to rely very considerably on medical opinion, and, as the years go by, as we get further and further from the armistice and from the declaration of peace, the harder it will become to decide as to the relationship of a particular ailment to a man's service. Hon. members will realize that immediately.

The fact, however, that we have 63,000 pensioners in Canada would not indicate that we have been entirely ungenerous. The board in many instances has rendered a decision which was faulty, I think, not in a sense that it was dishonest at all but in the sense that it was too narrow. If a few hundred more pensions had been awarded, we might not have heard any complaints at all. When one hundred pensions are awarded in Vancouver nobody speaks about it, but if one case is turned down, and if it is known by the public that that man is entitled to a pension but that it has been denied him it is discussed on the street and discontent penetrates the different classes of the population. I hope, however, that we will amend the Pension Act to carry out the recommendations. We will restore the insurance principle and will do away with the contention that because a man was discharged as A1 he must be A1 all his life, and he must not have any ailment related to his service in the years to come. It is a preposterous and, I think, absolutely unsupportable contention, that because a man is discharged in a hurry from the army as fit, or A1, he cannot, after six months or a year or two years, claim that he has a recurrence of a certain disability which was incurred on service and had disappeared for the time being.

We will also provide for insurance, but I wil. deal with that a little later, when we are in committee on the resolution. Now my hon. friend from Burrard (Mr. Clark) has thrown out a suggestion that appeals should be heard by the ordinary courts of this country. I do not know how that will work out in some instances. I have in mind the city of Montreal. At the present time there are more than 1,000 cases awaiting hearing before the courts of Montreal. I do not think I am very much wide of the mark when I say that—

Mr. CLARK: What particular tribunals does the minister refer to?

Mr. BELAND: The courts of justice,—the circuit court.

Mr. CLARK: Quite true; I realize that, but there are many more divisions. In regard to the particular division I have referred to, I feel quite convinced the situation is comparatively uniform thoroughout the country, and I think the hon. members for eastern Canada will bear me out in the statement that the work is not congested in any sense of the word. In fact I venture to say that in every county court in Canada the cases which are entered for trial at the beginning of the month are fully disposed of each month.

Mr. BELAND: My hon. friend's judges are happy judges.

Mr. CLARK: I am not referring to British Columbia only.

Mr. BELAND: In the city of Montreal, where undoubtedly a large number of appeals would arise, I do not know of a court that could hear those appeals to-day. I cannot speak for Halifax, Winnipeg, or Vancouver, but in the cities the courts are generally overwhelmed with cases, and they have more than they can attend to. My hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Boys) would, perhaps, know more about the situation in Ontario than I do.

Mr. BOYS: I would say that outside of Toronto, in the province of Ontario, I think the statement of the hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Clark) is correct. I refer now to the time that I think Ontario county court judges would have for disposal of appeals of the kind under discussion. I think the courts of appeal in Toronto sitting in appeal from the county court judges have plenty to do. But I venture to say in all the counties, outside of Toronto, and possibly Ottawa, London and Hamilton, the county court judges would have time to dispose of these appeals, if the minister thought that was the proper method of disposing of them.

Mr. BELAND: Of course I do not think that is the proper method. I am, however, subject to conviction. Toronto, Ottawa, Hamilton and London have a combined population of at least one-third of the population of the whole province of Ontario. One-half of the appeals, I would judge, would come from those cities, and those appeals would have to come before those city tribunals. Is an ordinary court of justice a competent board? Can one imagine, for instance, all the files needed in the trials of some of these cases being removed from the units to the different county court divisions, in Ontario for example? The matter is quite different if the board sits in a city itself; it is within easy reach of the unit where the files of the men are available.

As to the constitution of the court; generally those courts will have only one judge. The boards must have men who are conversant with military matters, with veterans' claims generally, with veterans' ailments. Members of the board should know what conditions prevailed in the army, generally speaking, and that is why I presume the royal commission recommends that two of any three men should be ex-service men. I believe also the recommendation is made in this regard upon the insistence of returned men generally. I do not know that in England those cases are tried before the ordinary courts of law. I am informed, and I think credibly, that those boards have been appointed by the Minister of Pensions for the purpose of hearing cases and then appeals upon decisions.

I think I have dealt with almost every feature of this subject that has been brought up very moderately by hon. gentlemen. The question of dealing with veterans generally has never been in the past, from the moment I served on the parliamentary committee in 1919 to this day, a matter of political cleavage. All the parliamentary committees from 1919 to last year have dealt with this question regardless of any political leanings that any member of it may have. This spirit has prevailed all through. I believe it is the intention of the people of Canada to give to the returned men a square deal,—justice—full justice—and if there is some remote measure of doubt in the case of a returned man, that he should get the benefit of the doubt, in other words, be treated with generosity. It will be in that spirit that I will submit, during the course of this week, I hope, the legislation that is intended.

10 p.m.

[Mr. Boys.]

Mr. CLARK: What particular case had the minister in mind when he said some time ago that there was only one case of that type in existence, and, therefore, legislation dealing with that case would not be justified.

Mr. BELAND: I think it was the case of a man with two wives.

Mr. CLARK: If that is the only case that has come to my attention, I think there are other cases like it. I presume the minister will admit that it is a case in which justice should be done to the woman, she having married the man in a bona fide manner. How does the minister propose to deal with such a case if no legislation covering it is to be introduced?

Mr. BELAND: The case submitted by my hon. friend has been disposed of as one of the widows has re-married.

Mr. CLARK: No, it has not.

Mr. BELAND: I understood my hon. friend to say that one of the widows had re-married.

Mr. CLARK: But a pension having once beeen awarded to one of the widows, the other one is barred forever by the act.

Mr. BELAND: I have now in mind another similar case to that referred to by my hon. friend. It came to my knowledge some six or seven months ago. I do not know in what way the matter was settled, but I have the feeling that it was adjusted. At all events, there are so few cases that they may be easily dealt with. I do not think I have anything else to say in this regard. The discussion has been interesting, instructive, illuminating in some regards, and I think also I have supplied the committee with all possible information in connection with the amount that was paid in pensions during last year.

Mr. LADNER: The minister did not state in connection with the proposed legislation, whether he intended to deal with the construction of section 11 in its relation to section 25 (3), that being the section which states that "no deduction shall be made from the pension of any member of the forces who has served in a theatre of actual war" and who was admitted as being physically fit when he enlisted. As the minister knows, the applicant must come under section 11 which deals with the rates of pensions before he can claim the benefit of this "no deduction" clause. That is a matter of importance and we have heard nothing in regard to it.

Mr. BELAND: It has been dealt with in the preparation of the bill. Clause 25 (3) has been removed under section 11.

Mr. MANION: The minister pointed out that the Pension board can act only within the statute. That is correct to a certain extent; but there are in the act a number of clauses under which the Pension board are allowed the discretion and I think that should be pointed out, because continually the Board of Pension Commissioners themselves point out that they cannot do such and such a thing because the act does not permit them to do it. The minister made that statement fairly strongly himself. While he was speaking, I looked over half a dozen clauses, clauses 29, 31, 33, 34, 37, and in all those clauses I have given the numbers of, the term "in their discretion" or "in their opinion" is used. That is as to the granting of pensions, so that in many clauses of the Pension Act the board can act in their discretion or opinion. Therefore, they are not tied down to cast iron rules as the impression would be given by the minister or themselves. I wish to make that correction because I think it is only fair that that statement should be corrected. They are tied down to cast iron rules in many of the clauses; but in many others the matter is left to their discretion, and it is usually in those clauses that cases arise on which there are disputes.

Mr. BELAND: Of course I am perfectly aware that in the Pension Act a number of clauses give the Pension board wide discretionary powers. But I beg to differ from my hon. friend when he says that these discretionary clauses are the vital clauses of the act.

Mr. MANION: I did not say that.

Mr. BELAND: Well, I understood my hon. friend to say that most of the cases that were complained of came under those clauses.

Mr. MANION: I said that very many of the cases came under them, and I think they do.

Mr. BELAND: I do not share my hon. friend's view, and I beg to differ humbly from his opinion. Most of the complaints are due to the interpretation or administration of two clauses of the act, clause 11, which is the vital section, providing for the award of pensions in the case of disability and death, and section 25, subsection 3, which deals with pre-existing disabilities in the case of men who served in any theatre of actual war. Outside of that, of course, there are a number of discretionary clauses. For instance, there are such clauses in the case of parents, grandparents, prospective dependency, dependent sisters, dependent brothers, any major child that has become of age but who for some reason or other may be incapacitated mentally or physically, and unable to earn his own living. If he were sound he would not receive a pension, supposing that he belonged to a pensioner, after the age of sixteen, and in the case of a girl after the age of seventeen. He might, however, be twenty-one and still be unable to earn his living, but in the discretion of the board he might be awarded a pension. In numberless cases of the kind discretionary powers are left with the board. No doubt there are some complaints in this regard, and my hon. friend is right in a measure. But if I have appreciated rightly the complaints that have come before me, most of them come within the category of disabilities on the part of men who claim a pension on that account, such disabilities having been incurred on service and not having been recognized by the board. There are a few cases of widows who claim a pension and are denied it because they married after the appearance of disability on the part of their husbands. Section 25, subsection 3, also caused a good deal of trouble in the matter of pre-existing disability in men who served in a theatre of actual war, undoubtedly the board have discretionary powers in many cases, and some of the complaints bear upon these matters.

Mr. BOYS: Earlier in the session I brought to the attention of the minister one or two cases where pensions had been cancelled without notice to the persons receiving them. It seems to me that there should be a very definite provision requiring, in every case either of suspension or discontinuance of pension, that the person entitled should receive personal notice, either by personal service, or at all events by registered letter, of the intention to dispose of the pension in one or other of these two ways. The person should be given every opportunity during a certain number of days, say ten days or two weeks, to explain any charge that may be made. I have no doubt there are many cases, apart from the ones that came to my personal notice, and I feel sure that the minister will agree that no pension should be suspended or discontinued without notice to the person entitled and an opportunity given of presenting his or her case to the board.

Mr. BELAND: I am of the opinion that a notice is always served on the person concerned. I am very much surprised to hear

that the board decides to cancel pensions without notifying the pensioners. I think they do notify them. But what my hon. friend undoubtedly has in mind is that a certain length of time should be given the person whose pension is to be cancelled in order that he may submit some evidence to prove that the information before the board is faulty or unreliable.

Mr. BOYS: I do not expect the minister to remember the matter, because too many of these things come to his notice for him to bear them all in mind. But earlier in the session I brought to his attention a case in my own town in which an officer came and got information locally. A widow was notified that her pension was discontinued and she never had an opportunity of putting in any evidence at all. Certain charges were made against her which she was prepared to meet. As far as I know her pension was restored, and I believe she is being paid it to-day. At least, I think so. But for a time it was absolutely cancelled and no opportunity was given her to submit any defence of any kind.

Mr. BELAND: I agree with my hon. friend absolutely that in such cases they should be notified, say, a month ahead of the intention to discontinue their pensions in order that they might have sufficient time to make representations.

Item agreed to.

Pensions on account of the Fenian Raid, 1866-1870, $1,000.

Mr. BELAND: I have only two pensioners.

Item agreed to.

Pensions payable to militia men and on active service Northwest Rebellion, 1885, and general pensions, $42,700.

Mr. BELAND: These pensions, the item of which I am bringing before the committee, are being paid by the Board of Pension Commissioners. The other pensions do not come under my department at all; they are statutory.

Item agreed to.

Salaries and contingent expenses of the Board of Pension Commissioners for Canada, $83,700.

Mr. MANION: What is the reason for this increase of over $12,000? We are getting away from the war.

Mr. BELAND: These estimates are prepared by the Pension board themselves. The expenses are their own and they have supplied me with an explanation. They cover clerical staff that was moved from the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment to the Pension board proper. My hon. friend will remember that under the late administration the Pension board was brought under the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment and the whole of the Pension board's clerical staff, except the personal staff, was transferred from the Pension board to the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment. That was effective in 1921. The Pension board remained with a certain number of clerks for their own work—correspondence, investigations, and so on. During the year they asked for the transfer from our department of a few clerks to assist in their clerical work, to which, of course, we agreed. There is really no increase. My hon. friend is aware that the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment decreased its staff in the city of Ottawa last year by 500 or 600. The items are made up as follows: permanent staff, 1 secretary; 1 accountant; 2 head clerks; 2 principal clerks; 1 senior messenger; 1 junior messenger; 3 senior clerk-stenographers; 3 clerk-stenographers; 1 junior stenographer. The total for the permanent staff is $26,880. The temporary staff consists of 10 medical advisers and 1 senior clerk-stenographer, total, $45,820. Then there are contingencies, $11,000; transportation and subsistence, stationery and supplies, unforeseen expenditures.

Mr. MANION: Is it likely that the maximum expenditure for the board has now been reached, or are we likely to have another increase for salaries next year? Has the minister any information on that subject?

Mr. BELAND: I have no information on that. As I have said, they simply asked for the transfer from our department to theirs of a few more clerks, and we could not refuse them.

Mr. MANION: The amount is $12,700, so it is not only a question of a few clerks. I do not suppose there would be any objection to the transfer of two or three clerks, but we are getting further away from the war, and while there may be occasion under the proposed amendments for some increased activity, no regulations were put in force last year to justify any such large increase in salaries.

Mr. BELAND: It is also my view that as we get further away from the war the work should decrease. But I do not think the Pension board had less work this last year than they had in the previous year.

Mr. MANION: They should not have had any more.

Mr. BELAND: I do not believe they had less. I would judge they had more.

Mr. MANION: Why?

Mr. BELAND: Applications come in regularly. My hon. friend would be surprised if I told him the number of applications received and the number of cases dealt with by the board in one year.

Mr. MANION: Does the minister suggest that we were not receiving applications in previous years?

Mr. BELAND: We were receiving them, but they were disposed of. The cases that now come up require a great deal more examination. At all events, the Pension board prepared this estimate; they say they require that clerical staff, and I have no doubt they are perfectly straight about it.

Mr. MANION: I am not questioning that at all. The minister seems to take the attitude that he should not know anything about this estimate. I admit that so far as administration of the act goes the minister has no control over the board, but so far as the executive work goes he is the minister in charge and is the only one from whom we can get information regarding any of these things. So I think it is up to him to be able to furnish information respecting any of the items involved in this vote.

Mr. BELAND: I realize that. I do not think I have indicated any desire to withhold information. The fact is that the board have asked the department for five or six more clerks—I do not know exactly how many; we have transferred these clerks from some of our branches, and instead of being paid by us they are now paid by the Pension board.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Can the minister tell us how these ten medical advisers are disposed? What are the departments represented—medicine, surgery and so on?

Mr. BELAND: I do not know exactly; the board select their own medical advisers. I think the men who are there now are the same men who were there two or three years ago. I do not know the names of more than three or four of them.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): This is a matter to which I have already made some reference. It seems to me that these men who are close to the Pension board should be the biggest men obtainable, having regard to the nature of their duties. I was wondering if the minister could tell the committee what medical departments they represent?

Mr. BELAND: I have not any particular knowledge as to their attainments, but I believe that so far as some of them are concerned, they enjoy a very good reputation. It is up to the board to select their own men. They have surgeons, internists, oculists, genito-urinary specialists, chest specialists, and so on.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): There has been a little criticism, quietly, that some of them are rather young and without the experience that one would naturally expect in advisers of such an important department as the Pension board.

Mr. BELAND: I entirely agree with my hon. friend. I was not responsible for their appointment.

Mr. CHISHOLM: How much are they paid?

Mr. BELAND: Each is paid $4,500.

Mr. CHISHOLM: Do they devote all their time to the work?

Mr. BELAND: Yes.

Mr. LEWIS: How many of them live in Ottawa?

Mr. BELAND: All of them.

Mr. LEWIS: Does the minister mean to say that these ten medical men devote all their time to that work in connection with the Pension board?

Mr. BELAND: They do.

Mr. LEWIS: They are not practising on the side at all?

Mr. BELAND: No, none of these are.

Mr. MANION: Does this item contain the salaries of the Pension commissioners themselves?

Mr. BELAND: No, that is statutory.

Item agreed to.

Progress reported.

RETURNED SOLDIERS' INSURANCE

Hon. H. S. BELAND (Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment) moved that the House go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend The Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act by providing,—

(1) That in any case where an application for insurance under the said act has been received, and the applicant has died prior to the delivery to him of the policy of insurance, the approval of the application by the proper officer and the receipt of the initial premium shall be deemed to have been sufficient to put the insurance into force, unless it can be shown that the application was fraudulent, and any insurance

moneys which would have been payable had the policy been delivered to the applicant shall now be made payable, subject to a deduction of the amount of premium due from the date of application to the date of death.

(2) That any applications which were rejected prior to 1st July, 1922, under any conditions set forth in section 2 of the amending act of 1922, or the schedule thereto, shall be reviewed, except in cases where the applicant is suffering or has become impaired as a result of self-inflicted wounds or immoral conduct, or where the application was fraudulent, and provision be made to give the right on such review to any applicant now living to insure, and if the applicant has died, the amount of insurance for which he applied shall now be made payable, less the amount which would have been due as premium from the date of application to the date of death, notwithstanding that no effective insurance contract was completed, and provided that the application was approved.

He said: This resolution is for the purpose of carrying out the recommendation of the royal commission respecting soldiers' insurance. Clause 1 applies to a few cases where the application for insurance had been filed with the department, had been approved and the premium paid, but the soldier died before the policy was delivered to him. It was held by the Finance department that in such cases no contract existed and the insurance money was not paid to the soldier's dependents. There are only six or seven such cases in all. This is to provide that when the application was regularly approved and the premium paid—

Mr. BOYS: Prior to death? The resolution does not state that.

Mr. BELAND: That is what it means.

Mr. BOYS: The bill will?

Mr. BELAND: It is to cover these cases where the application was received and approved and the premium paid but where the soldier died before the policy was delivered.

Mr. MANION: May I ask the minister if these two amendments to the Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act cover all the recommendations made by the royal commission respecting soldiers' insurance?

Mr. BELAND: Absolutely.

Mr. MANION: All of them?

Mr. BELAND: Yes.

Mr. POWER: Would the minister explain what is meant in clause 1 by saying "unless it can be shown that the application was fraudulent?" Would he give us some examples of what would be considered a fraudulent application?

Mr. BELAND: It might be signed by another man in his name.

[Mr. Béland.]

Mr. POWER: Would that be the only case?

Mr. BELAND: I have no other cases in mind at the moment.

Mr. POWER: Would it be such a case as this? The applicant is dying; he has beeen warned by his physician that he is likely to die within two or three days or a week and he sends in his application for insurance. Would that be considered a fraudulent application?

Mr. BELAND: No.

Mr. HANSON: Is it intended to cover cases where the application had been passed on before death?

Mr. BELAND: Clause 2 of the resolution covers that. I stated when I gave notice of this resolution two or three days ago that there was a slight error made in the drafting of clause 2. The last line should not have read "provided that the application was approved' but "provided that such applicant lived for a sufficient period of time to admit of the approval of his application by the proper officer of the department in the ordinary course of procedure."

Perhaps a word of explanation is necessary in this connection. The intention when this Soldiers' Insurance Act was passed by parliament was that every returned soldier who made an application for insurance could insure, in other words, that every soldier should be insurable if he made application. I think in 1921, and especially in the month of January, 1922, some restrictions were made and enforced by the Pension board, which has the administration of this act together with the Minister of Finance, to the effect that the insurance money in the case of an application not being approved would not be payable, and also that certain applications on the part of men who were seriously ill of an illness which was not due to war service, and who moreover had no dependents, should not be entertained by the board or approved by the Minister of Finance. Hon. gentlemen will remember that during the session of 1922 we amended the Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act to provide a certain schedule which sets out the conditions under which an application for insurance can be refused. That amendment was passed last year. The Returned Soldiers' Act was passed originally in 1920 and was made valid for the period of two years, so on the 1st September, 1922, it was coming to an end, but last year we extended the provisions of the act for one year making it applicable to the 1st September

1923, with certain restrictions proposed in a schedule that was annexed to the act. But now we contend, and I think it is only fair, that all the men, no matter what physical condition they may have been in who filed their applications before the 1st July, 1922, that is the time the act was amended with the schedule, should be insurable and in case of death their dependents will receive the insurance money. I asked the department to supply me with a report in this connection and they gave me the following figures which, perhaps, are not absolutely needed in this instance but which may be of interest to hon. members: Total number of policies issued as of March 31st, 1923, 19,516, with a value of $46,864,500. Total number of death claims as of March 31st, 1923, 514. I may say en passant that this is not a very large rate. The value of these claims is $1,622,500. The total number of claims settled under section 10, insurance cancelled by award of pension, was 109.

Mr. BOYS: Have you a statement of the premiums received for the policies that were paid?

Mr. BELAND: No, I have not that information.

Mr. POWER: Has the minister a statement of the applications refused?

Mr. BELAND: Yes, I will give that in a minute if my hon. friend will wait. Now, as to the number affected by the bill which I am going to introduce, I may state that the total number of cases that will be subject to review under the proposed legislation is 71. This has reference to the second part of the resolution, to applications which were not approved. The 71 applications are divided as follows: Applications of those who have died 35; applications with dependents still living but seriously ill, 36; making a total of 71 with a liability of $233,500. It is represented that these men had, under the original act, the privilege of insuring their lives only by making application, without any medical examination and regardless of their physical condition. Well, 71 of those cases have been refused, and I am introducing a bill to provide for the honouring of those claims.

The CHAIRMAN: Have you a copy of the amendment?

Mr. BELAND: I have no amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: There was an amendment read to paragraph 2.

Mr. BELAND: As far as the resolution is concerned?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. BELAND: I must have the bill then.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it in the bill.

Mr. BELAND: It is in the bill.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Beland thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 203, in respect of the Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

DEPARTMENT OF SOLDIERS' CIVIL RE-ESTABLISHMENT ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. H. S. BELAND (Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment) moved that the House go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend The Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment Act, and to provide:—

1. That the power to make regulations for the constitution of medical boards, including appeal boards, with such powers as may be deemed expedient, be repealed, and provision be made to give the minister power, with the approval of the Governor in Council, to make regulations for appeals from decisions as to the right of ex-members of the forces to treatment with pay and allowances, and for that purpose to designate the review and appeal tribunals to be constituted under the proposed amendments to the Pension Act.

2. That the Governor in Council may, on the recommendation of the minister, appoint an ex-member of the forces to be an Official Soldiers' Adviser in each unit or district of the department, at such salary or remuneration as may be decided in each case, with prescribed duties.

3. That the minister shall have power to appoint a person or persons to hear and receive evidence on oath in respect of any matter pertaining to the department or procedure of the department.

Motion agreed to and the House went into committee, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

Mr. BELAND: Under the Pension Act resolution which is now on the order paper it will be seen that a certain number of appeal boards will be constituted in different units throughout the country. The Pension Act, however, only deals with pensions. It is desired also to provide appeals for those ex-members of the force who are seeking treatment with pay and allowances. As hon. members are aware a number of men apply for treatment and are denied treatment with pay and allowance by the Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment board. As the right has been granted to appeal from a decision of the Pension board it is also proposed that the right shall be granted, in cases where treatment is denied, to appeal from the decision of headquarters to the boards that will be constituted under the Pension Act.

The second portion of the resolution provides for the appointment of a soldier adviser in every unit of the department, thus following the example which has been set in England. In every one of the thirty units in that country there is a soldier adviser who is paid by the government to give advice to the men who desire to appeal, that is, to examine their claim, and to advise them as to the propriety of appealing or not appealing, and to present their case before the board. In other words to represent them. This has been asked by the men generally throughout Canada and it has been recommended by the royal commission.

The third part of the resolution is a provision to give power to these investigators of the department to receive evidence on oath. This provision exists for the Pension board. In the Pension Act there is a clause, I do not remember which one, which provides that the investigators or the examiners of the Pension board can receive evidence on oath. We have numberless investigations to make in connection with treatment and with pensions. The officials of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment have no power to swear a person who gives evidence in these cases, and this provision is designed to prevent fraud as much as possible.

Mr. BOYS: How many appeal tribunals is it intended to appoint? One for each military district?

Mr. BELAND: One for each departmental unit.

Mr. BOYS: And I suppose the members of the tribunal are to be paid salaries?

Mr. BELAND: Oh, yes.

Mr. BOYS: How many units altogether?

Mr. BELAND: Nine units.

Mr. BOYS: And how many men will there be in each appeal tribunal?

Mr. BELAND: There will be three men.

Mr. BOYS: There will be twenty-seven appointments to be made in pursuance of this provision.

Mr. BELAND: Yes.

Mr. BOYS: At what proposed salary?

Mr. BELAND: That will come under the Pension Act Bill. If my hon. friend desires to discuss it now, I can give him the information.

Mr. BOYS: I just asked as to the proposed salary.

[Mr. Béland.]

Mr. BELAND: The salary for the men who will serve on the appeal boards is not fixed. I did not intend to make that position a permanent one. I had in view—and I think it is also the recommendation of the royal commission—that these men should serve part time, and that they should be paid so much per day when they are called upon to sit on a certain number of appeals that are brought in by the unit. When a number of appeals has accumulated, the members of that board should be called together and will discharge their duties during one, two or three days in a month, or more, as the number of appeals would warrant, and they will be paid so much per day. We thought that it would be a good deal more economical than to pay a regular salary and have these men devote the whole of their time to the work. It is presumed that during the first six months, or perhaps during the first year, the number of appeals will be very large, but after one year the number will decrease considerably. Then it is provided in the bill that we can contract the appeal board to the number which will be required; in other words, to extend the territorial limits of these appeal boards. Some of the men who were heard by the royal commission submitted the view that there should be one in every unit and were very insistent upon it. Others expressed the view that, perhaps, if we had three or four all over Canada it would be sufficient. But the commission has recommended specifically that in each unit there should be an appeal board and I think my hon. friend from the Yukon (Mr. Black), if I mistake not, referred to the great patronage that would develop therefrom. I can assure my hon. friend that I do not see it in the same light. My idea is not to exercise any patronage in this regard. The aim will be to secure three outstanding men in each one of those cities where the unit is located, who would commend themselves to public confidence and to the confidence of the returned men generally, regardless of their political leanings. I may say that the royal commission itself contained one Liberal, one Independent, and one Conservative.

Mr. HANSON: Who was the Conservative?

Mr. BELAND: Dr. McKeown.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: No, no.

Mr. BELAND: Has my hon. friend any doubt about it?

Mr. HANSON: Yes, I have.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Entirely wrong.

Mr. HANSON: Liberal-Conservative.

Mr. BELAND: That is an ameliorated Conservative.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am afraid there is simply amelioration and no conservatism.

Mr. BELAND: If my hon friend knew of the protests I have received from my Liberal friends because I did not make the appointments strictly Liberal, he would agree with me.

Mr. SHAW: Has the minister considered the matter of having the appointment of the official soldier advisers made by the Civil Service Commission? It seems to me, at least, that there should be some good reason for having them appointed otherwise than by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. BELAND: Does my hon. friend suggest they should be appointed by that commission?

Mr. SHAW: Yes.

Mr. BELAND: I have not the remotest objection.

Mr. CARROLL: Have they power to appoint temporary officials?

Mr. HANSON: Give them power to do it.

Mr. BELAND: No objection whatever. I would be pleased.

Mr. MANION: Is it the intention to proceed with the bills to-morrow? If so, we would require to get copies early in the morning because we want to look at them.

Mr. BELAND: No, it is not the intention, because they would not be distributed.

Mr. MANION: I hope my hon. friend will see that these bills are distributed early, because we would like to see them some time in advance of their being taken up in the House.

Mr. BOYS: As to the procedure before the appeal boards, will the boards merely review the evidence that appears on the files, or will they themselves hear evidence?

Mr. BELAND: It is provided that the man himself has the right to appear personally before that board.

Mr. BOYS: Before the appeal board?

Mr. BELAND: Yes, and he may submit whatever evidence he likes which is not already on the file, and the soldier adviser in this connection will be most useful to us. In that connection I would point out that I undertake before this House to appoint the soldier adviser that will be indicated to me by the returned soldiers' associations.

Mr. MANION: That is recommended by the commission, is it not?

Mr. BELAND: I think it is. The Civil Service Commission will suit me absolutely, if it suits the House. This is an appointment made by the soldiers themselves—their own representative.

Mr. POWER: Is the soldier adviser to be paid fees or salary?

Mr. BELAND: I presume these men will receive a retainer of so much a month. I presume the adviser will be a lawyer. That, of course, is in the hands of the soldiers themselves. If they should appoint a lawyer, we should provide, in accordance with the number of pensioners in the unit, what should be a fair monthly remuneration for him for whatever time he gives to the work of advising the soldiers generally.

Mr. POWER: There is a reference to the official soldier adviser in each unit or district; what is the distinction between unit and district?

Mr. BELAND: There is a distinction.

Mr. POWER: So that the intention of the minister is to appoint a soldier adviser in each unit? If I remember rightly Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick, and Nova Scotia are all one unit?

Mr. BELAND: Yes.

Mr. POWER: So that the man from Prince Edward Island, in order to have his case properly prepared, would have to consult his official adviser in Halifax?

Mr. BELAND: Yes.

Mr. POWER: Would it not be well to have an official adviser in Charlottetown or St. John, if it comes under the same unit? I would make that suggestion to the minister, owing to the difficulty of the men communicating with the adviser under the other arrangement. I think the minister should look into that. We have the same situation in Quebec. We happen to be under the control of the headquarters in Montreal. It is extremely difficult and inconvenient for pensioners in Quebec to have to consult the adviser or somebody in Montreal in regard to their pensions. I would suggest to the minister that, in cases where applicants are far removed from the headquarters an adviser should be appointed in some more convenient place. This seems to be a good job; let us give everybody a chance.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Beland thereupon

moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 204, to amend the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment Act.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BELAND moved the adjournment of the House.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What business has been arranged for to-morrow?

Mr. BELAND: I presume it was understood by the Prime Minister or the Minister of Finance to-day that we would move to go into Supply in order to afford the hon. member for St. John City (Mr. Baxter) an opportunity of discussing a certain matter in connection with the Post Office Department. If we have time we will take up the second readings of certain bills on the order paper, a resolution in connection with the Canada Shipping Act, standing in the name of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries; a resolution in connection with the Dominion Lands Act, standing in the name of the Minister of the Interior; a resolution in connection with the harbour of Three Rivers, standing in the name of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, a resolution in connection with the Militia Pension Act standing in the name of the Acting Minister of National Defence; also a resolution in connection with the Pension Act, standing in the name of the Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment.

Mr. MANION: Is the minister going to endeavour to get this work of his finished this week?

Mr. BELAND: I hope to be able to-morrow to introduce the Pension Act amendment and to dispose of all those bills this week, if possible, by Thursday. I think we have discussed them, except the Pension Act amendment, pretty thoroughly. We could discuss the Pension Act on Thursday. I will try to arrange matters with that aim in view.

Mr. MANION: I hope the minister will endeavour to do that. A number of hon. members wish to go out of town for a short time. They have been staying over day after day hoping that this would go on. They stayed over last week, and now they are staying over this week. They would like to get away at the beginning of next week, and I hope the minister will do everything in his power to get this through.

[Mr. Power.]

Mr. BELAND: I could accelerate matters if I were permitted to pass the resolution in connection with the Pension Act. I sent the bill to the Printing bureau this afternoon, and I hope to get it to-morrow.

Mr. MANION: I do not think there would be any objection to the House passing the resolution. We could discuss it on second reading.

Mr. BELAND: I cannot withdraw the motion for adjournment.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Yes.

Mr. BELAND: Can I get the unanimous consent of the House to withdraw the motion?

Motion withdrawn.

PENSION ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. H. S. BELAND (Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment) moved that the House go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend The Pension Act, chapter 43 of the statutes of 1919, and the amending acts, and to provide,—

1. That enactments be made respecting pensions for military services rendered during the war and after the war, which shall be made retroactive to the first day of September, 1919, and all cases in which pension has been refused, reduced, discontinued or underrated by reason of the fact that the proposed legislation was not included in the Pension Act shall be subject to review by the Board of Pension Commissioners, and on such review pension shall be granted, increased or continued as from the date or dates it would have been granted, increased or continued had such proposed legislation been in force when such refusal, reduction or discontinuance or underrating was made effective.

2. That the Governor in Council on the recommendation of the Minister of Justice may appoint a District Review Board for each of the nine districts of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, and a Federal Appeal Board for Canada, to review appeals from decisions of the Board of Pension Commissioners; and that provision be made for the tenure of office and qualifications of the members of such boards, and for the payment of their remuneration or salaries out of any unappropriated moneys of the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

3. That the Governor in Council may make such rules and regulations as are deemed necessary to carry out and enforce the provisions of the proposed legislation.

Motion agreed to and the House went into committee, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): Is it proposed to make the decisions before these district review boards, if favourable to the applicant, final, or are they only intermediary? Must applications go to the Pension board, be refused, then go to the district review board and then, in any event, go to the federal appeal board again? Will these boards not have power to deal finally if dealing favourably to the applicant?

Mr. BELAND: All appeals, after they have been dealt with by the district appeal board, must come back to the Board of Pension Commissioners. In the case of a more favourable decision rendered by the district appeal board, the pension board will carry it out; but should they refuse to carry it out, it will automatically go to the federal appeal board for confirmation. Then the Board of Pension Commissioners shall be bound by the decision of the appeal board. In the case that the Board of Pension Commissioners carries out the decision of the district appeal board, the decision is final. In every case where the decision of the district appeal board is not more favourable to the applicant than the decision appealed against, it will automatically, through the Board of Pension Commissioners, go to the federal appeal board.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Beland thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 205, to amend the Pension Act.

Mr. CARROLL: Shall we get copies of the bill before it comes up for second reading?

Mr. BELAND: Yes.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

On motion of Mr. Beland the House adjourned at 11 p.m.

Tuesday, June 12, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

PETROLEUM AND NAPHTHA INSPECTION

Hon. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou) (for the Minister of Customs and Excise) moved that the House go into committee at the next sitting to consider the following proposed resolution:

That it is expedient to amend the Petroleum and Naphtha Inspection Act, chapter eighty-six of the Revised Statutes, 1906, by providing that the Governor in Council may make special regulations as to the sale of naphtha and its use for illuminating purposes, and that, subject to regulations made by the Governor in Council under authority of section three of the act, naphtha shall not be sold or offered for sale in Canada for illuminating purposes, except for the uses prescribed in section fourteen thereof.

He said: In the absence of the hon. Minister of Customs and Excise (Mr. Bureau) I desire to state that the subject matter of this resolution has been communicated to His Excellency the Governor General, who has been pleased to recommend it to the favourable consideration of the House.

Motion agreed to.

INLAND REVENUE ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou) (for the Minister of Customs and Excise) moved that the House go into committee at the next sitting to consider the following proposed resolution:

That it is expedient to amend the Inland Revenue Act, chapter fifty-one of the Revised Statutes, 1906, by providing for the inclusion of certain employees as departmental analysts; that the certificate of departmental or provincial analysts shall be accepted as evidence in all prosecutions under the Act; that a penalty be prescribed for deodorizing or clarifying denatured alcohol or specially denatured alcohol; and that a cultivator of tobacco for private use may sell the surplus tobacco grown by him after paying to the nearest officer of Inland Revenue the duty of twenty cents per pound.

He said: In the absence of the hon. Minister of Customs and Excise I desire to state that the subject matter of this resolution has been communicated to His Excellency the Governor General, who has been pleased to recommend it to the favourable consideration of the House.

Motion agreed to.

CANADA SHIPPING ACT

Hon. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou) (for the Minister of Marine and Fisheries) moved that the House go into committee at the next sitting to consider the following proposed resolution:

That it is expedient to amend the Canada Shipping Act, chapter one hundred and thirteen of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, by providing:—

1. That no registrar shall register any ship purchased or otherwise acquired from a foreign subject or corporation where any bill of sale or other document under or by virtue of which the ship became vested in the applicant for registry contains any provision express, implied or constructive, restricting the use of the vessel or imputing any measure of continued control thereof by the government of a foreign country.

2. That where in the opinion of the minister any person who applies to be registered as owner of a ship has not sufficient assets in Canada, other than the ship itself, to reimburse His Majesty for any expenses His Majesty may subsequently incur in connection with such ship, her master or a member of her crew, the minister may prohibit a registrar from registering such person as owner until security for such expenses, in such form and such amount as the minister may decide, shall have been furnished.

3. That the Governor in Council may make regulations prescribing the manner in which grain cargoes shall be loaded at ports in Canada on ships bound to ports outside of Canada not within the limits of inland navigation, and for the imposition of penalties for breach of any such regulations.

4. That the Governor in Council may make regulations prescribing the manner in which the Port Warden shall perform his duties, and giving him such additional duties as he may from time to time see fit.

5. That annual returns shall be made by surveyors, and that provision be made for calculating tonnage.

He said: In the absence of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe)

I desire to state that the subject matter of this resolution has been communicated to His Excellency the Governor General, who has been pleased to recommend it to the favourable consideration of the House.

Motion agreed to.

BANFF PARK POWER PRIVILEGES

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. SHAW: I should like to ask the government what disposition has been made of the application of the Calgary Power Company for additional power privileges in Banff National Park?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is a question I think for the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart). I will direct his attention to it when he comes into the House.

SUPPLY—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

On the motion of Hon. W. S. Fielding for Committee of Supply.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): In the statement of business for to-day which was given last night but which I have not before me at the moment, I am pretty sure Supply was not mentioned.

Mr. BELAND: I think it was mentioned.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Just for one purpose, to enable the hon. member for St. John City and Counties of St. John and Albert (Mr. Baxter) to bring up a certain subject.

Mr. BELAND: I stated, Mr. Speaker, that opportunity would be afforded for the discussion referred to but that afterwards we would go into Committee of Supply. At any rate, that was my intention, when I announced the business that would be taken up to-day.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That was not stated. I cannot dispute the hon. member's intention; all I can state is what he said. Hon. members must make their preparations in accordance with the government's statement. It is true that between twelve and one o'clock I was personally notified that the government intended to go into Committee of Supply on other matters, but even that notification to me is not sufficient. I did not get it myself until the time mentioned. But I am only one member; other members guide themselves by the notice of the government leader the night before, and would not be prepared, especially on important matters of Supply, because of the information given by the Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment. What the minister stated was that a motion would be made to go into Committee of Supply in order to afford the hon. member (Mr. Baxter) an opportunity of discussing certain matters in connection with the Post Office Department. Then he went on to say:

> If we have time we will take up the second readings of certain bills on the order paper—

And he named a list of them occupying a space two inches long—

Mr. BELAND: Three inches long.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Three inches is it?—which would be quite sufficient to take up to-day, I think.

Mr. BELAND: I take it for granted that at this stage of the session, when there is time we always go into Committee of Supply. There are very few estimates to be disposed of.

Mr. SPEAKER: It may, perhaps, clarify matters if I remind the hon. leader of the Opposition—I do not know whether he was here yesterday at three o'clock—that the hon. member (Mr. Baxter) rose and spoke for a few minutes on the motion to go into Committee of Supply, and it was agreed between the Postmaster General (Mr. Murphy) and the hon. member (Mr. Baxter) that the question should be deferred and should come up to-day on the motion for Supply.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have no objection to that, that is quite proper. We expect a motion for Supply for that purpose but not for the other.

SUPPLY—DISMISSAL OF MLLE. BOULAY

Hon. J. B. M. BAXTER (St. John City and Counties of St. John and Albert): Mr. Speaker, I shall try to bring the facts of this case before the House as briefly as I can. I regret that the documentation is rather large, and that it is necessary to refer to a good deal of it. I said yesterday that Mademoiselle Boulay, who was postmistress at Sayabec Station, had been dismissed from her position. As far as I can gather from the correspondence, her offence, and her sole offence, was the fact that she was a daughter of the previous member for Matane, Mr. Boulay. Of course, something else is alleged in the correspondence, and what that is and the way in which the removal of Mademoiselle Boulay was rather carefully led up to will be revealed by an inspection of the documents.

Now, the matter began as far back as the 4th January, 1922, when my hon. friend the Postmaster General received an offer, in perhaps rather unusual terms, from a gentleman named Eugene Lacroix who wrote from Sayabec under that date and said that he was just offering the minister a place to hold the post

office, that it was some place where the post office had been kept before but there was now another proprietor. It used to belong to Mr. Boulay, the deputy who had been beaten in the county of Matane and "we," whoever that may be, "had now acquired the property." He not only offers it but he says he desires to hold the post office, like so many other people who are desirous of holding some position under the government. He wants the Postmaster General to be good enough to give it to him and then he will make an arrangement with the Postmaster General. If the Postmaster General will give him the post office he will give him the building to hold it in for nothing and he thinks, and he says, "It will be difficult to do better than that." Evidently Mr. Lacroix was a very good supporter of our friend who now represents the county of Matane in this House (Mr. Pelletier). At any rate, he started the ball rolling. There were other gentlemen who also thought they had the support of the hon. member for Matane but perhaps they had not. I suppose they had no right to assume they had that support. The minister on the 12th January, very properly told Mr. Lacroix that this was a matter for the Civil Service Commission. Then Miss Boulay, who held the post office, had apparently heard that something was on foot. On the 17th January, she wrote the minister saying that she had learned that Mr. Lacroix had caused to be sent a request under false representations in respect to her; that he said to certain persons in order to get their signatures that she had resigned, and to others he said that he wanted the request signed in her favour so that the post office might remain in the building in which it was. Then she says that she has not given her resignation to anybody, and asks if it is necessary for her to sign a request for the purpose of annulling the request of Mr. Lacroix. Mr. Lacroix is told on the 17th January, that this statement has been put in and that the lady has no intention of getting out of the office—and the House will note that at that time the minister is finding no fault with her. On the 20th January, Mr. Lacroix presses his claim a little more. He now encloses a request signed by a number of people at Sayabec Station asking that the post office be left in the place where it was at the time, and in case there should be any change of postmistress or postmaster to give the position to him. He says that he hopes to have a favourable response, that with a request as strong as this one he does not believe the minister can refuse him. He sends with that a document which is rather remarkable. Mr. Lacroix, the man who has apparently convinced the Civil Service Commission, sent a petition to the minister on the 20th January, signed by ratepayers of the village or station of Sayabec, in which they say:

> That they wish to put very respectfully before His Honour the Postmaster General that Mademoiselle Boulay, postmistress of the said village, having given her resignation ought to be replaced soon.

And they are made to ask that occasion should be taken to give Mr. Lacroix the appointment as the new postmaster, and they point out the advantage of having the post office in a central site which they understand he controls. This was certainly ingenious on the part of Mr. Lacroix. He does not get very much, perhaps, from the minister, who just simply acknowledges receipt of his letter, and tells him that he has not received the resignation of Miss Boulay, and that in consequence the position is not vacant. So that down to the 25th January the minister is finding no fault with Miss Boulay. On the 6th February we have a letter written by Mr. Pelletier, the present member for Matane, addressed to William Foran, Secretary of the Civil Service Commission, dated 6th February in which he says:—

> A few days ago I wrote to the hon. Postmaster General in regard to a proposed transfer of the post office at Sayabec. My request has been referred to the deputy Postmaster General for inquiry and report. Thinking that this matter is under the control of the Civil Service Commission, I would, therefore, ask you to do nothing in this matter until I have the opportunity of conferring with said commission.

The previous letter, so far as I can find, is not on the files, and I do not know whether it refers to Mr. Lacroix, and I do not know what the contents were; it has not been returned. Then on the 28th February Miss Boulay writes to the minister and speaks of the lease of the building, the time of its expiration, and says that this building has become the property of Mr. A. Lacroix since the 15th March, and that she has seen Mr. Lacroix and asked him if he would consent, after the expiration of the lease, to lease the building to her, but she has not been able to obtain any answer. On the 21st March the member for Matane again writes to the hon. Postmaster General and says:

> In connection with the post office at Sayabec, I wish to state that, setting aside all political feelings, I must say in justice to all parties concerned, that Miss Boulay, the present postmistress at the above-named place is the daughter of my opponent Mr. Hermenegilde Boulay, and that the said Miss Boulay,

Mr. FOURNIER: Hear, hear.

Mr. BAXTER: I hope the hon. member will be able to carry the "hear, hear" out-

side of this chamber, and go upon any platform in the country and advocate the spoils system, the slightest reference to which is met by a "hear, hear" from him.

Mr. FOURNIER: Well, I can do it.

Mr. BAXTER: I have every faith in the ability of the hon. member in performing that which he claims to be able to do, but I do not know that such a thing would be so distinctly complimentary to him. The letter continues:

> And that the said Miss Boulay is the daughter of my opponent Mr. Hermenegilde Boulay, and that the said Miss Boulay during the campaign of 1921 allowed her father to hold political meetings in the post office. Therefore, knowing as I do, that the present postmistress has taken a very active part in politics, I feel the post office should be moved to a place where it will be exempt from all political influence.

And that is quite right. If Miss Boulay were guilty there should be only one rule to apply. No postmistress or postmaster has any business to meddle with elections. But I say Miss Boulay should be treated at least as a British subject and get some fair form of trial. She should have that undeniable right which has always been accorded by the laws of both the races represented here, that a person should be heard in his or her behalf before being condemned. And Miss Boulay was not heard.

An hon. MEMBER: The hon. member is being heard.

Mr. BAXTER: The letter continues:

> I therefore would recommend that the postmistress be dismissed and that Mr. Georges Bouchard, of Sayabec, who has a building that would suit the government and the public in general in that district, should be named in her stead.
>
> I sincerely trust that you will take this matter in serious consideration and that you may see your way clear to grant my request.
>
> Thanking you in anticipation, I remain,
>
> Yours truly,
>
> F. J. PELLETIER.

Ten days is rather a long time. On the 31st March we have another letter from the member addressed to the minister and it is marked "House of Commons" and reads:

> With further reference to the postmaster at Sayabec. I am herewith enclosing two affidavits, one from Mr. Cote, merchant, saying that Miss Boulay has allowed her father to hold political meetings in the post office during the recent campaign.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. BAXTER: How amusing it is to some hon. members. Is it really enough that a member of parliament shall write these things to make them incontrovertible? Would hon. members who laugh like to be tried in that way themselves if anyone launched an accusation against them? Would anyone be quite content to have the unsworn testimony of the prosecutor accepted as sufficient, and not be heard on their own behalf? I do not think so. And why should politics make a difference? Why should it obstruct the principles of fair play? I have also a letter from the member for Matane (Mr. Pelletier) which reads:

> With further reference to the post office at Sayabec, I am herewith enclosing two affidavits, one from Mr. Cote, merchant, showing that Miss Boulay, the postmistress, has allowed her father to hold political meetings in the post office during the recent campaign; also one from Miss Aurelie Imbeault, showing that the postmistress was actively engaged in political affairs on voting day.
>
> I therefore reiterate my request that she be dismissed and that the post office be placed in charge of Mr. Georges Bouchard who lives right close to where the post office is now, and I may state that he has very good quarters and the people of Sayabec are seemingly anxious to have Mr. Bouchard take charge of said office.
>
> Hoping that this matter will not be delayed, I remain,
>
> Yours very truly,
>
> F. J. PELLETIER.

Now there was probably some conversation in the meantime, but we have no note of it in these records. I will turn for a moment to these returns. Here is a copy of an affidavit of Mr. Cote which says:

> I, the undersigned, Louis Côté, merchant of the village of Saindon, parish of Sayabec, having been duly sworn on the Holy Scriptures, deponeth and saith:
>
> That on November 29 last, 1921, a political meeting was held by H. Boulay, candidate at the last general election, in the county of Matane, at the post office of Sayabec Station, of which Miss Adrienne Boulay is in charge.
>
> And I have signed.
>
> (Signed) LOUIS CÔTÉ.
>
> Sworn before me at Sayabec, this 27th day of March, 1922.
>
> (Signed) L. P. JOUBERT, S.C.C.,
> District of Rimouski.

Now this affidavit is regularly sworn by some one who, of course, violated the law of Canada in swearing any one to an affidavit.

Mr. MERCIER: Why?

Mr. BAXTER: That surprises my hon. friend. There is such a thing as the Canada Evidence Act. There is also an act for the suppression of extra-judicial oaths. The furthest anyone can go is merely to make a statutory declaration. I will tell my hon. friend—and I am glad always to dispense a little information—that it is an absolute crime against the laws of Canada to swear a person to an affidavit unless with lawful authority. This, however, was taken in the absence of Mademoiselle Boulay. She never saw it. She was never confronted with the man who made it. Some one accepts it. She gets no

trial. She gets no hearing. It is matter for the judgment of the House if that is fair dealing. The affidavit to which I refer was simply a declaration on oath that on the 29th November, 1921, a political assembly was held by Mr. Boulay, candidate for the constituency of Matane at the last federal election, in the post office of Sayabec station kept by Mademoiselle Boulay.

The next affidavit is by Aurelie Imbeault, of the village of Saindon, who is also sworn and who states:

I, the undersigned, Aurélie Imbeault, of the village of Saindon, in the parish of Sayabec, being duly sworn on the Holy Scriptures, deponeth and saith:

That Miss Adrienne Boulay, postmistress at Sayabec Station, has taken an active part in politics on polling day, by going in quest of women voters at their homes and taking them to the polling booth during the Dominion election of December 6 last.

And I have signed.

(Signed) AURÉLIE IMBEAULT.

Sworn before me, at Sayabec, on March 25, 1922.

(Signed) L. P. JOUBERT, S.C.C.,
Dist. of Rimouski.

A declaration that she busied herself actively in politics on voting day by going to bring female electors from their houses to the polls for the federal election, in which, of course, her father was interested. That is the first instance that we have of anything like a charge. Then we have the reply to that on the 6th April from the Postmaster General (Mr. Murphy). He says:

Dear Mr. Pelletier,

I am duly in receipt of your letter of March 31st enclosing affidavits in connection with the post office at Sayabec Station.

I notice that one of the statements is to the effect that the postmistress allowed the post office to be used for purposes which are improper and of a nature absolutely foreign to its destination as such. As an irregularity of so grievous a character cannot be tolerated, I have given orders for the dismissal of Miss Boulay.

Hon. gentlemen will note that the Postmaster General wrote to the deputé for Matane in French. He received the letter in English. I suppose that is the explanation why the Postmaster General is not anxious to have a French-writing deputy. He can do the work himself.

Mr. MURPHY: If my hon. friend will permit me, he misstates the position of the Postmaster General in that regard. He is anxious to have a French-writing deputy.

Mr. BAXTER: I congratulate the Postmaster General upon his taste, but not upon his speed. The Postmaster General said:

I note that one of these declarations is to the effect that the postmistress has permitted the use of the post office for an improper purpose and one absolutely foreign to postal administration. As an irregularity so serious cannot be approved, I have ordered the dismissal of Mademoiselle Boulay.

Tried in her absence, condemned without a hearing, and executed without mercy. On the 7th April, Mr. Eugène Lacroix, who afterwards got the job, but who was not the protege of the member for the constituency after all, though, perhaps, he may have thought he was, wrote asking what had been the result of a requisition signed by 235 people that he had sent three months before. He states that every day his friends of Sayabec are asking themselves what has been the result of the request, and he cannot give them information for he does not know any more about the matter than they do. He hopes for a response very soon, and he remains the very humble and very obedient servant of the Postmaster General, from whom he does not get any particular consolation. The minister tells him on the 15th April that that is a matter for the Civil Service Commission, and he says: "In case there should be any change of postmistress at the place indicated"—that is on the 15th April, but on the 6th April the Postmaster General had given orders for her dismissal. One is not surprised; the whole thing is evidently a political affair. The deputé for Matane had a candidate and that candidate was not Mr. Lacroix, it was Mr. Georges Bouchard; and naturally the minister is not going to assist Mr. Lacroix by giving him any unnecessary information. On the 19th April, Mr. Coolican of the Post Office Department writes for the General Superintendent to the Acting District Superintendent of Postal Service at Quebec:

It has been represented to the department that the postmistress at Sayabec station has allowed the post office at that point to be used for improper purposes, and in view of the fact that the post office is rented by the government a serious offence of this kind cannot be countenanced.

Under the circumstances the Postmaster General has authorized a change in the postmastership at Sayabec station.

Mr. Boulay, the father, writes to the Postmaster General saying that he wishes to ask a favour, namely to keep his daughter there as postmistress. He tells him that she has gained her living for six or seven years and that the department has nothing to reproach her with; that some instances are without doubt going to be brought before him for the purpose of having her dismissed, but he hopes he will grant her request. He says that the dismissal would not serve the Liberal party very much for about nine-tenths of the Liberals in the county are in her favour.

Moreover she is a woman, and he says that if the minister will refer to the dismissals made in Rimouski at the time when he was a member, the minister will see that one woman only lost her office, all the others being kept on by him.

I know before we get through the discussion, that it will be alleged that Mr. Boulay caused numerous dismissals.

Mr. FOURNIER: My hon. friend refers to Mr. Boulay. Is he the same gentleman who, when the Parliament building burned down, put in a claim for $200 for a bad promissory note and a pair of mittens?

Mr. BAXTER: I would be more than happy if I could give my hon. friend any information he desires, but I shall have to say to him that, so far as I know, he is not.

An hon. MEMBER: He is the same one.

Mr. BAXTER: My hon. friend speaks of some instance of which I never heard. I brought the matter personally to the minister's attention on the 20th April, 1922, and this is the first that I had heard of it. I told the minister that it was rumoured that Miss Boulay was to be dismissed, although her father did not know for what reason. The minister then replied to me on the 26th April, stating:

> This case has been before me for consideration, and in view of the fact that the postmistress allowed the building rented by the government for post office purposes, to be put to improper use, I have been obliged to follow the departmental procedure in such cases and accordingly gave instructions that her services be dispensed with.
>
> In view of the courtesy of your letter, I may assure you that the circumstances of the case and the evidence submitted, amply warrant the action taken.

Now, so far as the record discloses, that is all I have; I have given hon. members every syllable of the testimony that was submitted to the minister. The minister continues:

> From the terms of your letter, I judge that you are not acquainted with Mr. Boulay. At the first opportunity I will show you some illuminating exhibits from the official files.

I thought it was Miss Boulay that was on trial and not her unfortunate father. But as an excuse for the dismissal of the daughter there can be shown me some illuminating exhibits from the official files with reference to the father. Then we have a very large petition sent to the Postmaster General signed by numerous residents of this locality who say that Miss Boulay has for many years been postmistress in this place and has given general satisfaction, that the office has been kept in a perfect manner to the satisfaction of the public and the authorities of the postal department; and they insist strongly in their demand that she be allowed to continue in the exercise of her functions. They are strenuously opposed to any change in this relation. That petition was sent in in April, 1922, and, as I say, was numerously signed. On the 4th of May, Mr. Boulay, the father, writes to Mr. Tanner Green, inspector of post offices, that he is well enough informed to be able to deny swearing to the accusation in the name of Mlle. Boulay and to demand an inquiry at which he desires to be called, if justice can be accorded. Mlle. Boulay, he says, has never given any permission to make use of the post office for any improper purpose; and that such a suggestion is a black calumny.

Mr. MERCIER: Who signed that?

Mr. BAXTER: Mr. Boulay, the father; this is a letter to Mr. Tanner Green. Then we have Mr. Bouchard's application. There is a lot of correspondence leading up to that, and in answer to the civil service form, inquiring whether he has any defect of sight, hearing or speech, or any other infirmity, he says he has. That was the gentleman, however, who was being backed by the member for the time being. Some nine persons made oath again on May 8, 1922, that they were present in the post office at a political meeting held by Mr. Boulay and his friend Mr. Martineau at Sayabec. This is a solemn declaration, but they do not say that Miss Boulay knew anything about the matter, gave permission, opened the door or lent the key; it is alleged, only, that she was the holder of the office at the time. We also have a little sidelight on the way people were putting petitions around there when we find a lady making a declaration that she and others had been asked to put their names to a petition alleging that a request had been made that Miss Boulay might be paid her salary for the month of April. The lady who signs this says that the petition was supposed to be for the purpose of obtaining a pension for Miss Boulay, she having held the post office for more than ten years. But it was really a petition for the appointment of one of those who sought office.

On the 4th May, the Postmaster General apparently thought that it might not be quite fair to deal with the matter in the summary manner he had intended, and so he wrote to his friend the hon. member for Matane (Mr. Pelletier) enclosing some correspondence. He says:

In reading the enclosures, please note that Boulay denies, over his own handwriting, that any meeting was held in the post office.

After you have read the enclosures, I would like to see you about the whole matter, as it is evident that Boulay is in touch with his party friends with a view to having the matter ventilated as a grievance.

On May 6, the hon. member replies:

I shall read the enclosures very carefully and will be pleased to see you on Monday next and explain fully what the conditions are and have been at Sayabec.

I would not have asked the dismissal of the postmistress had I not been in a position to prove everything I have advanced against her.

That proof, however, has not yet been adduced. On the previous day, May 5, the same hon. gentleman writes Mr. Tanner Green, Inspector of Post Offices, and again recommends Mr. Bouchard as postmaster. He is persuaded that he is a sober man, is competent, and will know how to do justice to all the citizens of Sayabec. He recommends Mr. Bouchard to the Civil Service Commission and the Post Office Department. One would hardly have supposed that it would be necessary to have a Civil Service Commission if recommendations of this character were to go very far. Then the minister writes to Mr. Boulay stating:

In the course of the correspondence from you, I observe that you state that the Conservative party in 1911 did not dismiss anybody in your county without holding what you term a "reasonable inquiry". This statement led me to ask for the production of the files, and I regret to say that their contents are in direct contradiction of your statement. Without going into too many details, allow me to say that in the case of the county you represented, I find, in your handwriting, one list demanding the dismissal of no fewer than 23 postmasters, on the sole ground that they had taken an active part in politics against you. I further find that in each of the 23 cases the postmasters were dismissed without any inquiry whatever, and without any other evidence than was furnished by the list in your handwriting, demanding the dismissals solely on political grounds. You must, therefore, admit that if the department were to follow the example furnished by the written proofs on file here, there would be wholesale dismissals in your county, as there were in 1911, on the mere demand of the sitting member.

But Mr. Boulay does not accept that view at all. On the 8th of May he says:

I have perhaps asked for the dismissal of these persons to put back the offices into the hands of those that the Liberal party had taken them from in 1896, and not otherwise. At the time I asked for the dismissal of these twenty-three postmasters this was refused, except in the cases above cited, without previous inquiry; and I defy you to prove to the contrary of that statement in any case in this county.

He alleges that political friends of his were brutally dismissed in 1896 without any other reason than politics. He asserts that he has not asked for the dismissal of anyone for political reasons. All that was asked generally in 1911 was simply the re-establishment in their original positions of those people whom the Liberal party had thrown into the street in 1896 and very few were put back.

My friend from Matane (Mr. Pelletier), however, does not cease his efforts. On the 9th May he sends the minister an application signed by Mr. Bouchard, who had succeeded in being placed temporarily in charge of the post office at Sayabec Station. The minister replies on the 13th May and says that the representations made on Mr. Bouchard's behalf will be referred to the Civil Service Commission, by whom, under present legislation, the regular appointment will be made. Then my friend from Matane comes back on the 2nd June with another letter to the Secretary of the Civil Service Commission, in which, after acknowledging receipt of a communication from the secretary stating that the position is now vacant, he says:

I thank you for having advised me of the fact, and in passing permit me to say to you that Mr. George Bouchard, who was chosen as postmaster a couple of months ago, is very competent and, besides, I learn that he has spent $250 to $275 to repair the office. No doubt Mr. Bouchard will make application and you will see by his work that he is very competent to fill this position.

He adds he cannot recommend Mr. Bouchard too highly. On the 8th June he again asks the Secretary of the Civil Service Commission to take Mr. Bouchard's application into his "serious consideration," and on the same day he sends, under separate cover, two more letters of recommendation on behalf of Mr. Bouchard. On the 4th July Mr. Tanner Green writes to Mr. Eugene Lacroix,—the man who eventually got the appointment—sending back his petition on the ground that it was not dated and that all he had was a typewritten copy. Then Mr. Lacroix writes to the Postmaster General that his petition was in the minister's office. He apparently could not get it there. It went back and forth and nobody knew where the missing petition was, but Mr. Lacroix writes Mr. Tanner Green on the 8th July telling him that he has sent the original to Mr. Pelletier, who said that he had sent it to the Postmaster General. The writer also encloses a letter which he had received from the deputy for Matane and he wants to know where the original petition is. The Postmaster General even got a ruling from the Justice department, which states as a fact that the postmistress of Sayabec having allowed the post office to be used for a political meeting, she is guilty of improper conduct and subject to removal by the Postmaster General. One would still think the charge should be proved and the woman given a chance to defend herself. On the

13th July Miss Boulay again denies that the meeting was held with her permission or with her knowledge. On the 3rd August the Postmaster General replies with the assurance that the proofs actually on file in the department are sufficient to show that no injustice has been done the postmistress.

On the 30th September Miss Boulay writes to the minister:

> Having written you already many times asking you to be good enough to grant me an inquiry concerning my dismissal as postmistress of Sayabec Station, and never having had any response, I am again reiterating my request. I greatly desire to undergo an inquiry, and I hope you will accord it without further delay. You have no doubt received a copy of the petition from the public of Sayabec demanding that I be maintained in my office. The original was addressed to the Civil Service Commission.

In reply the Postmaster General tells her that he can add nothing to his previous communications upon the subject. On the 27th November Mr. Tanner Green writes the Civil Service Commission saying:

> With reference to the commission's letter of the 24th instant, asking for further information regarding the comparative qualifications and premises offered by Messrs. Bouchard and Lacroix, applicants for the Sayabec Station postmastership, the undersigned advises that Mr. Bouchard, who has been in charge of the post office since the 8th April last and who previous to 1911 acted as assistant to his father, the then postmaster, is surely the better qualified of the two.
>
> His quarters are sufficient, adequate and well located. Doubtless more central than Mr. Lacroix's, and therefore his selection would seem to be justified on these premises.

I do not propose to go into the competition between these two men or the attitude that has been taken either by the minister or his deputy in regard to the matter. I think I have referred to all the correspondence that is material, and I know it will be useless to take up the time of the House any longer.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. BAXTER: Well, it is a great pleasure to have the concurrence of hon. members opposite in some things. I know there will be no change made in this postmastership, but I want to put it on record as a regrettable fact that anyone should be dismissed on the written evidence of witnesses behind his or her back without being given an opportunity to cross-examine or challenge the witnesses. I think her request for a full inquiry should have been granted. No matter what may have been done in the past, I say it is still more unfortunate if we are to have a continued system of reprisals after every change of administration under which we are to be looked upon as enemy parties, each seeking to acquire some advantage over the other. When this House decided in favour of a Civil Service Commission it was to get rid of such a discreditable system. If, however, the Civil Service Act is to be practically disregarded, if we are to have dismissals merely at the request of the member for any constituency, and if we are to have a minister complaisantly granting such requests, we need not wonder if the Civil Service Commission gradually lapses into a body without very much vitality and accepts the pretty direct suggestions that are made to it through the medium of correspondence such as I have quoted.

4 p.m.

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, before dealing with the issue raised by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Baxter) who has just taken his seat I desire to thank him and the other members for the cordiality of the welcome which they extended to me upon returning to resume my duties in this Chamber after a long period of enforced absence. I desire also, Sir, to thank the hon. member for St. John City (Mr. Baxter) for his courtesy in allowing the matter under discussion to stand over from yesterday so that I might have an opportunity to familiarize myself with the facts of the case which he has brought to the attention of the House.

To give these facts their proper setting allow me to furnish some features which were not included in the hon. gentleman's statement. My hon. friend began his very temperate and fair presentation of the case by saying that judging by the record the sole offence chargeable to the postmistress at Sayabec Station was that she was the daughter of the previous member of parliament for that county. That, Mr. Speaker, I need not say is not correct, but I might add that if my hon. friend had been a member of this House from 1911 to 1917 he would be more fully aware than he is at present of the seriousness of the charge that he himself has made against the late postmistress at Sayabec Station. I would like to point out for the information of the House and for a proper understanding of the matter under discussion just how firmly entrenched was the Boulay dynasty at Sayabec Station. In the first place it is not the postmistress, the daughter, at all who is the chief actor in this matter. The moving spirit and the directing mind is the father, Mr. Hermenegilde Boulay. Mr. Boulay was the member for that county from 1911 to 1917. During that period, referring only to his activity in connection with the Post Office Department, he induced the Public Works Department to lease a building for post office

purposes to Mrs. H. B. Boulay, his wife. Then he made a charge against the then postmaster, had him dismissed on political grounds, and induced the then Postmaster General to appoint his daughter, Miss Adrienne Boulay, as postmistress at Sayabec Station. Then, as a good provider, as the head of a family ought to be, in order to see that nothing would escape the Boulay family, he had his son made the contractor for the carriage of the mails at Sayabec Station. So that my hon. friend, who apparently was unaware of these facts, will appreciate how deeply incensed was the Boulay dynasty when their entrenchments were disturbed by the unfeeling member for Matane (Mr. Pelletier). So much for the situation at Sayabec Station.

In connection with the renting of the building Mr. Boulay was not only not satisfied with having the ordinary arrangements applied in the lease that was made between the Department of Public Works and his wife, but he succeeded in having the rule applicable to such cases set aside. I might explain, Mr. Speaker, not for your benefit because as a former Postmaster General you are quite familiar with it, but for the benefit of my hon. friends in the House, that the usual practice in the case of an office such as that at Sayabec Station is to grant a rent allowance based on the revenue of the office, and when that is done the postmaster takes that amount and rents the office and pays for it himself. But not so with Mr. Boulay in the case of Sayabec Station. He first of all saw to it that his daughter got the usual allowance of $75 based on the revenues of the office, and then he got the Public Works Department to enter into a lease with his wife and add $125 more, so that they got $200 for this office which Miss Boulay should have provided out of the $75 allowed her by the Post Office Department. These are some slight features that have a bearing on the case.

Now let us for a moment dwell on the statement which my hon. friend extracted, and quite properly from a letter of Mr. Boulay which appears on the record, that is, that Mr. Boulay resented the statement that he had dismissed people on the wholesale scale charged against him, after 1911. Well, the records show that in this county there has been but one dismissal at the instance of the present member, while Mr. Boulay in a shorter time dismissed thirty-five, and I hold in my hand a list in Mr. Boulay's handwriting demanding the dismissal of no less than twenty-three people on the sole ground that they had been guilty of active political partisanship. I observe that my hon. friend quoted a statement from Mr. Boulay's letter to the effect that he had only made this request in the case of people who had replaced Conservatives who had been removed from office by the Liberals, but unfortunately for Mr. Boulay the document itself does not bear that out, because in certain paragraphs he does distinguish by asking for the reinstatement of certain people, but in other paragraphs he makes just the plain request that Mr. So-and-So be removed and Mr. So-and-So put in his place.

Mr. BAXTER: They were not removed, were they?

Mr. MURPHY: Yes, they were. They were removed on the authority of a little tell-tale pencil interlineation which I will read, and which is as follows: "O.K.—L.P.P." in every case.

Mr. MERCIER: Whose initials are those?

Mr. MURPHY: L.P.P. are the initials of the former postmaster general, the Hon. Mr. Pelletier.

Mr. MERCIER: Does it say that an inquiry was made?

Mr. MURPHY: No there was no inquiry made in any case. Now what are the charges in the present case? The charges on which the action was taken are two. First, that the postmistress allowed the building to be used for the holding of a political meeting. As to that we were furnished with a written statement by the hon. member for Matane.

Mr. BAXTER: He was not at the meeting surely.

Mr. MURPHY: I do not know whether he was there or not but in any event he makes the statement as a matter of personal knowledge and on his responsibility as a member of the House—a ground that in previous days was deemed amply sufficient to grant the request of the Conservative member supporting the administration of the day. But we have much more than that. We had supporting the statement of the hon. member for Matane the affidavit of Louis Cote which my hon. friend read, and which I propose to read in turn in order to make comment upon it:

I, the undersigned, Louis Côté, merchant ,of the village of Saindon, parish of Sayabec, having been duly sworn on the Holy Scriptures, deponeth and saith:

That on November 29 last, 1921, a political meeting was held by H. Boulay, candidate at the last general

election in the county of Matane, at the post office of Sayabec Station, of which Miss Adrienne Boulay is in charge.

And I have signed.

(Signed) LOUIS CÔTÉ.

Sworn before me at Sayabec, this 27th day of March 1922.

(Signed) L. P. JOUBERT, S.C.C.,
District of Rimouski.

Now, my hon. friend (Mr. Baxter) in commenting upon that seemed somewhat to attack the validity of the document, on account of the manner in which it was drawn up and sworn to. I understand, however, that the form in which this document was drawn up is a customary one in the civil courts of the province of Quebec.

An hon. MEMBER: In the superior courts.

Mr. BAXTER: Part of my criticism is that although a political meeting was held it does not appear that Mademoiselle Boulay had any knowledge of it or gave any consent to it.

Mr. MURPHY: It does not appear she had any knowledge or gave any consent, but she must have given the key to her father because he said "It was I who opened the door."

My hon. friend also referred to another affidavit supporting the charge of the hon. member for Matane. He read this in part; he did not read the whole of it. Had he read the whole of it I think the House would have been more impressed with its importance. I propose to read the whole of it. The affidavit in question is as follows:

We, the undersigned, of the parish of Ste. Marie of Sayabec, being sworn on the Holy Evangelists, respectively make oath and say, that on the 29th day of November last we assisted at a political meeting held in the post office of Sayabec Station, of which Miss Adrienne Boulay was the official at the time.

The aforesaid meeting was held by the candidate, H. Boulay, and his friend, Mr. Martineau of Québec.

And we make this declaration solemnly, knowing that it is of the same force and effect as if made under oath, and in virtue of the Canada Evidence Act,

And we have signed,

This is the part my hon. friend omitted:

E. BANVILLE,
LÉOPOLD JOUBERT, cult.
FRANÇOIS JEAN, cult.
LOUIS CÔTÉ, marchand,
VICTORIEN SMITH, inspecteur,
OCTAVE OUELLET, cult.
L. P. LEPAGE, M. dentiste.
ROMÉO RINGUET,
J. GEO. BOUCHARD, H.C.S.

Now this is a formidable list of names, and my hon. friend passed them over in presenting his version of the affidavit to the House. The affidavit concludes:

[Mr. Murphy.]

Declared before me at Sayabec, the 8th day of May, 1922.

(Signed) L. P. JOUBERT, J.P.,
District of Rimouski.

I have mentioned that Mademoiselle Boulay was not present at this meeting, but in a letter dated the 8th May, 1922, Mr. Boulay writes in the course of this communication addressed to me as follows:

A speaker made a speech in the waiting-room of the office, but it was without the permission and knowledge of the postmistress, because it was I who opened the door.

The father says the daughter was not there and the meeting was held without her knowledge and without her permission, and he gives us proof of that. He says "It was I who opened the door." Well, it is impossible to shift responsibility in that way in view of the activity of the father throughout all these proceedings. The use of a building for other than post office purposes is specifically prohibited by a rule or regulation of the department. That rule or regulation is imparted to the incumbent of each office upon such incumbent assuming the duties of his or her office, and my information is that such rule or regulation was communicated to Miss Boulay in the case of the post office building at Sayabec Station. Hence she violated that rule with knowledge of the consequences.

The second charge was that she was engaged in active partisan work during the general election of 1921. As to that there is a statement in the letter from the hon. member for Matane, and there is a specific affidavit on the point from Miss Aurélie Imbeault which reads as follows:

I, the undersigned Aurélie Imbeault of the village of Saindon, parish of Sayabec, having been sworn on the Holy Evangelists, depose and say:

That Miss Adrienne Boulay, postmistress of Sayabec Station, was actively engaged in politics on election day, in bringing female voters from their homes to the poll, on the occasion of the federal election, December 6, last.

And I have signed.

AURELIE IMBEAULT.

Declared before me at Sayabec, the 8th day of May, 1922.

(Signed) L. P. JOUBERT, J.P.,
District of Rimouski.

For the benefit of hon. gentlemen who may not understand French I may say that the person who makes this affidavit swears that to her knowledge Miss Boulay was engaged in bringing female voters to the poll on election day, and it would be too great a stretch of imagination—even at the request of an hon. gentleman whom I respect as much as I do my hon. friend (Mr. Baxter)—to think that

Miss Boulay was bringing voters to the poll to vote for the present hon. member for Matane.

Mr. BAXTER: I would not ask you to think that, but I ask you to try and prove the charge.

Mr. MURPHY: Miss Boulay has been guilty of a violation of section 32 of the Civil Service Act which reads as follows:

32. 1. No deputy head, officer, clerk or employee in the Civil Service shall be debarred from voting at any Dominion or provincial election if, under the laws governing the said election, he has the right to vote; but no such deputy head, officer, clerk or employee shall engage in partisan work in connection with any such election, or contribute, receive or in any way deal with any money for any party funds. 1908 s. 43 amended.

2. Any person violating any of the provisions of this section shall be dismissed from the Civil Service.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to take up the time of the House unnecessarily. I would submit that an offence was committed under the law as it stands at present, and as it stood on the date of the last general election. The proof of the offence was furnished to the Post Office Department. The penalty provided by the law which was violated was then applied by the department. And I submit further, Sir, that the action taken on that occasion by the department, under my instructions, was amply justified by the circumstances and was entirely in the public interest.

Mr. FRANCOIS J. PELLETIER (Matane): The Postmaster General has so completely proven his case that there remains but little for me to say. However, I wish to offer a few observations. At the outset let me say that evidently my hon. friend (Mr. Baxter) cares very little for the people's money when he occupies the time of the House in discussing a question of this kind. By this waste of time he has caused quite a large expenditure. Who is responsible for it? An hour and a half of the time of the House has been wasted in the discussion of this case and this means the expenditure of a large sum. You know, Mr. Speaker, the amount that is involved. If my hon. friend (Mr. Baxter) wants to give Adrienne a position I am informed and believe that he is a bachelor. He can therefore offer her a better position than she would enjoy as postmistress.

Mr. BAXTER: May I ask the hon. member a question? Would he kindly recommend the young lady either to his leader (Mr. Mackenzie King) or to the Postmaster General (Mr. Murphy)?

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: She would never marry a Grit.

Mr. PELLETIER: As I have already explained, I wish to be brief; I do not want to spend the people's money for nothing. Now Miss Boulay was dismissed for cause, and my hon. friend the Postmaster General has proven it. May I add a little to the things she has done. She allowed her father to hold a political meeting in the post office. When the electoral list was posted in the post office, Miss Adrienne Boulay, my hon. friend's client, erased quite a number of names from the list, and why and how did she do it? Her father told her to do it, and she did it. On nomination day I met Mr. Boulay, and accused him of it in front of the returning officer at Matane, and he acknowledged that he had given her orders to do it. Is that satisfactory to my hon. friend for St. John? I believe he has a bad case. Furthermore, campaign circulars were sent to the Sayabec post office, and unfortunately they were for the Liberal candidates, but they were never distributed. That is another charge. I would not advance these things if they were not facts. Referring to Mr. Lacroix, Mrs. Boulay was the owner of the property and sold it to Mr. Lacroix with the understanding that he would have the postmastership. That is another charge, is it not? I hope my hon. friend will be satisfied, and if he needs more, I can give him plenty.

Mr. CANNON: Let him off easy.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Do not spoil his opinion about the girl.

Mr. PELLETIER: In 1911 and 1912, as the Postmaster General (Mr. Murphy) has said, the member of that day asked for the dismissal of many employees, and if I may be permitted I shall read a letter that Mr. Boulay wrote at that time. This is addressed to Hon. L. P. Pelletier, and reads:

Ottawa, December 1, 1911.

Hon. L. P. PELLETIER,
Postmaster General,
Ottawa,

Dear Sir,

The enclosed petition is signed by the political friends of Mr. Bouchard, with three or four exceptions and I have nothing to withdraw from my request. I take the position that there is only one thing to do, to change the post office. Besides, there has been an inquiry already which will prove political partisanship on the part of the postmaster. The thing should be done without an inquiry because this man has been an open opponent of mine, not only all during the campaign but always.

I have the honour to be,
Your obedient servant,
H. BOULAY.

Yet he claims that he has not asked the dismissal of any one. I have before me Sessional papers No. 88. I find here another letter December 10, 1911, to Honourable L. P. Pelletier, Ottawa, which I translate as follows:

Hon. L. P. PELLETIER,
Postmaster General,
Ottawa.

Dear sir,—I am of the opinion that I have overlooked giving you the names of those who should take charge of the post office at Sayabec; Miss Hedwidge Boulay—

An hon. MEMBER: Another daughter.

Mr. PELLETIER: The letter continues:

Kindly make those nominations at once in order that the changes be made while the employees of the post office department in Quebec are in the county doing that business.

Now, what were they doing there?

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Shopping.

Mr. PELLETIER: Here is another letter dated Ottawa, and addressed to Mr. H. Boulay, signed, L. P. Pelletier. I translate as follows:

OTTAWA, December 26, 1911.

My dear sir,—I received your letter of the 10th instant recommending the nomination of Miss Hedwidge Boulay to the position of postmistress at Sayabec station to replace the postmaster who was dismissed. In answer I wish to say that I have given instructions to nominate Miss Boulay to that position according to your recommendation.

Yours very truly,
L. P. PELLETIER.

And he is one of those, as I understood my hon. friend to say, who did not ask the dismissal of any one.

Mr. RINFRET: Do I understand that Miss Hedwidge Boulay is another daughter of Mr. Boulay?

Mr. FOURNIER: Yes.

Mr. RINFRET: He had the first one appointed and the other was appointed.

Mr. PELLETIER: He did. Those who have known Mr. Boulay know that while he was a member of the House he had all the contracts, not only in his own riding, but he even went down as far as New Brunswick and elsewhere and would have contracts there. Mrs. Boulay would have one, Andre Boulay would have another, Adrienne Boulay would have another, and Hedwidge Boulay would have another.

Mr. CANNON: Not only family ties but railway ties.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Did he have a contract in St. John?

Mr. PELLETIER: I do not know. Probably my hon. friend knows that.

Mr. LOGAN: He was having a bully time.

[Mr. Pelletier.]

Mr. PELLETIER: Here is another letter dated Ottawa. This is a good one.

Translated it would read:

OTTAWA, March 4, 1912.

Hon. L. P. PELLETIER,
Postmaster General,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—I want to get through with Hélène Joubert.

Mr. LOGAN: I see her finish.

Mr. PELLETIER:

You have refused to dismiss her without making an inquiry, promising that an inquiry would be ordered immediately, and it is not granted as yet. I want her to be dismissed immediately or that an inquiry be held immediately, one or the other, because I am too humiliated with that affair to stand it any longer.

I have the honour to be,
Youds very truly,
H. Boulay.

It then happened that Miss Hélène Joubert was dismissed and Miss Hedwidge Boulay, recommended by Mr. Boulay, took her place, the same as when Mr. Bouchard was dismissed, Miss Adrienne Boulay was placed in his stead without inquiry.

I said at the outset of my remarks that I am sorry to see the time of the House being taken up with such a case as this. I was under the impression that the hon. member for St. John City (Mr. Baxter) would not take up a question of this kind to kill the time of the House. Knowing his ability as I do, I am really surprised. At the same time, now that this has been done, if he wished to give Miss Boulay a position, he can do so.

Motion agreed to, and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

RAILWAYS AND CANALS

Railways and Canals—chargeable to capital—Welland ship canal construction, $11,800,000.

Mr. CHURCH: How much money has been spent on the Welland canal? How many sections have been completed and how many sections remain to be done? Fifty or sixty million dollars have been spent on this work, and an effort should be made to finish the canal as soon as possible. The matter was very carefully considered from many standpoints, and after many years spent in investigation and discussion, the work went on. Last year we were told that the canal would not be open until 1927. It is a matter of economic necessity that the construction of the canal should be brought to a conclusion as soon as possible, so that the people of Ontario and also of the West may derive the benefit from the work already done and the

money spent. The Erie canal was opened two or three years ago although the construction of it was commenced at a later date, and the people are getting the benefit of that very important work on the other side of the border. The minister is aware of the congestion on the Great Lakes. If the Welland canal were finished, boats would be able to come down from the upper lakes to lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence. I think the work should go on somewhat faster. I appreciate the work that was done last year and previously. Will the contractors be allowed to use their own plants by which they may effect economies, instead of having to use plants provided by the government and in many cases not up to date? Surely this canal could be opened in 1925 instead of 1927.

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals): As hon. gentlemen know, this is a pretty large undertaking. During the period of the war, the work was in a large measure stopped, and to my mind rightly so. There are under contract five sections, no section of which is really completed. It was thought there would be four more—numbers six, seven, eight and nine; but I understand that eight and nine will probably be merged into one contract so that there will be three further sections to let. My hon. friend asked if hereafter contractors would be allowed to use their own plants. That question appears peculiar, but it is not. The department, under an arrangement with contractors, found themselves with about $2,000,000 worth of plant on hand, and in letting new contracts, they asked the contractors to take the plant over at a reasonable price. This was done. That was the only case in which contractors were not allowed to use their own plant. Of course it became their own after they purchased it from the government. This plant, I understand, has been absorbed, and they are at liberty to use their own plant now. About $34,000,000 has been expended, and the canal will cost altogether at least $80,000,000 and, perhaps a little more. It is an absolute physical impossibility, so I am informed, to complete the work in 1925. It is expected that the canal will be completed in 1927, that is, in about three years and a half. I think my hon. friend asked me the number of locks. There were 25 locks heretofore; there will be seven now. The size of the locks is 80 feet wide, 800 feet long with a 30-foot draught.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: We have five different sections, and my recollection is that all that work is under contract?

Mr. GRAHAM: The first five sections are.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: As matters stand at present the government are carrying on no work themselves at all. Their work has been entirely abandoned. I take it therefore that the government have no commitments whatever in connection with the Welland canal outside the existing contracts. For example, we are not buying supplies of any kind, are we?

Mr. GRAHAM: The arrangement, I think, has always been for the department to supply the cement for the different contracts. That is the practice in connection with all canal work.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: So that the government are still purchasing the cement?

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Apart from that, they are not buying anything?

Mr. GRAHAM: I am informed by the chief engineer that the government provides certain structural work. I presume the reason is that they want to be sure that they are getting the right material. This is all considered in the contract.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: But over and above that, do they buy anything, such as coal or sand?

Mr. GRAHAM: No.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Neither coal nor sand. Well, how is the price of the cement arrived at?

Mr. GRAHAM: Tenders are called for, the lowest of which is invariably accepted.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I had reference to these contracts. Do the contracts include the cost of cement which is rebated by the contractor to the government?

Mr. GRAHAM: The terms of the contract are that the department shall supply the cement.

Mr. LEWIS: How much of this work is completed?

Mr. GRAHAM: No section has been absolutely completed yet.

Mr. LEWIS: Are the government employing any men of their own on the work?

Mr. GRAHAM: The department, of course, must have its engineering staff to see that the work is properly done, in addition to a certain number of staff inspectors, just the same as on any other contract.

Mr. LEWIS: I understood that this work was all under contract, but I see in to-day's paper that carpenters, plumbers and steamfitters were making a protest under the nine-hour day advocated by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock). I was wondering whether these men were in the employ of the government or whether they were working under the contractors.

Mr. GRAHAM: What is known as the old Welland canal is still in operation with all its men, and the staff to which my hon friend refers has nothing to do with the construction of the new Welland canal. Those men are employed on the old canal.

Mr. GERMAN: Is the minister giving any consideration, in connection with the construction of the Welland canal, to the report of the International Waterways Commission in regard to the proposal of the United States government to join with the Canadian government in studying the St. Lawrence waterway question? Under that scheme the United States government would pay such proportion of the cost of construction of the Welland canal as their use of that waterway would compare with the use of it by Canadian shipping. That report appears to indicate that if the St. Lawrence deep waterways construction is gone on with, the proportion which the United States government would pay of the cost of the Welland canal would be, at any rate, 75 per cent. The Welland canal is going to cost $100,000,000 or more, and its usefulness will be very much restricted unless the work is carried on to tidewater. That, I think, is admitted by everyone who has any knowledge at all of the circumstances. There is no question that it would be of some use in allowing upper lake freighters to come from the upper lakes into lake Ontario, thereby reaching such ports as Toronto, Hamilton and Kingston. It would also be of great advantage to United States shipping, because it would allow upper lake freighters to reach Oswego, thus relieving the congestion in the port of Buffalo in the fall of the year when there is very great traffic during the shipping of grain in the western provinces.

Now, the United States government is quite willing to join with the Canadian government in discussing this problem of the construction of the St. Lawrence deep waterways, and as a matter of fact it sent an invitation to the Dominion government some time ago looking to a conference. Indeed, the idea contemplated more than a mere conference; it suggested not only the making of a treaty, but, independently of that, the alternative that the representatives of the two governments should sit down together and discuss the question solely from the point of view of the feasibility and the practicability of the St. Lawrence scheme. The answer to that proposal made by the Canadian government at that time, which answer I think was quite proper then, was that the time was not opportune to take the matter up. But that was nearly two years ago and it seems to me that the time is now opportune. I would therefore respectfully suggest to the government that they communicate with the United States government indicating their preparedness to sit down with the representatives of that government in order to discuss, not a treaty, but the feasibility of the project, to ascertain whether or not it is practicable, and to discover the correctness or otherwise, in the light of the facts as they exist to-day, of the figures that have been given by the engineers That, I think, is the least that the government can do. The Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) stated to a very large and influential delegation which waited upon him and other members of the government some time ago that this government would be prepared to discuss the matter with the United States government if a proposal again came from that source. I respectfully represent, however, to the Prime Minister and his government that, the United States authorities having already extended an invitation for a discussion of the subject, the next move ought to be on the part of the Canadian government. The Canadian government, I think, should in all fairness now suggest to the United States government that they are willing, without committing themselves to any definite line of action, without committing themselves to the construction of this gigantic work, to sit down and discuss the whole subject with representatives of the neighbouring republic. If that is done, I believe that a situation will ensue which will bring about the construction of the St. Lawrence deep waterways project. It is a scheme which undoubtedly will be carried out in the future, for it is one that will prove of enormous benefit to the people of Canada, and particularly to the grain growers of the western provinces. It has been said, and I have no doubt it is true, that in the fall of the year the congestion in the transportation of grain brings about an enormous increase in the lake freights, but with the St. Lawrence deep waterway in operation we would have an effective check on rate manipulation for we would have ocean-going boats proceeding to the head of the lakes and loading cargo for direct transport to Liverpool. I believe that this proposition is susceptible of complete and

positive demonstration, and, if so, it will be an enormous benefit to the people of Canada.

As I stated, the Welland canal improvements will cost at least $100,000,000. If the United States government in joining with us in the construction of the St. Lawrence deep waterway will contribute 75 per cent of this cost, it will mean a saving of $75,000,000 to the taxpayers of this country. Therefore I do hope the government will seriously consider this matter in connection with the construction of this great work of the Welland ship canal, and in the very near future will communicate with the United States government with a view to bringing about a conference looking to the construction of the St. Lawrence deep waterway.

Mr. MILLAR: Mr. Chairman, I propose to discuss this matter at some length, partly because the undertaking itself is of considerable magnitude, and partly because it has a direct bearing on the opening of the St. Lawrence route. In order to do so intelligently I must deal with the freight that passes through the Great Lakes. The greater part of this freight is iron ore, next comes coal, and thirdly grain. I know little about the other two commodities, so I shall confine myself to grain. I think perhaps the committee can best appreciate what I say in regard to this feature if they will picture to themselves the carrying of grain from the prairies down the lakes to Liverpool as resembling an inverted tree. The gathering of the grain in the provinces resembles very much the roots, then the trunk is represented by the western grain reaching Fort William, whence on its way to Liverpool, it branches out to Owen Sound, Collingwood, Port Edward, Goderich, Port Colborne, Buffalo and some other points, 65 per cent of it passing through American channels.

5 p.m.

Dealing with the cost of transportation, in the past we have heard a good deal about the immense saving that would accrue to the western farmers by the opening of the St. Lawrence route. Turning to the report of the grain commission appointed by the provincial government of Saskatchewan in 1914, at page 125 I find particulars of the cost of transporting wheat from Fort William to Montreal. The whole page is devoted to these particulars, but instead of taking up the time of the committee by reading all the different items I shall condense the information and merely give the averages. These different items I find average 4 cents per bushel exactly. The other pages that follow show slightly higher averages, namely, 4½ cents, 5 cents and 6 cents.

Mr. GRAHAM: Is that water-borne traffic?

Mr. MILLAR: Yes, all water-borne. Hon. members will note that the rate from Fort William to Montreal, water-borne, averages exactly 4 cents. Let me back up that statement by two extracts from a letter which appeared in the January number of Canadian Finance. This is the first extract:

> Some of the ardent advocates of the new scheme go to extremes and use the abnormal rates which are charged for limited periods by lake shippers. . . . Taking the years 1912, 1913, 1914 and 1915, we find that the average all-water rates from Fort William to Montreal were as follows:
>
> 1912, 5.77 cents per bushel; 1913, 5.35 cents; 1914, 4.58 cents; 1915, 4.99 cents.

This is the second extract:

> Taking the lake-and-rail route we find that the average rate during the above-mentioned four years was 7.47 cents per bushel—this includes the heavy rates prevailing in November and December. Certain storage privileges and saving in insurance go with this rate and, as a result, the lake-and-rail route has competed with the all-water rate of around five cents and secured a good volume of traffic.

My third extract is very short and is taken from Canal Statistics for 1913, a government publication:

> The combined water and rail rate from Port Arthur-Fort William to Buffalo-New York in November, was 8.796 cents per bushel, as compared with an average for that month between Port Arthur-Fort William and Montreal of 6.341 cents. With an advantage of 2.455 cents per bushel in favour of the St. Lawrence route, it is still true that more than ten times as many bushels of Canadian wheat went out by way of Buffalo-New York in November as came down to Montreal.

I give those rates to show that the contention of some people that 5 cents a bushel can be saved by opening this route is in fact preposterous. In the evidence given before the royal commission on Lake Grain Rates. I believe the consensus of opinion of the witnesses was that a reasonable rate at the present time from Fort William to the end of Lake Erie—Buffalo or Port Colborne—was ½ cent a hundred miles. That distance is about nine hundred miles. In other words, that gives a rate of 4½ cents per bushel. A reasonable rate from there to Montreal, passing through the canals and lake Ontario, would be 2 cents per hundred miles. This latter distance is about three hundred and fifty miles. So this would give a rate of 7 cents per bushel. In other words, a reasonable rate at the present time would be 11½ cents.

Mr. MANION: Lake and rail or straight water?

Mr. MILLAR: All water. Just here allow me to step aside to mention something that has a bearing on this and yet it deals with rail rates. It does seem remarkable that the

rail rate from Armstrong, a point on the National Transcontinental directly north of Fort William, to Quebec, a distance of 960 miles, is 21 cents, whereas the rate from Calgary to Fort William, a distance of 1,295 miles, is 15½ cents. Hon. members will note the comparison—that although the distance from Armstrong to Quebec is no more than 960 miles the rate is as high as 21 cents, as against a rate about a third less for a much longer haul. Perhaps hon. members may have the idea that the low rates are all in the West, but this illustration does not bear them out. I have not carefully verified the figures but in a pamphlet I have been reading I notice it is stated that the rate from Goderich by rail to Halifax, a distance of 1,305 miles, is 12¼ cents.

Mr. MANION: On what commodity?

Mr. MILLAR: I am speaking of wheat entirely—12¼ cents per bushel. I should have stated that. It would seem to me that a lower rate by rail from Armstrong to Quebec would have enabled us to utilize that railway to better advantage and perhaps have prevented a lot of the congestion of last year. Now let me go back. If a reasonable rate from Port Colborne to Montreal is 2 cents per 100 miles, then a reasonable rate through the canals must be very much more, and a reasonable rate through lake Ontario would be very much less. That means that the rate through lake Ontario would be—it is hard to say just what a reasonable rate would be, but I think it would readily appeal to your judgment that 1 cent per bushel per 100 miles of lake Ontario would be a reasonable rate. Now after the Welland canal is opened it is plain that all the advantage will be that the larger boats will be able to pass down to a point at the eastern end of lake Ontario, probably Prescott or Kingston. The carrying power I admit will be very much increased. In a pamphlet issued by the Department of Agriculture at Washington I notice that this calculation is made in respect of one large shipping company. In the case of a large boat loaded down so that it draws about 15 feet of water every inch of increased depth, means 80 tons of 2,240 pounds; that is, an increase of depth of one foot would mean 960 of such tons. The present depth of the Welland canal being about 14 feet, and of the new canal about 25 feet, if it could be utilized at once it would mean an enormous gain in the carrying power of the vessels, but I think it is safe to assume that for some time it will not be possible to use any greater depth than twenty or twenty-one feet for the reason that the depth of nearly all the harbours in the upper lakes, both lake Michigan and lake Superior at such points as Duluth, Milwaukee and Fort William, is only 21 feet so that until such a time as these are deepened it is likely that 21 feet is about all that will be used, but this in itself will mean a very great saving.

Let me say a few words in regard to the 65 per cent that is going through United States channels. I suppose it may be expected by some that the opening of this canal and the opening of the St. Lawrence river will hold nearly all of our Canadian wheat in Canadian channels. There are other reasons why our Canadian wheat goes through American channels. The route from New York to Liverpool although 500 miles longer than from Quebec to Liverpool has an advantage of about 2·55 cents per bushel in favour of New York, largely because, and I think entirely because the insurance rate is a little better, and there is much more traffic between the Old Land and New York than there is between the Old Land and Quebec. That 2·55 cents is a great drawing card, and a great deal of our grain passes that way for that reason.

Mr. ROBB: Does my hon. friend seriously desire to convey the impression that the difference in insurance as between Canadian ports and New York is 2 cents per bushel? Perhaps he would tell us what is the total rate of insurance per bushel.

Mr. MILLAR: I think my hon. friend misunderstood me. The total rate of carriage across the ocean is 2·55 cents in favour of New York, and while I am not just positive, I think a part of that may be due to insurance. Nearly all of it is due to the fact that there is greater space at New York. Let me make a remark here in regard to a matter that was discussed in the House a short time ago. We find that our grain on arriving in the Old Land is not in as good a condition passing through American channels as it is when it passes through Canadian channels. The reason for this is partly because the American people have considered in the past that when grain leaves the shores of the United States it is out of bond and mixing has been done—I know this for a fact—beyond the shore. The British people on receiving this grain complain, and I know on many occasions they have asked why it is so. I think they will have to learn, and the quicker they learn the better it will be for us, that they must accept this condition if they are going to take the grain through American channels.

Now will the Welland canal when opened keep a larger share of our grain in Canadian channels? I am not sure, because while it will allow the grain, both American and Canadian, to pass through the Welland canal and to the eastern end of lake Ontario, I believe that Oswego will become as keen a competitor for our grain as is Buffalo at the present moment. The natural place for the Erie canal is between Oswego and New York rather than between Buffalo and New York. The Erie canal runs eastward almost parallel with lake Ontario until it reaches a point nearly south of Oswego. Whether it be true or not I notice some comments in the American papers in which they claim that the expenditure on the Erie canal between Buffalo and New York was largely a political expenditure, and that it will be quite natural and more logical to spend money on the Erie canal between Oswego and New York. However, the canal is not a strong competitor. A few years ago, and I am not sure that it is not true up to the present time only 14 per cent of the grain reaching New York reached it by water. The American railways with their increased carrying capacity, better roadbed and larger cars have become very keen competitors, and have in fact put the Erie canal pretty well out of business, and the fact that Oswego is quite as close to New York as Buffalo is, in fact I believe it is a little closer, leads me to believe that Oswego will be at least as keen a competitor for our grain as Buffalo is at the present time.

A year or two ago I would have been very much in favour of delaying the building of this canal, but I will frankly admit that the congestion of last year has placed a very strong argument in the hands of those who would like to see the work hurried. In that connection I believe that with a very much less expenditure, in fact, with just a little more care and activity on the part of some of the government departments—and I am very pleased to see the Minister of Trade and Commerce in his seat because I have some little criticism to make of his department—much of that congestion could be avoided. The congestion last year was caused very largely by the fact that Montreal was not able to handle the grain as fast as it came. The output of Fort William and Port Arthur is many times the capacity of Montreal, and yet it would appear that the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal did not divert one single vessel of export grain to the port of Quebec. The capacity of 2,000,000 bushels at the port of Quebec was not fully occupied during this period of congestion. The grain backed up to Port Colborne, backed up to the lake ports and afforded not only an opportunity for higher rates but an excuse as well. Hence we have a monopoly on the Great Lakes exacting exorbitant rates, taking, it is modest to say, $5,000,000 out of the western producers. Does it not seem reasonable for the western producers, especially in this time of distress, to expect action on the part of the Department of Trade and Commerce? At least I believe I am right in saying we have reason to look to the Department of Trade and Commerce to control this route for grain. We have a Grain Commission in the West that looks after the western end, but I think, perhaps, I am right in saying that in practice they do not regard it as their duty to keep track of the eastern end I am not sure about that, but judging from what they do I infer that they do not view it seriously as their duty to look after the eastern end of the route. Does it not seem strange, therefore, that the Department of Trade and Commerce—knowing the capacity of Montreal, knowing the enormous crop in the western provinces—were not a little more active in trying to avert the catastrophe that really did occur? I believe the department have been active in seeking a market for our product and in many other lines; but I think I must, in fairness, criticize them for their negligence and indifference to the interest of the western growers in not trying to avert this catastrophe. I do not know whether they interceded with the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal to divert some of the grain to Quebec and thus relieve the pressure; I do not know whether they did anything in the way of getting floating elevators that would transfer grain from one boat to another; I do not know what they did. The fact remains, even if they are able to show that they tried to do their best, that there was a catastrophe and it resulted in enormous loss.

Now here is a suggestion I have to make: In past years we have, at about every ten year period, appointed a commission to investigate the grain trade. That commission found irregularities in every case and have given the information to the public. Then, it appears to me, we have practically sat down and allowed the same irregularities or others very like them—equally disastrous, equally against the interest of the producers—to grow up and become so bad that there was another outcry, another commission was appointed, another clean up took place, and then there was another sitting down. Now, that should not be. I think we have reason, as producers of

grain far removed from this channel of commerce, to expect that the government, through some of its departments—and I believe it should be through the Department of Trade and Commerce—should see to it that this route is kept clear, and that such abuses should not be allowed to grow up to the extent that it is possible to impose a rate that takes millions of dollars from those producing grain.

I will not say anything about what is taking place west of Fort William because it is now the subject of investigation, and because it is not closely connected with the Welland canal, but my point is that in the case of such an enormous expenditure, while it may or may not be wise to push the enterprise through as quickly as possible, a great deal more gain would accrue to the western producers if the government were active in seeing that the routes through which our grain passes were kept free from those who would prey upon us and take far more for their service than they were entitled to. This has been the case from time immemorial and I think that if we are ever going to get back to reconstruction, if we are ever going to place agriculture in a position in which it ought to be and where it may become prosperous, the government will have to display a little more activity. It will have to see that the route beyond our control is kept free from such practices as have been proven to exist by the report in connection with the Great Lakes rates which has been handed in recently.

I believe the contract for this Welland canal was let at about $55,000,000. It does seem to me that large contracts such as this have a queer way of doubling and trebling in cost after they get started. The Panama canal cost at least four times the first estimate, and there are many other cases that might be cited. In the present instance it is stated the cost will perhaps be $100,000,000 or about double the original estimate, and that possibly it may reach even three times that estimate. So that with capital expenditure and accrued interest the outlay will be enormous before we have received one dollar in benefit; and I think it is plain, from the figures I have given you there will only be a gain of one or two cents a bushel by the opening of the Welland canal until the St. Lawrence route is opened. Therefore, although I think, perhaps, we are the most interested, the benefit we will derive will be slow in coming. I find there is considerable activity on the part of some members of the House of pushing the construction of the Welland canal as quickly as possible. I cannot see where they are going to get much benefit. If anyone is going to derive benefit it is those who are producing grain, or shipping ore, or some of the other freights that are passing down.

There is a matter here that I would like to ask the minister a question upon. It has been stated several times by the minister that the request for this enterprise first came from some western people. I do not doubt for one moment that that statement is true, having come from the minister; but many of us in this corner of the House are in close touch with the farmers' organizations, and have been for years, and we know of none of them that have made that request. I would therefore ask the minister to state plainly just who it was that made that request. I have no doubt that some private individual may have done so, and probably people located around Fort William. They have been looking forward to the time when Fort William will become practically an ocean port. On another occasion I would like to deal a little more fully with that hope. I am afraid, they are doomed to disappointment. There will always be a time after the St. Lawrence route is opened up, and I believe it ultimately will be, when a number of vessels will ply between Liverpool and London and Fort William, but they will be very few in number, very few indeed. There are several reasons why Fort William cannot become an ocean port. There is the length of time it takes a vessel to pass up through the forty-four miles of canal between Montreal and Prescott at the rate of four knots an hour, then through the Welland canal, and there is the higher insurance rate and the greater risk attached to navigation by this route. I think a little study along that line will convince the members of the committee and the people of Fort William that the time when that place will become an ocean port is far removed. I think it well, in the case of each of these products, that we should carefully study the matter. We should not plunge too hurriedly into the opening of the St. Lawrence route, and the deepening of the St. Lawrence river at a cost now estimated at $252,000,000 but which, with our past experience, we may well estimate at two or three times that amount. Unless we move cautiously we will, perhaps, find ourselves in the same position with regard to those enterprises as we are in the case of the Welland canal. There is no thought of stopping it so far as any member of this House is concerned. We all know that it should be completed. It is only a question of how fast we should hasten the work. It

is going to involve an enormous outlay, and I do not think the returns will be sufficient to warrant hastening the work, as has been proposed. It seems to me it would be wise to expend our money, for the time being, where it is urgently needed, and rather delay this work, even though it may not be completed for four, five or six years.

I have one word to say in regard to another matter. If we are going to have a bumper crop in the West this year—and the government can judge of that in a month or two—or anything like the quantity we handled last year, it would be well for the government to increase their elevator capacity at Montreal, and provide also some floating elevators. They cost about $100,000 apiece, and with these elevators grain should be transferred from one boat to another at the rate of about 10,000 bushels per hour. If a few of these floating elevators had been available last season, I think much of the congestion causing such an enormous loss would not have occurred.

Mr. ROBB: There is a floating elevator there.

Mr. MILLAR: The Minister of Trade and Commerce says there is a floating elevator there, but I believe that floating elevator at Montreal is not entirely satisfactory. I do not know whether the reason is that it is an old type of floating elevator. The elevators used at New York are entirely satisfactory. I believe such elevators would be of great service. When there is congestion at Montreal, and the elevators at Quebec are not being used to any very great extent, and partly empty, while Montreal is filled to the roof, I think it would be well if the Department of Trade and Commerce would intercede with the Harbour Commission, I suppose they desire to make a record, but it is not in the interests of the country or of the western producer that they should make a record and cause congestion and block the grain. It would be better if they would divert some of the boats and send them to Quebec, so that they could utilize the facilities there. At another time I shall have something more to say in regard to Quebec as a grain handling port. The National Transcontinental cuts off two hundred miles by having a direct route. There is a great saving in distance, and the largest boats can come to Quebec. If the railways were charging the same rates from Calgary to Quebec as they are charging from Calgary to Fort William, nothing more or less, the rate between Armstrong and Quebec would be exactly the same as the present water rate between Fort William and Montreal. Even at the present time it would seem as though some grain could go all rail; but by bringing down the rate to what they are charging in some other places, I think we could utilize Quebec to a much larger extent than we have been doing in the past. That might tend to prevent a considerable quantity of our grain going through American channels. The natural route for grain is by the St. Lawrence, and if we as Canadians are going to be more alert and do what we can to make that route attractive, we ought to be able to retain more of our grain than we have retained in the past. Many things attract grain. The quickness of handling, the fees at the harbours, and a lot of other little things have a great influence on the shipper when he is deciding which route he shall adopt. I would be pleased if the minister would answer the two or three questions I have asked.

Mr. ROBB: Before the minister replies, I desire to make a few observations regarding the congestion of last year. I have no exception to take to the observations of my hon. friend (Mr. Millar) regarding the rate of freight that prevailed prior to 1912 from the head of the lakes to the seaboard; nor have I any exception to take to his observations regarding ocean steamers going to the head of the lakes. I understood him to say that that proposition was very remote. I agree with him. But with the deepening of the Welland canal, the larger boats operating on the upper lakes will be able to come further down the river, and to that extent reduce the cost of carrying grain from the head of the lakes to the seaboard.

I rose more particularly to answer my hon. friend regarding the congestion which developed towards the close of the season last year at the eastern ports. There was discrimination in freight rates on the upper lakes long before the congestion developed at the eastern ports, and if any department, or if any government, ever tried to regulate that, it is the government in power to-day, and having failed by persuasion and representation to get the shippers to do what was fair, the government hopes that when it comes down with legislation to try and effect a cure, it will have the support of parliament. It is true that towards the end of the season congestion developed at Montreal, and it is also true that there was and is a considerable capacity at Quebec. Early in the summer, I think it was probably in August, I made a special trip to Quebec to try and work out the elevators at Montreal and Quebec together, some arrangement whereby they could operate. General Tremblay made a special trip

up to Montreal to have a talk with the Harbour Commissioners and urged upon them the importance of making great use of the elevators in Quebec, and I am not sure but that the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal were quite willing to co-operate with the Harbour Commissioners of Quebec to divert grain to that port. But the shipper has something to say about where his grain is going to be transshipped, and the shipper had had an experience in the Quebec elevator that was not very profitable. He has not yet learned that there had been a change of management in that elevator and that it is safe to put grain through it. They are putting grain through now because the shippers are confident that the grain will not be mixed, as it was a few years ago; but my hon. friend, I believe, is associated with a large elevator equipment in western Canada, and if his agent refuses to ship grain to any particular port, neither the Department of Trade and Commerce nor any other department could compel him to put that grain through that port. He owns the grain and routes it the way he thinks best. I want to dispel the illusion in the mind of my hon. friend that it is the duty of the government to go and tell the shippers which way they should route their grain. That is not the work of a department of government.

Mr. MILLAR: Did the Board of Grain Commissioners not make a similar adjustment on the Pacific coast during the congestion, by bringing pressure to bear on shippers and railways and those who were handling the elevators? I think they brought about an adjustment of a very similar difficulty.

Mr. ROBB: I am glad my hon. friend has mentioned that. I will come to it in a moment. I was not going to touch on that. The duty of the Department of Trade and Commerce is to find markets for the products of this country. We leave it to the people of the country who are doing business to contribute in some degree towards getting their stuff forward. As a result of the experience of last year, the elevator capacity in Montreal will be considerably increased. They have now with the Quebec house a working arrangement which will take care of much more grain, and which, I believe to that extent, will minimize the possibilities of congestion this season.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is the arrangement?

Mr. ROBB: It is just a friendly working arrangement that the Harbour Commissioners send along grain when their elevator gets filled up, and I think the shippers now have confidence that their grain is safe going through the Quebec house; that it will not be mixed as it was mixed a few years ago. A few years ago some of the large shippers put some grain through the Quebec house, and No. 1 northern was mixed with No. 3 northern and No. 4 northern with No. 2 northern. This was not a very profitable proposition for the shipper, and he simply boycotted the Quebec house for the time being. It is only recently that he is satisfied it is safe to put grain through the Quebec house.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is another question. I shall have something to say about that. I asked what the arrangement was, and I was told that it was a friendly arrangement. I did not expect that it was a hostile one. I want to know the terms.

Mr. ROBB: In what regard?

Mr. MEIGHEN: What are the terms of the arrangement between the two commissions?

Mr. ROBB: There is just a friendly understanding as my right hon. friend and I might have an understanding that when he has too much business, he will give me a share of it. Broadly speaking that is the arrangement.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What was to hinder their doing that before, that is during this past season? Surely they did not need to meet in order to do that.

Mr. ROBB: They did do so towards the end of the season.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Why did they not do it in time for it to be of some use?

Mr. ROBB: I was answering my hon. friend's observation that the Department of Trade and Commerce had done nothing. I am trying to convince him that we did something to contribute towards that understanding.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Too late.

Mr. MILLAR: The minister just stated that they did this towards the end of the season. I believe it is correct that not one bushel of export wheat was diverted from Montreal to Quebec last season.

Mr. ROBB: My information from General Tremblay is that some grain was put in the Quebec house towards the end of last season. It may have remained there all winter.

Mr. MILLAR: I have that statement from the commissioners.

Mr. ROBB: Probably my hon. friend is right. I was away at the time, but that was my understanding from General Tremblay

As regards the Pacific coast situation, I would not like to say this boastingly, but the records are there that we have put more grain through the Vancouver house than had been put through during all previous years from the time of the construction of that elevator.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Why does the minister say "we"?

Mr. ROBB: The government of the day.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I understood the minister to say a few minutes ago that the shipper had the routing. I did not know the government had it. How is it that they have the routing via the Pacific coast?

Mr. ROBB: Probably more ships were brought in there and attention was directed to the value of that route.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Hear, hear. The mercantile marine.

Mr. ROBB: I have not the figures before me, but my recollection is that this year they will have put through the Vancouver house almost double what was put through it last year. When I was in Vancouver last fall, shippers were complaining bitterly and finding fault and one of the newspapers was carrying on a campaign because the government had not built another elevator there during the summer to provide for the extra business. The shippers were complaining that they were not going to be able to route through that port as much grain as there was a market for. I sent for the superintendent of the elevator, and he told me that he was running his house to full capacity. I said: "Are you working it nights?" He said: "No, we are running it only fourteen hours a day." I said: "You must get busy and run this house nights." He complained that he did not have expert elevator men to operate it; that there was a danger of mixing the grades, and that would do more harm than good. I immediately communicated with Mr. Boyd, Chairman of the Grain Commission at Fort William, and instructed him to send to Vancouver one or two foremen who could take charge of the night shift, and also suggesting that they look into the question of operating the Vancouver house in connection with the Calgary house. Bear in mind the situation there is quite different from the situation on the east coast. The department have no control whatever, beyond inspection, over the management of the elevator system either in Montreal or Quebec; but the department will have control of the Vancouver house until the end of July this year and they had control of the Calgary house. I suggested to Mr. Boyd that they work out a system whereby they could operate these two houses together: that when ships were coming in and they saw that the elevator at Vancouver was going to be lightened, they would telegraph to Calgary to send along the reserves. That is the reason why they have been putting so much more grain through the Vancouver house this year.

Mr. MILLAR: Does that experience in the West as compared with the experience in the East last winter not convince the minister that the government should have some control?

Mr. ROBB: My friend, even if he were in this office, might have some trouble in convincing the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal and Quebec. They exist under act of parliament, and I think they claim the right to operate their own houses. They have been doing so fairly well; they have been putting a good deal of grain through those houses.

Mr. MANION: When the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Millar) arose, I was just going to rise in order, in a very few words, to support the proposal of the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German), asking the government to make a proposition to the United States government for a discussion of the question of the St. Lawrence-Great Lakes canal. It would appear to me to be a very reasonable request to ask the United States government to enter upon a discussion of this question. The hon. member for Welland made it perfectly clear that that was all he was asking for; he was not asking the government to bind itself. He pointed out the fact that the United States government had about a year ago made to the Canadian government a proposition to discuss this question, but the Canadian government then thought the time was not opportune for such a discussion.

Before I say a few more words regarding that, I wish to deal with a few of the statements made by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Millar). I will deal with them very briefly. In his closing remarks he seemed to draw the conclusion that the whole idea of the building of the St. Lawrence-Great Lakes canal was the outcome of some imaginative chap at Fort William; that Fort William, being anxious to be an ocean port, had come forward with this proposition and decided to belabour the rest of the country into building the St. Lawrence-Great Lakes canal. That, at least, was the conclusion I drew from his remarks. As a matter of fact, the original pro-

position, so far as I remember—and I think I am correct—started in the north-western states of the Union amongst the grain growers, and the organization gradually became strong and large until the movement took hold of the Canadian people, and the first meeting was held at Windsor, the home of the late Minister of Railways.

Mr. MILLAR: I certainly had no thought whatever that the idea had started at Fort William. I do not know what I said to give my hon. friend that impression.

Mr. MANION: The hon. member said that he did not know why the Welland canal was being built, but that Fort William seemed to be anxious to be an ocean port.

Mr. MILLAR: Among others.

Mr. MANION: He did not say "among others"; he is saying that now. However, that does not matter. I wish to supplement what the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Robb) stated regarding ocean steamers. I believe that no one who has studied the question expects ocean steamers to any great extent ever to go to the Great Lakes even to Toronto or Windsor, or to the head of the lakes or Duluth. It is anticipated that if the canal system is ever built, as I have no doubt at all it ultimately will be, those ships taking grain from the head of the lakes and Duluth will be able to carry it to Montreal at a much less cost than is charged at the present time, and without transshipping at Port Colborne or the Georgian bay ports or at Buffalo and going down by the Erie canal to New York. There is not a thought, on the part of those who have given any study to the question, of great ocean steamers landing at the docks at the head of the lakes.

In regard to the building of the Welland canal, I have the same to say as I have said concerning the St. Lawrence system: certainly, Fort William has had no idea of asking for any particular consideration in this respect. There was no move on the part of the people at the head of the lakes in this matter. Naturally, Fort William and the head of the lakes are directly interested in the building of the canal and are supporting it in consequence; but they do so with the complete conviction that it is a good thing in the interests of the country. My hon. friend spoke about rates on grain and pointed out, what he has already indicated to me in private, namely the rates for which grain was carried from the head of the lakes to Montreal previous to the war; and I must confess that when he showed me the figures I was startled by the low charge that was made upon grain over that distance. At the same time, we must not forget that twenty or fifteen years ago everything was very much lower than it is to-day, and I greatly doubt whether we shall ever get back to such rates as the hon. gentleman quoted, such as an average of 4 cents for grain from the head of the lakes to Montreal. Later on in his remarks he pointed out—at least I understood him to do so—that a water rate from the head of the lakes to Montreal of 11 cents was a reasonable one. I think I am quoting the hon. gentleman correctly in that regard. Well, I would consider that a very unreasonable rate if we had the St. Lawrence waterway built.

Mr. WARNER: Would that be 11 cents a bushel?

Mr. MANION: Yes. I should think that if the large shell-like boats at the head of the lakes can transport grain clear through to Montreal, then certainly the rate ought ultimately, except under very special circumstances, to be nothing like 11 cents.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It should be more like 3 cents.

Mr. MANION: Yes; probably 3 or 4 cents would cover it, and my hon. friend would then get back to the rates which he quoted as prevailing before the war. The hon. gentleman made the statement, which is correct, that some time ago about 65 per cent of the grain grown in western Canada was shipped to the United Kingdom via New York, in this way: It would come from the head of the lakes to Buffalo, and thence by the Erie canal to New York. The charge from Buffalo to New York alone was 10 cents; and yet my hon. friend points out—what is the fact—that the shippers generally, at least two-thirds of them, chose the American route. They did this for various reasons, and in spite of the fact that they had to pay 10 cents for the carriage from Buffalo by the Erie canal to New York city alone. That is another reason, and an important one, why, if the canal is ultimately built, grain will be carried at a much lower rate than is the case at the present time. I believe my hon. friend stated that in the past year a large proportion of Canadian grain went via New York. I do not think that last year such a large proportion did go by New York; I believe that at least two-thirds went via Montreal.

Mr. GRAHAM: There went by Montreal 153,000,000 bushels.

Mr. MANION: Well, 153,000,000 is a very large proportion of our grain. That is what I understood—about 150,000,000

Mr. MILLAR: I think it is correct that 150,000,000 went through American ports and about 147,000,000 via Canadian ports.

Mr. MANION: I do not think my hon. friend can be correct. What was the crop last year? I think it was about 399,000,000 bushels. The figures were given to me about a month ago by the Department of Trade and Commerce, that there was still in the West about 150,000,000 bushels.

Mr. ROBB: Do not give too much publicity to an inactive market.

Mr. MANION: It is all going out now; it is no longer inactive. But at that time there were about 150,000,000 bushels in the West, and if 150,000,000 also went by Montreal, that would make 300,000,000 bushels. So that 150,000,000 could not possibly have gone by New York.

Mr. BROWN: Is it not true that a great deal of American grain was shipped via Montreal?

Mr. MANION: Yes; my hon. friend, I think, is correct in that regard. However, that is beside the question. Now, I might observe here that one of the greatest authorities on the grain question in the world, as my hon. friends to my left will no doubt agree, is Julius Barnes. He is at all events one of the most reliable authorities, and he has made the statement again and again that the carrying out of this undertaking would save from five to ten cents a bushel on wheat being shipped to Europe. And Herbert Hoover, a man who is internationally known, has also expressed the same view. If we look at the report of the International Joint Commission we shall also find exactly the same thing stated. After two years of study, after a very thorough investigation, they come to precisely the same conclusion, that a great saving would be made to the western farmer by building the canal. In view of these facts, and in view of the statements made by Julius Barnes, by Herbert Hoover and by this commission, I certainly think that the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German) makes a quite reasonable request when he asks the government to extend an invitation to the American government to discuss this question from the standpoint of the feasibility of the project. I would repeat and support what he said. Such a request would not bind the Canadian government to anything, and I certainly believe that the discussion would lead to practical results. It would undoubtedly be a thorough one, and before either government undertook to commit itself, it would no doubt be convinced that the scheme was in the best interests of both countries.

I believe, from the report of the commission, and in view of the fact that we shall have spent $100,000,000 on the Welland canal, that the St. Lawrence-Great Lakes canal could be built for a very small sum of money so far as Canada's share is concerned. And if in raising the money the two governments united in guaranteeing bonds at 4 per cent or 4½ per cent, the necessary funds I have no doubt could be obtained. If the respective governments united in the undertaking, it would not necessarily entail the expenditure of one cent directly by the government of this country. I submit once more that the request that the government take steps to bring about a discussion of this question between representatives of the Canadian administration and of the United States government is undoubtedly a reasonable one, and I hope that in the near future the government now in power will extend an invitation to this end to the neighbouring republic and take up the matter.

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Millar) criticizes the cost of the Welland canal, now estimated at not less than $80,000,000 and perhaps more, and he points out that the original estimate was some $55,000,000. This seems to him to be proof that the estimates are now too high. But I would point out that these were pre-war estimates and the contracts of necessity had to be dropped on account of the war. Had there been no war the estimated cost, I imagine, would not have been exceeded to any great extent. But to-day everything costs twice as much as it did before the war, and I think I am safe in saying that an expenditure of ninety million dollars now is no more extravagant than fifty-five million dollars would have been at pre-war prices. So there is nothing strange or wrong about the increased expenditure.

Now, my hon. friend refers to the Oswego canal. I would suggest that he need not worry any more about that. Those who were opposed to the deepening of the Welland canal years ago—I refer now to Buffalo interests largely—always tried to frighten us with the bugaboo of what they were going to do to us on the Erie canal by way of Oswego. As a matter of fact a large appropriation was secured from the state of New York for the canal. I have read of the hopes they had of a 20 or 25-foot draft channel. But the best engineers reported that 12 feet was the best draft they could get, and that not in all places. But in addition to that there are

hundreds of bridges over the Erie canal of only 15 feet clearance, and these would have to be raised. With a straight route now from the Welland canal through to—I must say both Kingston or Prescott, or perhaps as a compromise, Brockville—sufficient for vessels drawing 21 feet, my hon. friend can see the absolute impossibility of the Erie canal with its little 12-foot draft and its 15-foot overhead bridge clearance competing with such a route. Even we are complaining that the draft is small and we have to use barges, but our shallowest draft is two feet deeper than the Erie canal's maximum. So at the very best we can carry through our canal, even as at present constituted, much heavier loads than the Erie canal can ever accommodate.

Mr. MILLAR: I think the minister has overlooked one statement I made, that at the present time all but 14 per cent of the grain reaching New York comes by rail; that is, the Erie canal is not cutting very much of a figure in the competition now.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is true, and it never will. But Buffalo, so far as the Oswego route is concerned, could compete via New York by rail and not use the canal at all. The object of the Welland canal deepening is to bring the traffic of the West as far east as possible before transshipping it into smaller boats. Sir William Van Horne on one occasion when discussing this very project stated that he believed it was as cheap to transship to shallower draft vessels at the foot of lake Ontario or farther east and take the cargoes to Montreal as it would be to have larger vessels for the whole route, but I am not going to discuss that subject at the present time. However if the Welland canal deepening will not decrease the cost of transportation of western grain, it will not do anything. I think it will. Some few years ago I had an opportunity of discussing the figures with those engaged in transportation, and, although those figures would not be applicable now, I was informed by these people that they believed there would be an appreciable reduction in the cost of transportation of grain and other products eastward as far as Kingston and Prescott. My hon. friend refers to a saving of one cent a bushel. Does he realize that such a saving or even half of it, on Canada's grain crop would mean a saving of millions of dollars?

When I was speaking the other night I was mildly castigated for suggesting that the western people ever asked for the deepening of the Welland canal. Of course, a great many of the members from the West now are young men, and they perhaps do not remember what happened years ago, but I made several trips through to the coast with Sir Wilfrid Laurier in 1907 and 1910—shortly before the calamity befell this country—and one of the main things dwelt upon at every meeting in the West was: When are you going to start deepening the Welland canal? Deputations from one part of the West were urging the construction of the Hudson Bay railway, but from the time we struck Winnipeg until we reached Victoria the Welland canal deepening was mentioned by nearly every deputation that came to us. I asked my secretary to see if anything could be found in the way of representations from boards of trade and other associations that were sent to the department, because hundreds of representations were made orally to every minister of the then government who went West. At random I find the following representations were received: From Winnipeg, Vancouver, Edmonton, Port Arthur, Kamloops, Virden, Victoria, Camrose, Regina, the Winnipeg Grain and Produce Exchange, the Selkirk Business Men's Association, and so forth. I dare say if I were to go to Brockville and open up several boxes of correspondence marked "private" I could dig up hundreds of these representations from the West. But the deepening of the canal is started, and it is for the purpose of making transportation cheaper in the Dominion both east and west. We believe it will accomplish that object. It has cost more money than was anticipated. So has everything else in this country. Even a meal costs more to-day than it did in 1913. One of the difficulties of carrying on national affairs to-day is that everything is much more expensive than it was a few years ago.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. GRAHAM: I was referring at six o'clock to what my hon. friend from Welland and my hon. friend from Rainy River had said in urging this government to communicate with the United States government with a view to holding a conference to discuss the advisability of proceeding with the St. Lawrence deep waterway. Some time ago the Canadian government did receive a communication from the United States government suggesting a conference with a view to making a treaty, but the Canadian government at that time did not see its way clear to proceeding so rapidly in the matter. At a later date a large deputation

waited on the Prime Minister and others, when the Prime Minister suggested if I remember correctly, that he would gladly consider it if the United States would make another proposition for a conference without going so far as to say that it was for the purpose of making a treaty. I think my hon. friend was mistaken in saying that the United States government offered to pay a substantial part of the construction cost of the Welland canal.

Mr. GERMAN: That was recommended by the International Joint Commission.

Mr. GRAHAM: That recommendation was made by the International Joint Commission in a report containing certain references to each government. Of course, the matter of a great St. Lawrence waterway is very interesting to me. Having lived on the St. Lawrence most of my life perhaps I take a deeper interest in the matter than others not so situated. It is a very big problem and without consulting the other members of the government I would not like to say anything definite as to holding another conference between the United States government and the Dominion of Canada. There are other interests concerned in the proposition besides the Dominion of Canada and the United States. The federal authority, of course, takes cognizance of improvements to navigation, but the construction of the proposed St. Lawrence deep waterway would mean the development of a very substantial amount of power. I am free to admit that this part of Ontario at least is in need of power. In some sections we have the Hydro Electric power, but in most cases it has to be transmitted over such a distance that it is really not cheap power, particularly in places where the consumption does not extend to any great degree. The provincial authorities have also something to say in the water itself, and as hon. gentlemen will remember there have been some disagreements as to the legal rights as between the federal and the provincial authorities. However, I think it has been pretty clearly demonstrated that so far as the water itself is concerned the provincial authorities have at least some ground for making their claim. Then, of course, there is the state authority on the other side of the line. When last I mentioned this in the House some years ago I added another factor, the International Joint Commission, but the commission has since made certain propositions to each government particularly as to the Welland canal. The Welland canal construction was started years ago before the suggestion for the St. Lawrence deep waterway had taken definite shape, I imagine. But this one thing is assured, that the deepening of the Welland canal will form the beginning of that enterprise so far as the connection between the two lakes is concerned, and if the time comes for the proposal of the International Joint Commission to be put into effect Canada will be in a position to lay claim to the share which the United States ought to pay for the construction of the Welland canal.

Mr. CHURCH: I would like to say a word or two on this subject inasmuch as I come from a city that is spending twenty-six millions in rebuilding the port of Toronto and improving and enlarging its harbour anticipating that a contract had been made between the cities and towns on the St. Lawrence and on lakes Erie and Ontario and the upper lakes with the government regarding the deepening of this canal. A study of the canal situation in Canada does not disclose any definite and consistent plan such as the people of Canada had in 1829 when the Welland canal was first started. It is true also that water-borne traffic has not had the chance it should have had in competition with the railways of this country, and for that reason we have congestion every year not only in handling the wheat crop but coal and every other basic commodity in this country. Water-borne traffic got no subsidies, bonuses, land grants or hand-outs like railways did.

Money has been spent on some canals that never should have been constructed in the first place and left unspent on others, and three transcontinental railways have been built where probably one or two would have sufficed. The people of this country have spent $900,000,000 directly and indirectly upon the railways of this country, and still we have congestion half the time and the deplorable situation in which the railways are to-day. I repeat, Mr. Chairman, the canals have never had the chance they should have had, and if some of the money that has been spent on any one of these transcontinental railways had been spent on deepening the St. Lawrence waterway and the Welland canal, and in addition if money had not been spent on canals that can have no economic value, we would have had much better value for our money and should have taken a great step forward in solving the transportation problems of this country.

As shown by this deep waterways report the Welland canal is one of the most important links in the whole St. Lawrence waterway scheme. The history of the Welland canal goes back to 1829 when the government

of Canada, assisted by the British government built the first canal. It was supposed to be a four foot canal, but its dimensions were subsequently changed to the following: a 40 foot lock, 110 feet long, 20 feet wide, with 8 feet of water over the sills. On the union of Upper and Lower Canada in 1840 the government took over the canal, and replaced the 40 wooden locks with 27 stone locks ranging in length from 150 to 230 feet with a width of from 26 to 45 feet and 10½ feet of water on the sills.—In 1871 this canal was found inadequate and the Welland canal in use at present was begun on a 12 foot basis and then deepened to 14 feet on the sills.—What is known as the present canal was opened in 1887 with 14 feet of water in the sills but it became altogether too small and a more comprehensive scheme was entered upon which is known as the large ship canal. That is the project that is before the country to-day. This the International Joint Commission considers is absolutely necessary if we are to handle the volume of trade which is offering in the West as well as in the East.

As to this ship channel scheme, my hon. friend the member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Millar), who made a very able speech this afternoon on the subject, and who has evidently been studying the canal problem very deeply, offered some criticism. I do not agree with him when he says there has been no demand for the Welland canal. I well remember the movement which led to its demand. I was president of the Union of Canadian Municipalities which embraces some four hundred and sixty municipalities, and we came down and asked the Borden government for the new Welland ship canal. The deputation was received in the old parliament buildings and we asked the government to go on with this work. At the time there was great congestion of grain on the lakes and congestion generally. The government were launching a second transcontinental railway, and a third was under way. Those that came down on that deputation pointed out the great importance of water-borne traffic in solving the transportation problem of Canada. I may say here that unlike the railways the water-borne traffic has never had a fair chance. The railways have had subsidies, land grants, and handouts of all kinds from governments—from the Dominion government and from the governments of the provinces. The province of Ontario and the old provinces of Upper and Lower Canada have paid a very large proportion of this assistance since confederation. In 1896, I think, there was a return brought down by the Minister of Finance which showed that 52 per cent of all the taxes of Canada up to that date had been paid by the old provinces of Ontario and Quebec. Therefore I say there should be no sectional feeling displayed on this question.

The St. Lawrence scheme is one of the most important economic problems we have on the North American continent to-day. We are dependent on the St. Lawrence and the development along the great chain of lakes for future transportation facilities. Therefore I say there was a demand for this particular work. It was shown there was a great necessity for doing something along this particular line to bring down and regulate rates and give the farmers a chance not only in the West with respect to grain but in many other parts of the country where there was freight to be handled. The government decided to go on with the canal and a very exhaustive inquiry was made and reported on. As a result of that inquiry it was estimated that the cost of the new Welland canal would be about $50,000,000. The minister this afternoon stated it would take $80,000,000 to finish the work, and the hon. member for Qu'Appelle places the probable cost at $100,000,000.

I do not agree with that hon. gentleman that the work should have been suspended during the war. I think it was a great mistake that the government suspended the work because it is now going to cost about 50 per cent more than it otherwise would have done. If the contracts had been awarded at the prices for dredging, for concrete work and other classes of work of that description, the contracts being applicable to a period of years, the canal could have been constructed at a saving of twenty-five or thirty million dollars. That was illustrated by the results which attended similar contracts carried out by the Harbour Commissioners of Toronto. At that time business men and others said "Do not go on with the Toronto harbour improvements, we cannot afford it." The harbour commissioners, however, of whom the late Lieutenant Governor Lionel Clarke, one of the best informed men we had in Canada on the grain situation, was chairman, decided to go ahead with the work. Contracts were awarded to the Canadian Stewart Company on a basis of 19½ cents per cubic yard. That work was accomplished during the war and it helped very largely in connection with unemployment. The lands improved were also of a revenue producing character. If that work had not been started at that time the price would have gone up to 38 or 40 cents a cubic yard, the average rate at present. The work on this Welland

canal, undertaken at this time, is going to cost more money by reason of higher cost of labour, higher cost of materials, the difference in exchange, and everything else than if it had been entered into during the war. The Chippawa power canal planned to produce 100,000 horse-power cost $10,000,000. It was extended to develop 550,000 horse-power and the result is that that canal has cost $70,000,000. But that was not due to any errors or mistakes that were made in the plans or estimates. It was entirely due to the advance in the cost of materials, of money, of labour, and of everything else, as a result of the war.

Some of the arguments advanced this afternoon against the ship canal, in my opinion, have no proper basis. The hon. member for Fort William and Rainy River (Mr. Manion) quoted Mr. James H. Barnes, president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, and a member of one of the leading grain firms of Duluth, as saying that there would be a saving of ten cents per bushel in the carrying of grain when the Welland canal and the St. Lawrence route are finished. He also quoted Herbert Hoover, and many other authorities in the United States, on the subject. There is congestion at Buffalo and the United States government are willing to pay their share towards the deepening of the St. Lawrence canals. The International Joint Commission in their report recommend that the United States government should pay a large proportion of the cost of these improvements in the Welland canal, and that report sets out the opinions of many authorities in the United States along this line.

To show you the immediate necessity for the building of this canal, I want to refer for a few minutes to the great congestion of the grain elevators. In the West, in North Dakota, and in many other states, this is the case. On both sides of the border the elevators were filled with wheat and could not take in another bushel.

Mr. LEWIS: Would the hon. gentleman tell us on what terms the United States will co-operate with us in carrying out this work? Have they stated the terms on which they will do it?

Mr. CHURCH: I cannot say on what terms the United States will do it at the present time. I have a lot of material here in the report of the International Joint Commission which is too voluminous for me to read but I will be glad to give it to my hon. friend if he wants to peruse it and see the discussion on the matter. I also have here a statement of the National City bank for December, 1922, referring to this Welland canal, the last month that I have any record of in regard to this particular question. It is a very able statement and it has been quoted by all the bankers on both sides of the border, in reference to this subject. It goes on to refer to the grain congestion at the railway stations in the West and all along the chain of great lakes to the seaboard. They quote Mr. Barnes, president of the United States Chamber of Commerce and a huge grain dealer at Duluth and New York who gives a very graphic description of the congestion from his own immediate knowledge. He goes on to refer to the congestion on the Erie barge canal which, as I said this afternoon, was started about the same time as the Welland canal but has now been open for two years. The work on it was not stopped during the war and as a result the people of that country are getting the benefit of that important transaction to-day. Mr. Barnes who, as the member for Rainy River said, is about the greatest expert upon this subject, goes on to speak about the importance of the present Welland route and the figures which Mr. Barnes gives for carrying grain from Buffalo to New York should be carefully noted. This is what he says:

> From the first of September until the first of October in the very height of the crop-moving period of this country, the main channel of export outlet for grain in America, from Buffalo to New York, was practically closed The grain moved from the West until it had congested and exhausted the elevator facilities at Buffalo—18,000,000 bushels.

The same thing happens at Montreal.

> As soon as the unloading facilities were thus exhausted the lake carriers, reflecting the apprehension of their owners that the boats would be tied up with undischarged cargoes instead of being returned, made an advance in the lake rates, in thirty days from 2 cents per bushel for the carrying of grain from Chicago and Duluth to Buffalo to 6 cents.
>
> The rail rate from Buffalo to New York on the published tariff is 9 cents.

An hon. member this afternoon referred to the combined water and rail rate Port Arthur to Buffalo and New York as 8.274 cents per bushel, and he compared the rate Fort William to Montreal, 6¾ cents a bushel, showing a difference of 2.45 cents per bushel in favour of the St. Lawrence route, and he argued that the business did not go to Canada, but that to Buffalo and New York went 65 per cent of the grain. Those figures are shown to be wrong, according to this paragraph from the address of J. H. Barnes.

The member for Qu'Appelle says the rate is 6 cents, but Mr. Barnes says:

> The rail rate from Buffalo to New York on the published tariff is 9 cents, but as I explained to you prac-

tically no grain was moving. The route that was open —the Erie canal—with totally inadequate facilities advanced the rate to 13 cents per bushel, paralleling the railroad which was supposed to carry it for 9.

From Buffalo to Montreal is a water route. It is equipped with the facilities of forty years ago. It can handle a vessel of 250 feet in length when the lake carrier of to-day west of Buffalo is 600 feet in length. That means that the carriers that operate on this 40-year-old route are limited in number and limited more in carrying capacity. Thirty days ago those carriers were operating on a tariff from Buffalo to Montreal of 6 to 7 cents per bushel. Last Saturday 15½ cents was paid for the carriage from Buffalo to Montreal. That is the pressure of grain west of Buffalo seeking an outlet to foreign markets.

The effect of the market rise in prices has been this. In thirty days the foreign price of wheat has advanced 25 cents per bushel, the foreign price of corn has advanced twenty cents per bushel, because these markets are inadequately supplied. The market price in America of wheat has advanced 10 cents per bushel and of corn 10 cents per bushel. That is, the spread between the ultimate foreign price which should be reflected back to our farms, has widened from 10 to 15 cents per bushel because of the lack of adequate facilities to move the crop pressing on the market in the West.

In other words, the lack of a deepened Welland canal and adequate rail and water facilities to properly take care of the crop produced the conditions described by Mr. Barnes. These statements I have read from the report of one of the leading experts on the transportation of grain on the North American continent show the necessity of at once deepening this canal, and until the canal is open, the $30,000,000 which has been spent so far has been wasted and will be of no benefit. I think the people of Canada for this reason should get the benefit of the canal as soon as possible. A good many matters have entered into this discussion that I think should not have been brought up, and I was sorry to hear them discussed. In the first place, there has been too much sectional discussion in this chamber regarding this canal. I do not wish to refer to other routes, because they are not relevant to the question before the House. At the same time many of these routes have a great many advantages and disadvantages, and I believe the route via the Welland canal and the river St. Lawrence which has been in existence since 1829 is the best route. The more we discuss it the more we are convinced that it is the logical route for the carriage of grain to the sea.

A question was raised in this debate about the use of the merchant marine and the boats that would be used with the improved Welland canal. I am sorry that these boats have been offered for sale, because I know that there is a good deal of transportation being carried on, not only in package freight, but in the carrying of grain, coal and iron ore that these ships could get.

[Mr. Church.]

I will give one concrete example. A company called the Kirkwood Company are now operating between the Maritime provinces and Toronto and Hamilton. Last year this company, with one ship, operated as far west as the cities I have named, and they cut six cents per 100 pounds off the carrying charge for package freight. That had such an effect on the transportation business that the Canada Steamships Company have reduced their rate per 100 pounds, and the Kirkwood Company, according to returns brought down to the House the other day, have written several letters to the government in regard to the purchase of the merchant marine ships. They find they can build up a good trade between the Mother Country and the Maritime provinces and the Great Lakes, through the Welland canal.

The hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Millar) has referred to various matters, but the figures which were presented in the report of the Saskatchewan Grain Commission, in 1914, are not correct, because the prices have been raised; there have been several increases in the rates. The Grain Commission in Saskatchewan sat before the war in 1914, and took evidence. Since that time the cost of transportation between Fort William and Montreal has been fluctuating. The hon. member referred to the average rate as stated in some of the government periodicals. These are not altogether correct in some respects because the quotations in some of the returns for the past two seasons show the rates the hon. member mentioned are not correct. The figures given by the Toronto Harbour Commissioners, and by the commissioners of some other ports on the Great Lakes are at variance with these figures, and I have shown the rates quoted in the report of J. H. Barnes from which I have read. The prices to Montreal in the grain congestion last year went up to 13 and 19 cents a bushel. At Buffalo and New York the rates went up in the same ratio. I might say the more you study this particular question the more you will be convinced of the accuracy of my statements. If some hon. members for the West would go down to the banks of the Detroit river in the summertime and spend five or six minutes there, they would see the continual stream of lake freighters of large tonnage passing through. In effect these big freighters all go to Buffalo, because you have no deepened Welland canal to take care of them. The canal is unable to take care of the trade at present. The Erie barge canal cannot take care of the ships and they are delayed there for sixty

days. In effect the Welland canal and lake Ontario route is not able to get the business because of the present small canal. When you take the large freighter the Grant Morden, about 750 feet long, you see what they can do. The grain from that one large ship has to be transferred to seven or eight smaller ships at Port Colborne, in order to take it down lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence. The Welland canal has never had a chance to show what it can do either in rates or anything else.

In conclusion, I agree with what the hon. member for Qu'Appelle has said about the desirability of having additional elevator accommodation all over the Great Lakes; we should have had it long ago. We used to have seven or eight of these elevators in the port from which I come, and there is not a single elevator there now. The farmers of Ontario sent a memorandum to the government some two or three years ago asking for a terminal elevator in central Ontario. We have never got it. When the Welland canal is finished in 1927 there will be a terrible scarcity of elevator accommodation, not only at Port Colborne but at Fort William, Toronto and other cities along the route. It will take several years to build these elevators. Money spent in that direction I think is wisely expended. The natural route for grain is the St. Lawrence and the sooner we get that route in proper shape the more money will be saved in transportation costs and charges.

I wish to read from the International Joint Commission's report one or two conclusions regarding the Welland canal. At page 178, the conclusion of the commission is as follows:

> Another factor in the situation that should not be lost sight of is the peculiar relationship to the proposed improvement of the new Welland ship canal, a portion of which is now under construction. As pointed out in an earlier part of this report, the completion of the Welland ship canal and the adoption and completion of the St. Lawrence improvement would remove the only barrier to the creation of a deep-water route from the head of the lakes to the sea. This would give at least 25-foot navigation from the sea up to the Detroit river, with a present minimum of about 20 feet above Lake Erie. Although entirely outside the strict terms of the reference submitted to it by the two governments, the commission has been impressed by the fact that the new Welland ship canal is such an integral part of the waterway, and is so inseparably interwoven with the project under immediate consideration, that it should properly be considered as a part of the whole scheme and the expense of its construction should be apportioned between the two governments upon the same basis as the works recommended for the upper St. Lawrence.

About a page or so further on they recommend:

> That the new Welland ship canal be embodied in said scheme and treated as a part thereof.
>
> That Canada proceed with the works necessary for the completion of said new Welland ship canal in accordance with the plans already decided upon by that country.

I want to say to hon. gentlemen from the West that I believe the people of Ontario are sympathetic to the desire that the West should receive increased transportation facilities, not only by rail, but by water, and they want to see the West grow and prosper. The hope of the country is in the West. They want to see the West receive a measure of relief from the transportation difficulties they have in that great country to-day. With the early completion of the Welland ship canal, all the great boats on the upper lakes will be able to go down to lake Ontario, and this will bring about, not only a cut in the rates, but a more important factor, namely relief from the congestion of the railways and assistance in getting the crop out. It will do a great deal to reduce costs and will assist the farmers as well.

The hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Millar) dwelt on the cost of this canal and many other phases of the problem. The figures fluctuate very much. The interests of the country would be best served by the immediate construction of this canal. In conclusion, I hope the work will be started this year, and that a vigorous effort will be made by the engineers in charge to push it along. The engineers who had charge of the Chippawa power canal had their own plant; they had an electrically driven shovel and other electrical devices of all kinds; the engineering was modern throughout, and they did a great deal of the work themselves, with the result that a great work like that was consummated with very considerable economy.

Mr. LEWIS: I do not know whether any serious objection can be taken to the expenditure on the Welland ship canal at the present time. I think the objection should have been taken some years ago. I do not know whether the last speaker (Mr. Church) spoke wisely and said the truth when he said that $30,000,000 had already been wasted. But the question that I wish to ask at this period is this; What will be the value of the canal when it is completed, if it is looked upon as a unit? I have listened to the various arguments that have been presented in this House this afternoon, and all who have spoken in favour of the Welland canal did so in the light of the larger scheme, in conjunction, I might say, with the deepening of the St. Lawrence waterway. If the Welland canal has no virtue outside of the larger scheme,

it seems to me that at the present time it would be opportune to object to the expenditure that is now being advocated. The argument in favour of both schemes is this, that grain and other commodities will be carried much more cheaply. As regards grain, we heard this afternoon that the grain would have to be handled at least five or six times before it reached Montreal for shipment to Great Britain. I can hardly understand how you are going to cheapen rates when you have to handle a commodity five or six times before it reaches the ultimate consumer.

The question that confronts us at the present time is this: In view of the larger scheme, can we seriously contemplate the deepening of the St. Lawrence waterway when we consider that we have only 9,000,000 people, those people already well over-burdened with taxation? Before that scheme can really be contemplated, we need a much larger population and a great deal more work for the canal to do. Are we really utilizing the resources that we now have? The Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) said that when he was in the West in company with the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the West was advocating the deepening of the Welland canal. I was wondering at that particular time whether the West had three transcontinental railways that were not being fully utilized, or whether they were even completed. But the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Millar) spoke rightly when he said that we had three great transcontinental railways and that we were not utilizing them to the fullest advantage. As a people we believe in economy. Why should we not utilize these railways to their greatest effect, and then if they prove inadequate, to stop the shortage or to meet any embarrassment we find in the fall season, it will be quite time for us to advocate some larger scheme? I should like the minister to say, after I am through, if there is any virtue in the Welland canal if it is taken by itself, whether it will be of any benefit to the West or to any other part of the country if the St. Lawrence waterway scheme is never completed.

As regards the cost, the hon. member (Mr. Church) said that if we had continued the work during the war, the cost would have been 50 per cent greater. The minister himself said that when the canal was started, it was expected to cost $55,000,000. He then went on to say that it may cost eighty or ninety million dollars, and the hon. member for Qu'Appelle says possibly $100,000,000, which figure, I think, is more nearly correct. In that case, although the war did stop the work, we find that the work is costing 100 per cent more than it was originally expected to cost. How much of the work is completed? Last year the late Minister of Railways gave us a detailed statement regarding the expenditure, the contracts that were under way, and we would be glad to have that information now.

As regards the larger scheme, I understood from the hon. member (Mr. Church) that the United States were willing to build the canal, that is the canal from lake Ontario to Montreal. I have carefully read many of the statements that have appeared in our papers, and I have never heard or read of any public man, any official, stating that the United States were willing to pay for this great scheme. If that is so, I would be glad to be corrected in my statement; but I do not believe such a statement has been made, and until we in this country have been able to pay some part of the principal of our war debt, until we as a people are willing to live within our own budget and taxation which we are able to impose upon the people, it is presumptuous for anyone to advocate a scheme that will involve this young country with a small population in an expenditure of possibly over $300,000,000. For that reason, before I can vote intelligently upon a scheme on which possibly some $35,000,000 has already been expended, I want the minister to inform me how much work has been completed, what contracts have been let for this year, and what the cost of the entire scheme completed will amount to.

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend intimated that it would have been better to go on with the work during the war—

Mr. LEWIS: No.

Mr. GRAHAM: —because it would have been cheaper. Does he realize that this would have meant cutting down the wages of the men to 50 per cent of what they are getting now.

Mr. LEWIS: I do not think I said that. I said that at the present time the work is costing 100 per cent more than it would have amounted to under pre-war prices.

Mr. GRAHAM: If my hon. friend did not mean what I said then I accept his explanation. But I understood him to argue that it would have been wiser to go on with the work at that time because we could have got it done more cheaply. It was impossible to go on with the contracts. They were made on the 1913 basis and the contractors accepted the fair wage clause under which the men would have to be paid the current rate of wages, and during the war the current rate of

wages was more than double what it was before. The only thing that could have been done during the war was to devote all the energies of the country to the prosecution of our part in the struggle, and these other things had to be dropped for the time being. I do not see how the late government could have done anything else.

As to the other question, of the United States offering to build their share of the canal, this matter was discussed by the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German) before six o'clock, when he said that it had been recommended by the International Joint Commission that the United States should pay a certain proportion of the cost. The United States, however, have not accepted that proposition, although it has been recommended. As regards the benefit to be derived from the Welland canal, as I said this afternoon, you cannot make any absolute statement. If the enlargement of the Welland canal, apart altogether from the larger scheme, is not going to be a factor in lowering transportation costs, then undoubtedly the expenditure on it would be a foolish one. But is it not reasonable to suppose that if the larger bulk of traffic can be carried 200 miles nearer to ocean-going vessels and then be transshipped, it must of necessity lessen the cost of the entire carriage? Let me illustrate the point. It is only a matter of hours, for instance, to transfer a cargo from Prescott or Kingston to Montreal for ocean transportation, while if these smaller vessels have to come all the way from Port Colborne, or 200 miles further away, the cost, as my hon. friend can well see, is bound to be increased. In other words, the closer you can get a cargo in large bulk to the point of final shipment the cheaper must be the freight rates. If there were never to be a further deepening of the St. Lawrence channel the enlargment of the Welland canal must be of benefit to the solution of the transportation problem in the way of reducing costs. As a matter of fact, the surveys for the enlargement of the Welland canal were undertaken and were partially complete before the larger scheme was seriously thought of; and it has been contended, and will be accepted as a truism by all men who have studied the question, that the deepening of the canal, allowing larger ships to come to the end of deep water above the rapids, must tend to reduce the cost of transportation.

No new contracts have been let this year. As I pointed out this afternoon, sections 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 are under construction, while 6, 7, and 8 have not yet been let. The object is to have the contracts let so that the completion of the work on all the contracts will be accomplished approximately about the same time. As to the percentages of work done, earth excavation has been completed to the extent of 48 per cent; watertight embankments, 60 per cent; rock excavation, 31 per cent; concrete excavation, 31 per cent; and reinforcing walls, about 40 per cent. That is for the whole of the contracts.

Mr. KNOX: I was struck with the minister's statement before six o'clock in regard to the strong representations made from the West for the Welland canal; and the same thing has been repeated by the hon. member (Mr. Church) to-night. I remember very well when the minister made his trip throughout the West along with the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier, but I cannot recall any concrete demand for the Welland canal at that time. I am probably speaking from the producers' standpoint rather than from the standpoint of a representative of some of the corporations or municipalities which the hon. gentleman has spoken of. However, it has occurred to me that if the minister wishes to satisfy the demand of the West in the matter of railway transportation he will be afforded a very good opportunity when he brings down that estimate he has promised for the Hudson Bay railway. I do not want to precipitate a discussion on that item just now, because no doubt we shall have occasion later to deal with it; and the liberal estimate which appears here for the Welland canal encourages me to look forward to equally generous provision for the completion of the Hudson Bay route. I question very much, though, whether we are justified in voting so much money for the Welland canal at the present time. I endorse most heartily what was said by the member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Millar) this afternoon, in regard to some of the matters he discussed. He stated, I believe, that so far as he could figure out the completion of the Welland canal would make no more difference to the transportation of grain than possibly 2 cents per bushel. Personally I doubt whether it would make even that much difference. But I think the minister would be well advised to consider some of the other demands that have come forward.

Mr. GRAHAM: Is my hon. friend in a position to tell us by how much the completion of the Hudson Bay railway would decrease the cost of freight? We must have definite information.

Mr. KNOX: The information in this regard will be just as definite as it can be in connection with the other matter. We know from

the report submitted by the Lake Freights commission that the rates last year from September to November varied all the way from 3 to 11 cents, and while we have such conditions we can form no idea of the cost of carrying grain from Fort William to Montreal. We know in regard to the Hudson Bay route, taking Saskatoon as a centre, that grain can be carried to Port Nelson for less than it can be carried to Fort William, and we also know that Port Nelson is approximately as near Liverpool as is Montreal. If we can eliminate the cost of lake transportation along with considerable rail transportation there is no doubt that the saving on that route would be very much more than the saving that would be gained by the deepening of the Welland canal. I shall not continue the discussion now because, as I said before, I am looking forward to a very liberal estimate being brought down for this work shortly, and then we will have an opportunity to discuss it further.

Mr. HOCKEN: Mr. Chairman, I am somewhat surprised to find hon. members from the West opposing the completion of the Welland canal, for I have the conviction that the development of the St. Lawrence route is the very best undertaking that can be carried out in the interests of the grain growers of the West. It will secure for them a reduction in the cost of carrying their grain to the seaboard that is variously estimated at from 7 to 12 cents a bushel. My hon. friend from Swift Current (Mr. Lewis) seems to argue that before we think of improving our transportation routes we should congest all our railway routes with grain.

Mr. LUCAS: How does my hon. friend estimate the saving of from 7 to 12 cents a bushel on the transportation of grain by the improvement of the Welland canal and the deepening of the St. Lawrence?

Mr. HOCKEN: I am not putting that forward as my own estimate, but on the authority of men who have gone into the question very thoroughly, such as the engineers of the International Joint Commission. It is their estimate.

Mr. KNOX: Does the hon. member refer to the deepening of the Welland canal or of the St. Lawrence?

Mr. HOCKEN: I say that when you get the water route from the head of the lakes to Montreal or Quebec available for the through transport of grain a saving on the cost of transportation will be effected which is estimated at from 7 to 12 cents per bushel.

[Mr. Knox.]

Mr. MILLAR: Considering that even last season when there was a great deal of congestion and a monopoly was operating on the Great Lakes a considerable quantity of wheat was carried for less than 12 cents a bushel, how does my hon. friend arrive at his estimate that 12 cents a bushel could be saved between Fort William and Montreal?

Mr. HOCKEN: I think my hon. friend will find that that rate was secured for only two or three cargoes and that it is capable of explanation, but not being conversant with the circumstances I cannot explain such an exceptionally low rate. I do not think any one will attempt to argue that it is not cheaper to carry grain by water from the head of the lakes to Quebec than by lake and rail. It is notorious that the cost of carrying any merchandise by rail is greater than by water. My idea is that the work on the Welland canal should be proceeded with with all possible energy and that the other part of the great water system from the head of the lakes to Quebec should be completed.

In reply to my hon. friend from Swift Current who estimates the improvement of the St. Lawrence channel at $300,000,000, I would point out that he is about $50,000,000 higher than the estimate made by very competent authorities of the International Joint Commission. But there is this factor to be kept in mind, that by improving the St. Lawrence channel we would get a by-product which would pay for the whole cost of the work. That fact was brought out last session, I think, by my hon. friend from Welland (Mr. German) with some very definite and convincing figures. The electrical energy to be developed along with the improvement of the channel could be made to pay for the whole undertaking, and if we adopted Mr. Gardiner's plan of financing this enterprise, all that the Dominion would be committed to would be a guarantee of its share of the cost of the work. In a book written by him on the St. Lawrence deep waterways Mr. Gardiner, of Chicago, proposes that the government of Canada and the government of the United States should jointly appoint an international commission with authority to issue bonds. It was Mr. Gardiner's opinion that three times the amount of money required for the work could be raised at 4 per cent, it would be such an attractive investment. According to his idea the commission would operate the undertaking without profit. No doubt the commissioners would be properly remunerated for their work but there would be no dividends to pay, and what would usually be diverted for this purpose would go to amortize the debt. So that

all the responsibility the Dominion would incur would be the guarantee of its share of the bonds. It follows that the financing of the undertaking would be a very easy proposition, and when the work was completed we would have a deep waterway from Fort William to the city of Quebec, or perhaps lower down, where great cargoes could be transshipped and we would reduce to a minimum the cost of handling the grain from the producer on the prairies to the consumer in Europe. We have vessels now carrying 500,000 bushels—

Mr. MANION: Six hundred thousand bushels.

Mr. HOCKEN: Well, I was putting it well within the mark. One of these great freighters from Fort William could take 500,000 bushels of grain down to Quebec—not stopping at Montreal necessarily, except that this port has great elevator capacity—or even down to the gulf, and there transship its cargo to two or three tramp steamers which would take it across the ocean. I venture to say that the greatest relief for the agricultural industry in western Canada is to be obtained in that way. I voted for the Hudson Bay railway. I do not believe that that route is going to give the farmers of the West so much relief as they expect, for I am afraid the navigation season will be too short. What I do pin my faith to is the Welland canal and the St. Lawrence deep waterway, and I think my hon. friends who live in the West, and whose interest lies in getting their produce to the world's markets at the lowest cost, should not oppose the spending of money on any link of that great waterway which will ultimately—and shortly, I venture to say—be completed. I do not think there is enough influence anywhere to prevent this project being undertaken and carried to completion, because it is one of nature's great waterways, and only requires to be developed to give its full service to this country. I believe that when Canada can join with the United States to carry out this great international work there will be such a flood of trade through our lakes and down the St. Lawrence that it will astonish the people of this country. If my memory is right, I have seen it stated somewhere that of the grain produced on our western prairies last year less than 40 per cent went by Montreal, the bulk of it, or 60 per cent, going out by Buffalo. There is no reason on earth why 60 per cent of our grain should go out by a foreign channel, especially when we have better means for its transportation, but the big barges on the Erie canal have been taking this large percentage of our wheat to New York and developing that port at the expense of our own ports. I think, Sir, that of all classes of our people those who stand to gain most by the development of our waterways from lake Erie to the gulf of St. Lawrence are the men who grow grain on the western prairies.

Mr. WHITE: Nearly every hon. member who has spoken on this vote has coupled the deepening of the Welland canal with the completion of the St. Lawrence deep waterway. Although the minister has given his view as to the reason why the Welland canal should be finished, I believe that the full benefit of the new Welland canal will not be available until the St. Lawrence route is completed. On May 29 last year the Prime Minister, in response to a question from the hon. member for West York, said that a reply had been sent to the United States government that this was not an opportune time to discuss this question, particularly as the report from the International Joint Commission had only been available for a short time. That objection is disposed of now, of course, by the lapse of time.

9 p.m.

It seems to me that this discussion has revolved a great deal around the transportation of wheat and the problem of getting the wheat from the western prairies out to the seaboard. There are many routes proposed. The route by way of Vancouver has been dealt with previously this session, and a large amount was voted for the construction of an elevator at Vancouver harbour, which will no doubt take care of a great deal of the wheat at the western end of the prairies. The hon. member for Prince Albert is in hopes that the Hudson Bay railway will also transport a great deal of western wheat. It seems to me that the production of wheat in Canada is by no means limited. We have not yet reached the maximum production, and even with all these increased facilities for shipment we shall not be able to handle the crops which are to come any better than those we have handled in the past. The development of the St. Lawrence waterway is not entirely for the purpose of shipping grain. There is also involved in it the question of supplying fuel for Ontario particularly. Recently we have been making efforts to get a favourable freight rate on western coal, but the only rate available, $9 per ton, seems too high for us to be able to bring western coal to Ontario. There therefore remains the St. Lawrence route, which in time will possibly mean that Nova Scotia coal or coke can be delivered in Ontario at competitive prices with the American product, or it may be that

Welsh coal, which found its way last winter as far as Brantford, Ontario, coming from Montreal by rail, will be enabled to come up the St. Lawrence river and into lake Ontario and perhaps lake Huron.

Another object which we have in view is the development of power. About twelve years ago the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario undertook to sell 10,000 horse-power in the municipalities adjoining the Niagara district. The chairman of that commission was told that he would never find a market for 10,000 horse-power, but in a few years the demand had so increased that it reached 275,000 horse-power, and the existing plants being worked to capacity it was necessary to provide further development, and the Chippawa creek scheme was launched with a plant first of all with a capacity of 100,000 horse-power. Ten million dollars was to have been spent on that development, but the demand for power increased by leaps and bounds, and in the end that development is to reach an estimated production of 600,000 horse-power and cost about $80,000,000. Now we are told that if the demand within the next three or four years increases in the same proportion, all the power that is being developed at the Chippawa plant will be taken and virtually all the power that can be developed in the Niagara district will then be utilized; and it will be available at prices ranging from one-half to one-third of the cost at which power can be developed by the use of coal. In my own city of London, which is about 120 miles from Niagara, we contracted about ten years ago for, I think it was, 4,000 horse-power. Some of those who were opposed to the scheme threw up their hands and asked: What will you do? You will never get rid of it. But the result is that the city is now using four times that amount and is calling for more. Niagara power is now being distributed throughout the rural districts. The farmers are beginning to use it, and that demand is going to increase very largely. So, Mr. Chairman, it will be necessary for Ontario to find more power somewhere.

The report of the United States and Canadian engineers on the St. Lawrence development goes to show that about 1,500,000 horse-power can be developed in connection with the construction of this deep waterway, and that probably 3,000,000 additional horse-power can be developed in time. I support most heartily the suggestion of the hon. member for Welland that the United States government be invited to a conference on this question. They came to us asking us to meet them in a conference to discuss the terms of a treaty, but there is no reason why Canada cannot counter with a different proposition. Terms may be discussed, and as the hon. member for Swift Current suggested, the ideas of the United States legislators could be secured on the proposition.

Many figures have been quoted as to what the scheme would mean in the saving of freight on wheat. I have a clipping here which I cut from the Toronto Globe of November 14, 1922. It gives the opinion of Governor J. A. Preus of Minnesota who was in Ottawa about that time. He estimated that there would be a saving of 7½ cents per bushel on grain shipped from Duluth to Liverpool by the proposed St. Lawrence deep waterway. He said:

> This amount was spread over the short railway haulage from Buffalo to New York. The total cost of shipping to Liverpool from Duluth was 15½ cents a bushel. All the farmers of eighteen states bordering on the Great Lakes were anxious to have the St. Lawrence deep waterway constructed as soon as possible. Railway transportation in the United States was very inadequate. Potatoes were rotting in the ground in Minnesota and western states because farmers could not get enough cars to handle their crops.
>
> The only opposition to the scheme in the United States came from the New England states and New York.

Recent newspaper reports would lead one to believe that many of the railroads in the central states are also favourable to this development. I would like to ask if the government has had any communication from the Ontario provincial government or the Ontario Hydro Electric Power Commission relative to this project being taken up as a provincial activity.

Mr. GRAHAM: I cannot speak positively as to that. The chairman of the Hydro Electric Commission, Sir Adam Beck, had one or two conversations with me concerning it, but there were merely suggestions, no definite statement was made as to the province taking up the project on its own initiative altogether. I can scarcely see how the province itself could undertake the entire work because it is so interwoven with the federal situation both in the United States and Canada, but we did have a discussion as to the possibilities of the project. In fact, Sir Adam Beck suggested a partial development of the undertaking for the present, but as to the details of how this should be done I think there was nothing definite said.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): There seems to be some opposition among our friends from the West to the expenditure of money on deepening the Welland canal. I believe that there

has always been a demand from the West for the deepening of the Welland canal right up to the present time, and I say so after a study of the subject. I have here an old copy of the Sessional Papers for the year 1871, which gives some very interesting facts regarding the canal system of Canada. The whole question came under discussion then and a commission, as usual, was appointed to look into the matter, and the facts brought out in the report published in 1871 are very interesting to any person who wishes to study this question. A series of questions had been submitted to various people all over the country interested in the matter, and among the questions asked was this:

What have been the relative rates, for three years, of freight from Chicago to Montreal; and Chicago to New York?

W. J. Patterson, of the Montreal Board of Trade gives a very interesting set of figures here. Starting with the year 1861 he quotes the rate of freight per bushel on wheat from Chicago to New York as follows:

Year	Via Buffalo	Via Oswego
1861..	27½ cents	27 cents
1862..	26½ "	26½ "
1863..	23 "	22¾ "
1869..	23 "	23¼ "

With freight rates of such a character as this a demand came from the west for the opening and deepening of the canals to reduce the charges, and if we have at the present time a rate of 12 or 13 cents it is largely due to the fact that these canals have been opened and deepened.

Mr. FORKE: When you say "West" do you have regard to the Canadian West?

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): There was no Canadian West, at any rate not to amount to anything, in those days.

Mr. FORKE: That is what I meant.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): The demand came from the West for these improvements much in opposition to the opinion of the boards of trade in the East where it was considered the expense of these canal improvements was too great for the country to undertake. In this same year the question was asked:

What reduction per bushel in the rates of freight from Chicago to Kingston and Oswego would result from the enlargement of the Welland canal to the capacity of the largest class of vessels now carrying from Chicago or Milwaukee to Buffalo?

These same questions are being asked to-day, and there seems to be an almost unanimous opinion that the reduction, on account of the increased cargo carried in the larger boats, would amount to about 3 or 4 cents a bushel. The question is asked why we in the East are interested in this matter? In reply we have to say that we regret that our trade is largely going through United States channels. What were the conditions prevailing at the time to which I refer? I find these figures given in the report from which I have already quoted:

Total receipts of grain at Kingston in season 1870, from United States ports amounted to a trifle over 6,000,000 bushels.

The proportion is computed to be—

In British vessels..	2,256,000 bushels
In United States vessels..	3,785,000 "

In other words over 6,000,000 bushels of grain were being received at the port of Kingston through both Canadian and United States vessels. What is the result to-day? To-day the trade amounts to very little. The large bulk of it, during the last few years, has been going to the United States. We believe that the deepening of the Welland canal, in addition to reducing the freight rate, will restore this traffic again to our Canadian ports, to our own Canadian steamship lines and to our own Canadian railways.

Mr. BROWN: I would not have taken part in this debate at the present time were it not for the assumption contained in the speeches of some hon. gentlemen, an assumption which I am prepared to admit is warranted in some degree because of speeches made from this corner of the House, that the West is unanimously opposed to the project of the deepening of the St. Lawrence waterways. In spite of the fact that last year, in speaking on this matter, I indicated some doubt as to whether the time is opportune for engaging in the expenditure necessary in that great work, I did express the opinion that the time would come when that work would be a completed fact. Indeed, I feel satisfied that in the not very distant future it will be an accomplished fact. In regard to the Welland canal itself I confess that I had some doubts as to the wisdom of continuing expenditure on that work until the greater project itself was well under way. I may say, however, that in view of the discussion this afternoon, and some thought I had given it previously, I can see that while the full benefit of the Welland canal will not be available until the greater work is completed, there is reason to believe that even with the one link connecting lake Erie with lake Ontario, thus making it possible to bring the grain farther down in the larger vessels, there is reason to believe that there can be a considerable saving effected in the carriage of wheat.

Some few years ago, going back to the larger project, I attended a conference in Winnipeg at which the hon. member for Welland was present together with a number of gentlemen from the United States. I was there representing our farmers' organization at that time. They placed the matter very fully before us, and from that time I have been very sympathetically disposed towards the larger enterprise. It is true we laid down two propositions at that time. We refused to accept it as an alternative to the Hudson Bay railway, nor do I think there is any disposition indicated here to offer it as an alternative. We take it that those members who have spoken from all sides of the House have spoken in good faith when they have said that the Hudson Bay railway will be completed. However, we did lay down that proposition, and we also laid down another: That we could not agree to the expenditure of a large sum of money on the part of Canada until there was some assurance that the benefits that would come, or that should come, to Canada by entering into that larger scheme would not be absorbed by some lake freight shippers combine. I think the fear we expressed on that occasion was well warranted, as was amply demonstrated during last fall which led to government action in the appointment of a royal commission, the report of which is now before the country. Undoubtedly the necessity has been made manifest of having the rates under some control. I will just say again that I have no desire to enter into a lengthy discussion at the present time. I for one would just like to make it known that the West is not absolutely opposed to this scheme as might seem to be implied by some of the things that have been said.

Mr. GERMAN: Before the vote carries there are one or two observations I should like to make further in regard to this matter. In speaking of the construction of the St. Lawrence deep waterways, the estimated cost of which is $250,000,000, certain hon. gentlemen made the statement that that estimate will not nearly complete the work. They say it will cost double that and they instance the fact that the construction of the new Welland ship canal has cost, or will cost, nearly double the estimated amount of its construction, I should like to call attention of hon. gentlemen to this fact: The estimated cost of the Welland ship canal was $55,000,000. That was in pre-war times. The canal is divided for construction purposes into eight sections. Four of those sections were advertised prior to the war, and three of them are among the heaviest construction sections on the canal. Yet the tenders for these four sections were all within the estimate. The tenders on which the contracts were made, were within the engineer's estimates for construction. If the whole work had been tendered for as advertised and contracts entered into for its construction previous to the war, those contracts would have all been at prices within the engineer's estimates. The war came on and we all know what happened. I wish to call the attention of hon. members to the further fact that the engineer of the Department of Railways and Canals who made the estimate for the construction of the Welland canal is the same engineer, or one of the same engineers, who made the estimate for the construction of the St. Lawrence deep waterway, and instead of that estimate being made on pre-war prices, it was made during the continuance of the war and at prices which prevailed at that time, and consequently when he estimates a cost of $252,000,000 or thereabouts for the construction of the deep waterway from lake Ontario to Montreal it is based on the estimate of cost which is above what that cost would be at the present time. So that I will venture to say that the work can be done well within the engineer's estimate. But even at that, in view of the financial conditions of the country at the present time, I would not stand up and speak in favour of the construction of this channel if I did not feel absolutely convinced in my own mind that the work could be done and paid for by the disposal of the electric current which will be developed by reason of that construction. Now, $252,000,000 will not only construct the deep channel from lake Ontario to Montreal, but it will also pay for the construction of the hydraulic plant which will develop at the Long Sault rapids 1,500,000 electric horsepower, one half of which or 750,000 electrical horse-power will belong to Canada. That can be sold at the switch board of the power house retail at $14 per horse-power. Yes, and more than that; because at this very hour hydro-electric power developed at Niagara Falls is costing in the Niagara district $20 per horse-power. The price has gone up by reason of the extra cost of construction, and it is costing us in the city of Welland at this hour $20 per horse-power. So that when I say this horse-power can be sold at the switch board for $14 per horse-power it is well within the mark, and 750,000 horse-power at $14 per horse-power will in thirty-five or forty years pay every dollar of the cost of construction of that St. Lawrence deep waterway.

Mr. HOCKEN: It is not a million and a half horse-power?

Mr. GOULD: I would like if the hon. member could give the pro rata values, or what price is charged in urban districts and in rural districts for power?

Mr. GERMAN: The hon. member means in Ontario?

Mr. GOULD: Yes.

Mr. GERMAN: Exactly the same price —no difference. It is "service at cost" in Ontario, and what it costs to produce and transmit is what the consumer pays, no matter where it may be located. The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken) says it is not a million and a half horse-power. It is a million and a half for the whole development, 750,000 of which would be for Canada.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is only on the international waterways.

Mr. GERMAN: That is only on the international section. Of course another 2,000,000 horse-power can be developed on the remaining sections of the river between the Long Sault rapids and Montreal.

Mr. GRAHAM: All in Canada.

Mr. GERMAN: Yes, every bit of it. The minister has stated that there was a question as to the legal right to use the St. Lawrence river, as between the province of Ontario and the Dominion. I do not think it will serve any useful purpose at the present time to discuss the relative legal rights of the province and the Dominion regarding the use of the waters of the St. Lawrence. I will venture to make this statement and express this opinion—it is only an opinion, and I will be interested in knowing what the newspapers, at any rate in Ontario, think about it—that the people of the province of Ontario are so anxious that this St. Lawrence project should not only be begun, but prosecuted energetically and immediately, that they would be willing, even though they had the legal right to the whole of it, to allow the proceeds of the sale of the 750,000 horse-power which is to be developed to be applied first in payment of the cost of construction, and after that payment has been accomplished that the proceeds of the sale of that power should be handed over to the province, if it was found that the province was solely and wholly entitled to it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the hon. member mean the entire construction? He does not want us to understand that he is distinguishing between the cost that is attributable to the benefit of navigation and the cost that is attributable to power?

Mr. GERMAN: I was not distinguishing between them at all. I say that I believe that the people of Ontario would be willing that the proceeds of the sale of the 700,000 electrical horse-power which can be developed should be applied first to paying Canada's share of the whole cost of the construction of the deep water channel from lake Ontario to Montreal, which would be $125,000,000.

An hon. MEMBER: Where would you sell it?

Mr. GERMAN: That question is being asked by many people, "Where would you sell it? There is no market." It is only a very few years ago, perhaps 20 years ago, that electric power was developed at Niagara Falls. I heard that same question asked at that time. "Where can you sell 100,000 horse-power"? I was told by the then Premier of Ontario that we could not sell 30,000 horse-power. I told him that in a very few years we would not only be selling 30,000 electric horse-power, but we would be selling 300,000 electric horse-power, and these words have not only come true, but more than come true, because at this hour, after 20 years of the use of the electric current developed at Niagara Falls, we are disposing in this province, from Niagara Falls only, of 500,000 electric horse-power, and the people are crying for more. That 700,000 electric horse-power would be sold, certainly inside of ten years, and I believe inside of five years. There is no question about disposing of this commodity. If you read the information which is given in the report of the International Joint Commission, you will find that, after a thorough investigation, they say that far and away more than that will be disposed of in a short time. Therefore, I say that there will be no difficulty about the sale and there should be no difficulty about the beginning and the continuance of the construction of that great enterprise.

Those of us who are members of the Canadian Deep Waterways and Power Association are not asking the government to pledge themselves to anything. We are asking them to do only what, in my opinion, is a gentlemanly thing to do. The United States government first communicated with the government of Canada asking them to a conference. The government of Canada said: "No, we cannot have a conference with you now; it is too early." We ask the government now, after nearly two years of office, to say: "Now, we will sit down and discuss this matter with

you." Ask them to a conference this time. They asked you a while ago for reciprocity. You ignored that request. You did not wait for them to ask you again; you are asking them now for reciprocity. Therefore I say: They asked you for a conference over this St. Lawrence waterways scheme. You refused it. Now sit down and ask them to join you in a conference; discuss the matter, and if you find that the estimates of the engineers are correct, and that there is a reasonable chance of disposing of the electric current which can be developed, then go ahead with this project which will be a benefit to the whole community.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I quite understand the hon. member's state of mind when he says that nobody is asking this government to pledge itself to anything. That is a very general attitude. I feel that I should say something, and this time in support of the contention advanced by the minister, that is, in support of the appropriation, irrespective for the time being of the larger project. The history of the Welland canal development, that is, of this last improvement, dates to about the beginning or before the beginning of the war. The project was continued until war necessities compelled its suspension. It was resumed as soon as possible after, in order that we might, as quickly as we could, arrive at the day when the large amount of capital already invested would be making some return. We felt that we could not launch on a very large scale on the renewed prosecution; but we did put in what we thought were reasonable appropriations, considering the circumstances of the time. Following exactly the same policy, the minister puts in now a similar appropriation.

It cannot be argued successfully that the deepening of the Welland canal will have value only when the larger project is complete. If such were the case, then it would be just as cheap to carry grain from Fort William in the canal vessels that now pass through right to Montreal. What I mean is this: If it were as cheap to carry grain over that distance from the Welland canal to Prescott or Kingston in small vessels as in large, certainly there never would have been any deepening at all. We might just as well take the small vessels right on to Fort William. In a word, if it is possible to carry in large vessels the distance from Fort William through the Sault to the Welland canal, though that entails a transfer into small vessels there, how much more will it pay to carry in large vessels 210 miles more, say to Prescott, when no extra transfer at all is entailed? One cannot, if one simply stops there, argue the question any further. Undoubtedly the further you take the grain in the large vessels, the cheaper the transportation. How much cheaper it would be, it may be hard to estimate; but if it is only two cents or a cent and a half, then undoubtedly there is value, even though we do not contemplate that the canal is to be ultimately part of a larger scheme.

It is quite true that if, after we have the best means of transportation, the grip of an ocean syndicate is going to demand whatever figure it likes, we might as well go back and rely upon our railways. We have to have competition, or if we cannot have competition, we must have control. The business of government is to get the best method of transport. That is the basic necessity. After that the matter is one of government; the enterprise feature is over. You must first, though, get the best method of transport. We cannot argue that we should leave it to our railroads.

Water transportation has always had an immense advantage over land transportation, and the advantage, instead of diminishing in proportion, has really been increasing. It is now estimated, I think, and I think very accurately estimated, that the proportion of cost at present rates is about one to ten. What I mean to say is this: Taking the actual investment, cost of carriage, cost of upkeep and all the rest, it is just about one to ten; you can carry about ten miles by water what you can carry one mile by land. The advantage of the water over the land has increased with increased capital investment necessary for railways—of course we have that already—with increased cost of upkeep, increased wages, increased cost of material. Very well; it follows that with that tendency the value of our waterways right into the heart of this Dominion and this continent as a transportation asset multiplies with the years. It is a tremendous asset to this country. When we get it utilized as it can be, we bring the products of the East right into the very heart of the American continent by the largest vessels. Consequently we must first make the best transport lines we can, and having done that, of course government is necessary. There may be a change of government necessary before we reap the harvest, but those things can be attended to in due course.

Mr. GRAHAM: We are not going to delay the work that long.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The work necessary to a change will be undertaken even before the completion.

Mr. GRAHAM: Naturally.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Very naturally. The completion of the change will follow quickly upon the undertaking. I was going to refer, though, to opposition apparently developing, not unanimously, but in some degree, from western Canada to this route. I think that is a mistake; I think hon. members will live to regret that they have assumed this attitude. I have never opposed, indeed I have urged, the completion of the Hudson Bay railway. I have urged it more as a matter of honest contractual obligation to western Canada than based on any certain assurance in my mind that it is bound to be a commercial success. I say here and now that I would rather stake what little reputation I have upon the value of the investment in the Welland canal than upon the value of any investment in the Hudson Bay road. Twenty years, thirty years from now, those who support the water route right out through our Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence will, in my judgment, have more reason to be proud of their record than those who were very enthusiastic over the Hudson Bay road. Nevertheless, the latter road must as soon as we can complete it, be completed; it would be folly to desist. We had in our estimates of 1921, that is for 1921-22, $5,000,000 odd, perhaps $5,000,000 only, to carry on this Welland canal wark. We were pretty bitterly abused. The lovetaps now administered to the hon. minister in charge of the estimates are very mild compared with the flogging we had to take for daring to do our duty in regard to the same enterprise. Indeed, in the campaign of 1921, I want to remind hon. members, when I challenged the leader of the Progressive party to make good by specific articles the charge of wild extravagance against the government of that time, the first thing he pointed to was $5,000,000 on the Welland canal. That was the most outstanding instance of folly he could think of. We have now $11,000,000 and though there is objection it is not very strong. I venture to say that the objection will get less and less, and that with the opening up of real prospects through our waterway navigation the country will grow in unanimity behind the scheme.

Mr. MILLAR: Before the vote carries I think it only well that I should make a few additional remarks since considerable reference has been made to what I said this afternoon. I agree with every word the leader of the Opposition said until he came to the point where he referred to the comparison between water rates and rail rates. Looking over an American report I noticed that the comparison was nine to one some years ago in favour of water rates on the lakes. Since that time a great change has taken place. If it is ten to one now how is it that the railways from Buffalo to New York have put the Erie canal out of business?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Erie canal is not a really practicable waterway at all. It is a 12-foot water route, and you cannot carry heavy traffic on such a canal.

Mr. GRAHAM. And it is not all of that depth.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No; it is not much better than a ditch.

Mr. GERMAN: It is only a few years since the Erie canal was deepened to 12 feet. It was only 8 feet until recently, and even now it is not 12 feet all the way.

Mr. MILLAR: Well, let us take another case. The Canadian Pacific Railway carries grain from Calgary to Fort William, which distance I have heard variously stated at 1,280 and 1,290 miles, for 15½ cents, whereas on the water route from Fort William to Montreal, a distance of about 1,200 miles, there have been as many as 22 different rates. The rates varied a great deal last season between these two points. I think that what would be considered a fair rate at present would be close to 10 or 11 cents. As a matter of fact I was slightly in error this afternoon when I stated that I thought 11 cents a fair rate. What I really intended to say was that this was an estimate I had seen stated for purposes of argument. I consider 11 cents really too high, and yet the distance for which this charge is made is some 1,200 miles as against the other rate I have cited of 1,280 miles.

Mr. MANION: Just in order to clear the point, I might explain to my hon. friend that the rate from the head of the lakes to Montreal is largely consumed in trans-shipments at the Georgian bay ports, or at Port Colborne. I understood my right hon. friend's estimate to refer to clear open-water transportation such as out in the lakes or on the ocean, but in a canal system the rate is naturally enhanced.

Mr. MILLAR: I think the hon. member (Mr. Manion) is putting the case too strongly when he says that a large part of the expense is taken up in the way he suggests. A little of it is consumed that way, but not a large per-

centage. Let me refer to another remark made by the leader of the Opposition and by the member for Lisgar (Mr. Brown). They both seem to infer from the discussion that some of the western members at least are opposed to the deepening of the Welland canal and of the St. Lawrence. I do not know of anyone who is opposed to the undertaking. The remarks I have made and those I have heard have been directed to the question as to when it would be wise to complete the work. That is all; and in order to arrive at a conclusion on that point we have been discussing the advantage that we might gain as shippers of grain, and how much we should save per bushel. I am quite confident the time will come when the St. Lawrence route will be deepened, and properly so; and it is quite well that the Welland canal should also be completed, especially in view of the fact that it has been started. I can agree with some hon. members, however, that it was started too soon, and it is now a question how quickly we ought to complete it.

Reference was made by some hon. members to the amount that would be saved, and the estimates vary from 7½ cents from the governor of Minnesota to 12 cents. Dealing with the high estimate that was suggested of 11 cents from Fort William to Montreal, I divided the cost into two parts: one was 4½ cents as far as Port Colborne and the other 7 cents from Port Colborne to Montreal. Now, it is readily seen that the only saving after the St. Lawrence route is opened up and the Welland canal is completed will be effected between Port Colborne and Montreal, I think that 7 cents is a very high estimate; it is far more than the grain will be carried for. But how will you save 12 cents when it is obvious that the total cost of carrying it is 7 cents as I have shown? That is what I want the committee to understand before this parliament commits the country to an expenditure of $252,000,000, which, as in a great many public undertakings, might probably be doubled in the long run. The member for Welland (Mr. German) suggested that it was probable we should not have to expend a dollar; he suggested that it would not cost the Canadian people one cent.

Mr. LANCTOT: Where will they get the money?

Mr. MILLAR: We have often heard that story. When something is promoted it is suggested that we are going to get something for nothing, but I do not think anyone will be foolish enough to be caught by that sort of thing now. Who thinks that if we deepen the St. Lawrence at a cost of two or three hundred million dollars the Canadian people will not have to shoulder any of that cost? It seems hardly worth serious consideration. Let us rest assured that when the St. Lawrence river is deepened Canada will pay for it and pay more than $252,000,000. The hon. member (Mr. Church) stated that my figures were not correct. That can be readily explained; as I said a moment ago, the rates are constantly varying. There were twenty-two different rates between various points last season, so I think hon. members will realize that by taking certain rates on specified dates one can prove almost anything. The rates I took were average rates, so I think my statement stands.

Mr. GOULD: I have been somewhat interested by remarks made by hon. gentlemen concerning this item. The Welland canal is getting to be quite a hardy annual and we look for its recurrence year after year, although it is pleasing to note that the appropriation is smaller this year and we hope that eventually it will disappear altogether. The statement I am about to make is not in opposition to the Welland canal and I am merely using this work as a key to the larger project which has entered into the discussion, namely, the deepening of the St. Lawrence route. I have taken the figures submitted by the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German) and made a few calculations. Taking a capitalization of approximately $250,000,000—and I might preface my remarks by referring to the prediction of certain hon. gentlemen that the power development and so on would pay for the whole undertaking—taking this capitalization, Canada's share is $125,000,000, which at 5 per cent—I have increased the interest rate—gives an interest charge of $6,250,000, which would have to come out of the revenue received from the sale of 750,000 horse power at $14 per horse power, or $10,500,000. Deducting from this revenue our bond interest charge of $6,250,000, we have a balance of $4,250,000. As business men, I do not think we would be prepared to deny that it would take the whole of this balance every year to meet the cost of maintenance. Consequently we would have nothing left to retire the bonds, and it seems to me these would have to be looked after by making a charge on the grain brought down by this route. That brings one to the statement made by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Millar), that he cannot see how the utilization of the route would enable us to save 10 cents a bushel on the transportation of western grain.

I do not wish to use this as an argument in support of the Hudson Bay route, but,

coming from the West, naturally I am in favour of this route, although probably only as an auxiliary to the St. Lawrence route. I do not think any members from the West have tried to make it appear that the Hudson Bay route would divert traffic which should rightly go down the St. Lawrence. I think the Hudson Bay route would look after a part of the country which at the present time is undeveloped, and even with this route in operation I believe that with the further development of the country which, one might say, is naturally tributary to the St. Lawrence route, a still greater traffic would result from the deepening of this waterway. Therefore the Hudson Bay route does not of necessity enter into this discussion.

It has been well brought out by one hon. gentleman that the activities of combines should be circumscribed to the fullest possible extent, because it appears that the longer our transportation route the more opportunities there are for these combines to get in and steal from the individual who produces the commodity which is being transported. When the confidence of the people is restored by the assurance that combines will not be allowed to intervene between the producer and the ultimate consumer, I think there will not be quite so much apparent opposition to expenditures of this character. And then I do not think parliament will hesitate to grant to the government of the day power to undertake all these projects which have been advocated from time to time.

I only rose to sound a note of warning, for if we take precedent as a guide we are justified in assuming that the cost of deepening the St. Lawrence channel, like every other great undertaking, will exceed the initial estimate by a very large figure indeed, and in this event the benefits which would accrue from the development and sale of 750,000 horsepower would be more or less neutralized.

Mr. WARD: Mr. Chairman, I rise to utter a word of protest against what seems to be taken for granted, namely, that the West is opposed to the Welland canal improvement. I am sure that this assumption is not well founded, and can only have arisen because of the fact that operations having been suspended on the Hudson Bay railway, we do not accept the Welland canal as an alternative for the non-completion of the former work. But I am sure that the West is not opposed to the construction of the Welland canal.

Item agreed to.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I assume that everything has been said in connection with the preceding vote, Mr. Chairman. But under the arrangement with the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) we were to discuss under that item the figures which he was to bring down under vote 139 providing for an advance of $73,000,000 to the Canadian National Railway Company. I think my hon. friend has the figures and is ready to table them.

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes. According to the arrangement, the other day, Mr. Chairman, I was to lay on the table a compilation of comparisons asked for by my hon. friend. I will lay it on the table now.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: No. Why not take it as read and incorporate it in Hansard? We want to use it.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am quite willing to put it in Hansard.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it the pleasure of the committee that this statement shall be taken as read?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Agreed.

The statements referred to are as follows:

COMPARISON OF

APPROPRIATIONS FOR CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS MAIN ESTIMATES 1922-23.....$96,950,000 00

WITH

VOTE NO. 139 MAIN ESTIMATES 1923-24—LOAN TO CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS.....$73,000,000 00

ATTACHED STATEMENTS SHOW RESPECTIVELY:—

No. 1. Loan to Canadian National Railways as per Vote No. 139—1923-24, estimated requirements distributed as per items authorized by the Vote.

No. 2. Summary of 1922-23 Votes (Main Estimates) comparable with above and distributed similarly to statement No. 1.

As Estimated.

No. 3. Summary of 1922-23 Votes (Main Estimates) comparable with above and distributed similarly to statement No. 1.

As Utilized.

It should be noted that the items in Vote No. 139 do not correspond directly to railway accounting classifications.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

SUMMARY—DETAILS OF ESTIMATES 1923-24

ITEM "B"—"*Acquisition of Property, Material and Supplies*"—		
Canadian Government Railways		$ 396,200 00
Canadian Northern Railway		2,506,441 00
		$ 2,902,641 00
Canadian Government Railways—		
Rails and Accessories, including Stores and Inspection Charges		112,900 00
Relaying track with heavier track rail: 84·0 miles		126,400 00
Improvements to Rolling Stock—		
Locomotives		109,900 00
Passenger Cars		47,000 00
		$ 396,200 00
Canadian Northern Railway—		
Rails and Accessories, including Stores and Inspection Charges		1,472,500 00
Relaying track with heavier track rail: 364·6 miles		566,600 00
Purchase of Work Equipment		203,091 00
Improvements to Rolling Stock—		
Locomotives		54,250 00
Passenger Cars		210,000 00
		$ 2,506,441 00

DETAILS OF STATEMENT No. 1

ITEM "C"—Interest and Sinking Funds on Notes, Securities and Obligations		$25,734,393 67
Canadian Northern Railway—		
Interest	$16,349,360 98	
Taxes	400,000 00	
Sinking Funds	1,113,133 33	
	$17,862,494 31	
Grand Trunk Pacific—		
Interest	$ 3,059,243 36	
Grand Trunk System—		
Interest G.T.P. guarantees	$ 579,323 00	
4% Guaranteed Stock	2,433,333 00	
Sinking Funds	1,800,000 00	
	$ 4,812,656 00	
Recapitulation—		
CANADIAN NORTHERN	$17,862,494 31	
GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC	3,059,243 36	
GRAND TRUNK SYSTEM	4,812,656 00	
Total	$25,734,393 67	

DETAILS OF STATEMENT No. 1

ESTIMATES 1923-1924

ITEM "D"—Principal and Interest of maturing or matured loans secured or unsecured		$ 5,271,566 00
Canadian Northern Railway—		
Equipment Principal	$ 4,112,000 00	
Grand Trunk Railway System—		
Equipment Principal	$ 1,115,400 00	
Bonds of Subsidiary Companies	44,166 00	
	$ 1,159,566 00	

DETAILS OF STATEMENT No. 1

ESTIMATES 1923-1924

ITEM "E"—Construction and Betterments

Canadian Government Railways

Description	Requirements
Eastern Lines	$ 1,080,000 00
Western Lines	638,931 00
Hudson's Bay Railway	40,000 00
Hotel Department	75,000 00
Telegraph—Railway	23,785 00
Telegraph—Re-Construction	13,800 00
Telegraph—Commercial	62,500 00
Stores Department	67,800 00
Special Items	355,455 00
Legal Department	4,000 00
	$ 2,361,271 00

DETAILS OF STATEMENT No. 1

ESTIMATES 1923-1924

ITEM "E"—Construction and Betterments

Canadian Northern Railway System

Description	Requirements
Western Lines	$ 3,355,432 00
Eastern Lines	1,650,000 00
Halifax and South Western Ry	200,000 00
Legal Dept.—	
Right of Way Surveys, C.N.R.	67,400 00
Right of Way Surveys, H. & S.W.	8,100 00
Hotel Department	274,655 00
Telegraph Department—	
Railway	88,400 00
Commercial	41,000 00
Re-Construction	95,834 00
Stores Department	72,000 00
Special Items	766,262 33
Great North Western Tel. Co.—	
New Facilities	53,750 00
Re-Construction	36,000 00
Electric Lines	950,000 00
Total	$ 7,658,833 33

DETAILS OF STATEMENT No. 1

ESTIMATES 1923-1924

ITEM "E"—Construction and Betterments

Grand Trunk Pacific Railway

Description	Requirements
All Lines	$ 1,734,532 00
Legal Dept., Right of Way Surveys	12,000 00
Hotel Department	312,607 00
Telegraph Railway	5,800 00
Stores Department	29,000 00
Special Items	137,000 00
Rails and Equipment—	
Purchase Steel Rails and Equipment	96,000 00
	$ 2,326,939 00

DETAILS OF STATEMENT No. 1

ITEM "E"—CONSTRUCTION AND BETTERMENTS

Grand Trunk Railway System

Description	
Building new lines, double tracking, grade reductions, etc	$ 1,012,000 00
Rail (heavier weight) also rail anchors, tie plates and rock ballast	882,726 00
Bridges and culverts	807,645 00
Passing tracks, yard tracks and other Company's track facilities	420,614 00
Engine house facilities	162,693 00
Passenger and freight handling facilities	655,774 00
Water service facilities	143,197 00
Fuel stations and appurtenances	69,850 00
Locomotive and car shop buildings	189,598 00
Shop machinery and tools	293,266 00
Docks and wharves	86,621 00
Eliminating grade crossings	388,600 00
Telegraph and telephone lines	225,380 00
Automatic block signals, interlocked crossings, etc	432,154 00
New buildings, Company's employees and materials	467,851 00
Improvements to locomotives and cars	5,079,880 00
Sundry land purchases	340,189 00
Works authorized for period April 1st, 1922 to March 31st, 1923, started but not completed, unexpended balance to complete	409,138 00
Estimated amount of expenditures which cannot be anticipated such as requirement of Railway Commission, local improvements required by law and other unforeseen contingencies	741,746 00
Electrification of lines in Ontario	652,251 00
Total	$ 13,461,163 00
Amount required, say	$ 11,546,023 00

Central Vermont

Roadway—	
Engine terminal facilities	$ 312,700 00
Yard exchange and passing tracks	46,480 00
Rail	31,444 00
Other track material	26,300 00
Bridges and culverts	132,000 00
Ballast	
Water stations	16,000 00
Ice houses	40,300 00
Shop facilities	28,500 00
Freight and station facilities	9,500 00
Track scales	19,400 00
Docks and wharves	2,000 00
New pile driver	35,000 00
Equipment—	
Machine equipment and tools	12,250 00
Locomotives	331,600 00
Freight cars	478,900 00
Passenger cars	240,000 00
Air brake cars	1,366 00
Electric shop truck	3,935 00
Wrecking crane	25,000 00
Turntable tractors	3,000 00
Miscellaneous unforeseen items	100,000 00
Total betterments	$ 1,895,675 00
Plus interest	188,000 00
Plus retirement of capital obligations	323,000 00
Total Central Vermont	$ 2,406,675 00

Montreal and Southern Counties Railway

Description	Requirements
Buildings	$ 15,000 00
Tracks	5,080 00
Equipment	45,300 00
Tools and machinery	1,700 00
Land	5,000 00
Contingencies	3,000 00
Total	$ 75,080 00

RECAPITULATION

Grand Trunk	$ 11,546,023 00
Central Vermont	2,406,675 00
Montreal and Southern Counties	75,080 00
Total Item "E" Grand Trunk	$ 14,027,778 00

DETAILS OF STATEMENT

ITEM "F"—CO-ORDINATION, $2,716,578.00

Canadian Government Railways

	Description	Requirements
Joffre	Connection 370′ long between G.T.R. siding and C.P.R. siding, north of ice house at west end of yard	$ 1,470 00
Chaudiere	Install two additional signals and low voltage junction switch operating machine in connection with existing automatic signals.	4,000 00
Unforeseen	To provide for expenditures that may be made necessary as Co-Ordination of lines progress	10,000 00
		$ 15,470 00

Canadian Northern Railway System—Eastern Lines

Quebec	Addition local freight facilities at Parent Square	189,000 00
"	Enlarge yard and rearrange trackage at Limoilou	20,000 00
"	Double track between Limoilou and Parent Square	34,700 00
St. Mars to Quebec	Six mile connection Dombourg to Donnacona	210,000 00
Hawkesbury	Complete connection with G.T.R.	5,400 00
Toronto	Pave Team Roads at Cherry Street	4,600 00
Howland	Install 75′ Turntable	6,000 00
Brockville	Connection Manitoba yard G.T.R.	10,300 00
Washago	Construct Storage Siding	5,600 00
Napanee	Connections and track alterations	43,130 00
"	Construct New Station	31,100 00
North Bay	Baggage room and scales	50,000 00
Unforeseen	Necessary to cover unforeseen items	50,000 00
	Total Eastern Lines	$ 623,930 00

Canadian Northern Railway System—Western Lines

	Description	Requirements
Neebing Yard	Completion of initial development of yard and engine facilities	$ 260,000 00
Kashabowie Sub	Double track Port Arthur to Empire Ave., Fort William	16,000 00
"	Double tracking M.P. 6·19 to 8·0 and to Twin City Jct. M.P. 13·2	126,750 00
Kakabeka Falls	Double Track Twin City Jct. to Kakabeka Falls	240,280 00
Mokomin	Mokomin and Automatic Signals	70,000 00
Kashabowie Sub	Second track M.P. 32 to 35·6	291,000 00
"	Grade Revision and connection M.P. 35·65 to 38·59	188,000 00
Portage la Prairie	Rearrangement of trackage and elimination of Interlocking Plant	72,500 00
Yorkton	Wye connections and eliminate interlocker	8,000 00
Lampman	Connection with G.T.R. move tank	9,275 00
Regina	Complete connection and co-ordinate engine facilities	30,000 00
"	Improvements local freight yard	10,000 00
Saskatoon	Connection with C.P.R. and automatic signals	5,000 00
Ryley	Construct connection, eliminate interlocker	2,100 00
Alix	Install automatic signals and construct two connections	2,823 00
Camrose	Complete two connections, extend Stations, install interchange with C.P.R.	52,800 00
North Edmonton	Alter grades, build connections, install interlocker	5,000 00
Luceme	Consolidate terminal facilities and abandon Jasper Division point	256,100 00
Magnolia	Credit account completion of connection C.N.R. to G.T.P	52,500 00
Unallotted	Unforeseen expenditure for co-ordination	50,000 00
	Total Western Lines	$ 1,643,128 00
	Total Eastern Lines	623,930 00
	Total C.N.R.	$ 2,267,058 00

Grand Trunk Pacific Railway

	Description	Requirements
Portage la Prairie	Rearrangement	$ 72,500 00
Yorkton	Construction of two wye connections, etc	2,000 00
Lampman	Connection with C.N.R	13,300 00
Regina	Water supply	160,000 00
"	Completion of connection and co-ordination engine facilities	35,000 00
Saskatoon	Connection with C.P.R. and automatic signals	45,000 00
Ryley	Construct connection and eliminate interlocking plant	5,600 00
Alix	Construct two connections and install automatic signals	16,950 00
Camrose	Complete two connections, extend station and install interchange tracks	3,700 00
North Edmonton	Alter grades, build connections and install interlocker	15,000 00
Magnolia	Automatic signals, Magnolia to Evansburg	15,000 00
Various	Unforeseen Expenditure for co-ordination	50,000 00
		$ 434,050 00

STATEMENT No. 1

ESTIMATES, 1923-1924

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

Classification as per Vote 139 1923-1924	Total	Canadian Government Railways	Canadian Northern Railway	Grand Trunk Pacific Railway	Grand Trunk Railway System
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
(A) Operating Deficits whenever incurred or ascertained	10,000,000 00	3,000,000 00	2,500,000 00	4,500,000 00	
(B) Acquisition of Property, Materials and Supplies	2,902,641 00	396,200 00	2,506,441 00		
(C) Interest and Sinking Funds on Notes, Securities or Obligations	25,734,393 67	.....	17,862,494 31	3,059,243 36	4,812,656 00
(D) Principal and Interest of maturing or matured loans secured or unsecured	5,271,566 00	.....	4,112,000 00	.....	1,159,566 00
(E) Construction and Betterments	26,374,821 33	2,361,271 00	7,658,833 33	2,326,939 00	14,027,778 00
(F) Co-ordination or consolidation of railway lines and facilities	2,716,578 00	15,470 00	2,267,058 00	434,050 00	
Total comparable with Can. National Railways Loan, 1923-24	73,000,000 00	5,772,941 00	36,906,826 64	10,320,232 36	20,000,000 00
ADD: Miscellaneous Votes under direct control of the Department Canadian Government Railways only.					
VOTE No. 116 $93,625 00					
117 5,390 00					
122 40,000 00					
130 50,000 00					
	189,015 00	189,015 00			
	73,189,015 00	5,961,956 00			

OTTAWA, ONT.,
June 11, 1923

STATEMENT No. 2

SUMMARY OF 1922-23 APPROPRIATIONS (MAIN ESTIMATES)

RELATIVE TO CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS CLASSIFIED IN ACCORDANCE WITH VOTE No. 139—1923-24

Classification as per Vote No. 139 1923-1924	Total	Canadian Government Railways	Canadian National Railway System	Grand Trunk Pacific	Grand Trunk Railway System
	$ cts.	$ cts. Vote No.	$ cts. Vote No.	$ cts. Vote No.	$ cts. Vote No.
(A) Operating Deficits whenever incurred or ascertained	20,000,000 00	7,000,000,00 (350)	5,000,000 00 (136)	8,000,000 00 (138)	.....
(B) Acquisition of Property, Materials and Supplies	2,800,000 00	284,125 00 (115)	2,515,875 00 (115)	.....	.....
(C) Interest and Sinking Funds on Notes, Securities or Obligations	38,473,094 57	.....	21,295,029 07 (136)	3,159,243 36 (138)	14,018,822 14 (137)
(D) Principal and interest of maturing or matured loans secured or unsecured	8,317,537 59	.....	6,754,970 93 (136)	.....	1,562,566 66 (137)
(E) Construction and Betterments	25,264,267 78	2,700,000 00 (112)	8,297,243 00 (136)	4,098,413 58 (138)	10,168,611 20 (137)
(F) Co-ordination or consolidation of railway lines and facilities	2,095,100 06	.....	1,452,757 00 (136)	642,343 06 (138)	.....
(G) Guarantees of securities	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Total comparable with Canadian National Railways Loan 1923-24	96,950,000 00	9,984,125 00	45,315,875 00	15,900,000 00	25,750,000 00
ADD:—Miscellaneous Votes under direct control of Department.					
CANADIAN GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS					
VOTE:—No. 113 $ 30,000 00					
114 150,000 00					
116 40,000 00					
131 50,000 00					
	270,000 00	270,000 00			
	97,220,000 00	10,254,125 00			

OTTAWA, ONT, JUNE 11, 1923.

STATEMENT No. 3

SUMMARY OF UTILIZATION OF 1922-23 APPROPRIATION (MAIN ESTIMATES)

CLASSIFIED IN ACCORDANCE WITH 1923-24 VOTE No. 139—CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

Classification as per Vote 139 1923–1924	Totals	Canadian Government Railways	Canadian Northern Railway	Grand Trunk Pacific	Grand Trunk Railway
	$ cts.	$ cts. Vote No.	$ cts. Vote No.	$ cts. Vote No.	$ cts. Vote No.
(A) Operating Deficits whenever incurred or ascertained	12,556,677 25	5,695,669 05 (350)	1,245,941 70 (136)	5,615,066 50 (138)	
(B) Acquisition of Property, Materials and Supplies	2,745,019 07	429,213 28 (115)	2,315,805 79 (115)		
(C) Interest and Sinking Funds on Notes, Securities and Obligations	32,691,149 48		17,475,772 38 (136)	2,205,816 52 (138)	13,009,560 58 (137)
(D) Principal and Interest of maturing or matured loans secured or unsecured	11,749,401 74		7,489,337 73 (136)		4,260,064 01 (137)
(E) Construction and Betterments	23,769,410 56	2,689,681 76 (112)	9,628,779 47 (136)	3,529,290 24 (138)	7,921,659 09 (137)
(F) Co-ordination or Consolidation of railway lines and facilities	1,777,693 78	9,295 73 (112)	1,462,847 11 (136)	305,550 94 (138)	
(G) Guarantee of Securities					
Total comparable with Canadian National Railways Loan 1923–24	85,289,351 88	8,823,859 82	39,618,484 18	11,655,724 20	25,191,283 68
ADD: Miscellaneous Votes under direct control of Department. Canadian Government Rlys., only.					
VOTE No. 113 $ 2,579 10					
114 59,950 00					
116 27,802 06					
131 48,699 09	139,030 25	139,030 25			
	85,428,382 13	8,962,890 07			

NOTE.—In the above statement there have been treated as cash advances certain amounts represented by certificates filed prior to May 31st and applicable to operations to March 31st, but for which the Department of Finance has not yet released the cash.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The figures submitted by my hon. friend, Mr. Chairman, give a summary of the allocation of the vote. In addition to that he has the details of the estimates, and as those are fairly long perhaps he would table them so we could have the information and save time. For example, these particulars show we are voting this year for the acquisition of property, materials and supplies $2,900,000. I think the House should have information as to what property we are buying for this sum. Then we have our interest and sinking funds on notes, securities or obligations amounting to over $25,000,000, and principal and interest of maturing or matured loans secured or unsecured amounting to $5,000,000. Then again we have construction and betterments amounting to $26,000,000, and co-ordination or consolidation of railway lines and facilities representing over $2,700,000. I would ask my hon. friend to table the details of the estimates of this year and of last year so we will have them for comparison and not consume the time of the committee.

10 p.m.

Mr. GRAHAM: I have not those details here but I will get them.

The CHAIRMAN: That relates to the vote No. 139.

CANADIAN GOVERNMENT MERCHANT MARINE

Loan to the Canadian Government Merchant Marine Limited, repayable on demand with interest at a rate to be fixed by the Governor in Council, upon such terms and conditions as the Governor in Council may determine, and to be applied in the payment of deficits in operation of the company and the vessels under the company's control during the year ending March 31, 1924, $1,500,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Before this matter goes on, it was pointed out by the leader of the Opposition that there was no notice given that this would be taken up to-day. He tells me that he has an understanding with the government, and I just want to see if I am right, that while the item will be called and the discussion proceeded with, it will not be closed to-night so that he will have an opportunity of preparing whatever may be necessary to be prepared.

Mr. GRAHAM: What we had in mind was this: This discussion may be a bit lengthy, and we thought we might as well proceed with some of it, but there is no intention of bringing the discussion to a close to-night.

I might say briefly that the report of the Merchant Marine for the year ending December 31, 1922, is in the hands of hon. members. There is nothing much to add to what is in that report. It may be asked why the figures in that report are given for the calendar year instead of for the fiscal year. It is convenient both for the railways and the Merchant Marine that their year should close with the calendar year, so any discrepancy between the figures of the appropriation and the amount given as expended will be accounted for by the fact that the appropriation runs from March 31st to March 31st, while the business year of the Merchant Marine runs from December 31st to December 31st. I do not know that I can add a single figure to what hon. gentlemen have in the report that is before them.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Did I understand the minister to say that this item would not be passed to-night? There are several hon. gentlemen in this section of the House who desire to speak on this vote who are detained at some banquet.

Mr. GRAHAM: The understanding was that some hon. gentlemen present wished to speak. We are open for speeches, of course. If they take the ground that they do not want either to speak or to put the item through it means a couple of hours wasted.

Mr. FORKE: Usually there is a great rush of hon. members to get on their feet to make a speech, but as no one has risen—

Mr. LAPOINTE: It is a good sign.

Mr. FORKE: —this is an opportunity for me to take up a little time to-night. I rise largely for the purpose of seeking information regarding the Canadian Government Merchant Marine. The other night I used a phrase that perhaps I should not have used when I said that it might be necessary some day to take the ships of the Merchant Marine out into deep water and sink them. I prefaced that remark with something and followed it with something, so I hope it will never be quoted against me. It brought to my mind how dangerous it might be to use phrases of that kind in the House, because I sincerely hope it may never be necessary to do any such thing with the Canadian Merchant Marine.

I have heard a good many things said of the ships of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine, but I have never yet heard anything said in their favour, and I would like some information in regard to the building of these ships: who designed them, what trade were they designed for, why is it that when any matter of shipping comes up in the House the first thing you hear is that the ships of the Merchant Marine are not suited for that sort of work?

I do not know whether the minister is going to be able to tell us just what sort of trade these ships were built for. I have read some of the past debates in connection with the building of these ships, and I do not intend to enter into that phase of the matter at this time. I realize that they were built at a very expensive time, that a good many of them cost from $160 to $195 per ton, while ships that were built in pre-war times could be built for about $50 per ton, and perhaps they can be built even cheaper to-day. I think a very reasonable thing to do at the outset in connection with the Merchant Marine—I know that this suggestion was made by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) with regard to the government railways, and I think it would be even more applicable to the Merchant Marine—would be to have these ships valued. I am aware that the minister is trying to sell some of them, and it might not be a good thing to value them too low; nevertheless I do not think it will ever be possible for these ships to pay interest and depreciation charges upon their valuation at the time they were built, but if they were valued at what they are actually worth to-day, and some attempt was made to make them pay interest on that amount, there might be reasonable hope that that could be done.

I notice in the report that the deficit after all charges, including depreciation and interest, amounts to $9,649,478.72—a very large deficit for the people no doubt who pay taxes in this country to make up. I have no doubt that there is going to be a deficit for a long time if an attempt is made to pay interest on the valuation of these ships that were built at such a high cost. I hope we shall get some information during this debate as to what is the matter with the Merchant Marine. Why is it these ships cannot do business on the ocean or on the lakes? We had a discussion the other night about subsidizing a service to the West Indies, and were told that these boats were not suitable for that service. Looking over the debates of past sessions I noticed that the Hon. Mr. Ballantyne made the statement that these ships were suitable for carrying cattle across the Atlantic ocean, but now we are told that they are not suitable for that purpose. The statement was also made in past sessions that the smaller boats of the Merchant Marine were able to compete and would carry grain on the Great Lakes, but now we are told that they cannot compete with the large boats that carry grain that were built especially for that purpose.

I said when I rose to my feet that I rose largely for the purpose of seeking information, because we really ought to know what is the matter. Why is it these boats are unable to compete with other boats? Perhaps I am correct in saying that at the present time there is sufficient shipping in Montreal and other seaports to do all the business that is being offered in the world to-day. I think that is correct. Nevertheless, it seems to me that our boats should be able to take their share of the business. I mentioned the other day that it might be a good idea for the Canadian National Railways to have boats running in connection with the railways that were able to carry cattle across the ocean and set a rate that would be a paying rate. These boats could demonstrate what was a reasonable rate for carrying cattle across the ocean. I have also seen it stated that while these boats are a losing proposition at the present time they bring a certain amount of trade to the Canadian National Railways, and although that results in a deficit so far as the Merchant Marine is concerned it helps to make the railways more paying than they otherwise would be. I believe the time is not far distant, or at all events I look forward to the time when the Canadian National Railways will have a line of ships running in connection with them just as the Canadian Pacific has to-day in connection with their railway. I hope that this Canadian Government Merchant Marine may be only the beginning of a line of ships that will bring trade and create ocean traffic that will help to make our railways pay a great deal better than they are doing to-day.

When I rose I knew that I could throw no light on this matter. I have, to use a nautical expression, been a good deal at sea in regard to these ships, and when I spoke the other day about sinking them in deep water it was only by way of passing a joke. We want to see some value got for these ships, and during this debate I am going to listen in the hope of finding out just what is the trouble, why we have this large deficit, and why we are told continually that these boats are not suitable for this, that and the other trade or any trade we can mention. Immediately we mention the Canadian Government Merchant Marine we are told its vessels are not suited for that kind of work. May I ask, what sort of work they are really suited for?

Mr. DUFF: I do not know whether I will be able to supply the leader of the Progressive party with the information he desires. He is not the only person in Canada who, I

who was Minister of Marine and Fisheries, also made a speech on that occasion, and he told us that they were having two ships built by the Vickers Company at Montreal, one of 8,100 tons dead weight capacity, and another of 4,350 tons. He said that in addition to those vessels another ship of about 5,000 tons was being built by the Wallace Shipbuilding Company, of Vancouver, and another vessel of 3,550 tons by the Collingwood Shipbuilding Company, Collingwood. He said the Dominion government had those four vessels under construction. That was the reason, why, in my opinion, the hon. gentleman who now occupies the distinguished position of Speaker of this House approved of that policy. It was also the reason why the hon. gentleman who was lately Solicitor General in this government also approved of the scheme. Neither of these gentlemen, nor any other member in parliament at that time, thought the government of the day intended to spend $80,000,000 in the construction of these ships. Now, Sir, we have also been told that whilst certain gentlemen were in favour of that scheme, nobody opposed it. But if you will turn to Hansard of 1918 you will find that the then hon. member for Red Deer, Mr. Clark, did oppose the government's shipbuilding programme. He said frankly and freely that he did not believe it was a wise expenditure, or that the policy contemplated was wise. Therefore, while some gentlemen approved of that scheme, other gentlemen in the House at that time did not think it was a wise policy to embark upon even in war time. As far as I am personally concerned I did not object to the expenditure of that money in 1918, principally because I felt that while the war was on and ships were being sunk every day it was a fairly good policy for the government to build ships so long as the war lasted. However, as we all know, the war ceased in November 1918, and at that time the keels of four ships only were laid in the shipyards referred to. I contend, and I have done the same thing for a number of years whenever I spoke on this subject in parliament, that the right and proper thing for the government of the day to have done when the war was over and when every shipyard in Britain, in France, and in the United States was busy building ships, was to have stopped the construction of these vessels. They should have stopped building when ships were partly constructed, and perhaps others were under way, in these shipyards.

My own opinion is that it would have been far better, if this government wanted to encourage a mercantile marine, to have gone out at that time and endeavoured to make some arrangement with the shipbuilders whereby shipbuilding would have been continued and a Canadian merchant marine, instead of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine, would have been built up in this country, as it has been built up in other countries. But instead of that the hon. member who occupied the position of Minister of Marine and Fisheries was determined to go on with his project, and without going into the matter very much further, the result was that $79,000,000 of this country's money was spent in the building of the ships, and these ships, instead of being sold, were operated by what was known as the Canadian Government Merchant Marine Limited. My own opinion is that if the government were determined to operate these ships that they never should have put it in this company form, or placed it under the management of a corporation. At the present time there is not one man who is managing these ships, or who is a director of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine, who has one dollar invested in the enterprise. I say that is not the right and proper way to run a business, and you can never get satisfaction out of it. It is purely a camouflage that this project which has cost the people of the country $80,000,000 is being run by men who have no financial interest in the matter.

After these ships were completed, in fact before they were all completed, the government commenced operating, and those who are familiar with ship operation will know that, during the first two years these ships were operated, conditions were abnormal in the shipping business, and that, instead of making 10 or 15 per cent on money invested in shipping, as high as 100, 200 and 300 per cent on the cost of ships was made yearly by different firms operating ships in different countries in the world. It would naturally be expected that the Canadian Government Merchant Marine would participate in the business the other people were getting, or in similar business, and would make large profits on the operation of the ships; but if hon. members will look at the statements that have been furnished by the government in connection with this project they will see that, instead of making a fair profit on the ventures, very little money was made in those years when other people were making large sums of money. Now we come to the present day.

Mr. McMASTER: On the first year's operation of the Canadian Government Merchant

think, should have a great deal more information with regard to this project than has been given to them, especially in the last two or three years. Now, if the committee will bear with me, in order that the Progressive leader and the country may know exactly how I look upon this project and how this project looks to me, I will endeavour in the shortest time possible to give all the information which I have at my command. In order to do that it will be necessary for me to go back and review the entire undertaking from the time of its inception. I do not pretend, however, to-night to criticize or condemn Union government or the Conservative government —the Union government for entering into the project, or the Conservative government for carrying it out after they came into power in 1921, or after Sir Robert Borden resigned and the present leader of the Opposition became Prime Minister of Canada. It is useless, in my opinion, for members of parliament, in order to make a point, to go back and throw political mud—shall I call it?—on their opponents and say they were to blame for everything that happened in connection with this or that matter. We have arrived with regard to the Canadian Government Merchant Marine, at a time when it does not make very much difference whether the Union government are responsible for the building of these ships or not. The question we have to face to-day in this country and in this parliament is, as to whether these ships should continue to be operated or not. If it can be proved conclusively that these vessels are necessary and if—as some people have tried to make out in the past, and are trying to make out now —we must keep them going to help the Canadian National Railways—if that can be proved conclusively then I say this country should carry on the proposition. If, however, it can be shown that these ships are not necessary to carry on the trade of this country, that there are millions of tons of ships on every ocean in the world ready to transport the products of Canada and every other nation, then I say it is not necessary for this government or this country either to keep on paying year after year the deficits on the operation of these ships that we have been paying, or to run government-owned ships in competition with private enterprise.

Now, Sir, as I said, I do not intend to criticize the Union government for the commencement of this project, but in order that the leader of the Progressive party and the House may know exactly what occurred, I should like for a few moments to review exactly what happened in connection with this enterprise in parliament. I think it was in April, 1918, that Sir Robert Borden, who was then leader of the government, came to this House and proposed that we should vote $25,000,000 for the building of ships in this country. The reason Sir Robert Borden gave at that time for the proposition was, that in view of the fact that hundreds of thousands of tons of shipping were being sunk daily by the German submarines, and in view of the fact that it was necessary in this country to build ships to carry supplies not only to the soldiers at the front but also to the various peoples in Europe, that it would be a good policy on the part of the Canadian people to build ships to help out that very serious situation. Sir Robert Borden, in reviewing the situation at that time, told us that the fourteen shipyards in Canada were busy building ships for the Imperial Munitions Board, which was really a branch of the Imperial government, but he said as soon as these ships were completed it was the intention of the Canadian government to start building ships in those yards with Canadian money and for the Canadian people. We heard it stated in this House a few days ago that not only were the supporters of the Union government favourable to that scheme at that particular time, but that certain hon. gentlemen who were supporters of the Liberal party also favoured it. Indeed it is now said in contradiction, whenever we criticize the Canadian Government Merchant Marine, that members of the Liberal party favoured the scheme. While that is quite true up to a certain degree, yet anybody who takes the trouble to read Hansard of that time will find that when Sir Robert Borden made that proposal there was absolutely no talk of operating ships. Sir Robert Borden only told us that in view of the prevailing conditions Canada was going into the ship building business, not into the ship operating business; and any Liberal members who spoke in approval of the scheme at that time never approved of operating the ships which the government intended to build. I do not know that it is necessary to read exactly what Sir Robert Borden then said. I think I have covered the ground very well, but on April 4th, of the same year Mr. Ballantyne, who was the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in the Union government, also spoke in regard to the matter.

Mr. FORKE What year was that?

Mr. DUFF: April 4th, 1918. The speech will be found in Hansard of that date, page 346. Sir Robert Borden's speech appears at page 28 of Hansard of 1918. Mr. Ballantyne,

Marine, after deducting depreciation charges, was no money made at all?

Mr. DUFF: The hon. member will remember that in the speech I made in connection with this matter, I think in 1921, I furnished a statement to the House in comparison with the statement given us by some of the Marine officials, and made up by the auditors who audited the books of the company. I think I proved to the satisfaction of most hon. members on both sides of this House that the statement as prepared by the auditors, or the people who did prepare it, was not in accordance with the facts, and instead of making a profit those years, after a sufficient amount was allowed for depreciation, without taking into consideration the large sum of interest which was due the Finance Minister, these ships went into debt. I do not need to give the House those figures, but if hon. members will look at Hansard of 1921 they will find all the figures.

Mr. FORKE: What page? If the hon. member will allow me, at page 903 of Hansard of 1920, I find the following statement by the then Minister of Marine and Fisheries:

> The total net profit, as I stated before, is $1,406,000.

Mr. DUFF: I will give the page of Hansard in 1921. That was after two years' operation. The statement will be found in Hansard of 1921, on pages from 1692 to 1701. There are several statements there which I prepared at the time, and the statement of the operating accounts will show that there was no profit on the business, and in the statement of capital account the figures I gave showed a loss to the country of $58,669,906.22. I remember distinctly when I read that statement the hon. member who was defending the estimate practically tried to laugh me out of court. I am not a prophet, nor the son of a prophet, but if hon. members will look at the statement of this year and see what Sir Henry Thornton says, they will find my prophecy has come true, and that these ships to-day, after deducting the interest charges, have practically lost to the country every dollar that the country has invested. I intend to go more fully into that in a moment when I deal with the annual report for this year. The annual statement for this year has not yet been placed on record.

Before I deal with that, I will refer to the matter the hon. leader of the Progressive party (Mr. Forke) spoke of a moment ago, as to the profits for the first year. According to the statement submitted to the House at that time by the government the profit shown for the year ending December 31, 1919, was $1,406,767.38, and the following year, December 31, 1920, the profit shown was $598,460.09. These are the two years in which it was supposed that a profit had been made, but if hon. members will look at the statement of 1921, which gives the business to the 31st December, 1920, they will find on the last page what is known as surplus account, and taking the figures of the company, or the government of that day, they will find the statement that they had a surplus at that time of $1,004,233.01 Last year the Minister of Railways asked the House to vote $4,360,720 in the estimates to apply towards the deficits of this company. We find that the present Minister of Railways this year, in what are called the Supplementary Estimates, asked the House about ten days ago to vote an additional amount of $1,700,000. In addition to that we are asked to-night to vote $1,500,000. These three amounts total $7,560,720.

Now, Sir, I want to say, first, with regard to these items, that I did not oppose the vote last year of $4,360,720, because in conversation with the then minister he told me—and I quite understood it—that he had not had time to look into the business. He had only been sworn in as Minister of Railways a few weeks before, and consequently did not have time to go over the whole business and see what could be done; therefore I raised no objection to the voting of that item. As, however, I said a moment ago, in addition to the $4,360,000, we voted the other night $1,700,000. To my dismay, I find that that money, if my information is correct, was given over to the Canadian Government Merchant Marine some time last fall on a Governor General's warrant. Although I am a supporter of this government, I want to enter my protest right here and now against this government voting that money by a Governor General's warrant and passing it over to the Canadian Government Merchant Marine.

Mr. JACOBS: What would the hon. member have done had he been in the government at the time?

Mr. DUFF: I intend to come to that in a moment. One does not need to have been in the government to say what a business man would have done in the circumstances. The total amount which we shall have voted if we pass this item to-night will be $7,560,720. As I read a moment ago, there was supposed to be a surplus on December 31, 1920, of $1,004,233.01. This makes a total of money voted by this House and a surplus profit which is supposed to be in the treasury of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine,

Limited, of $8,564,953.01. What has become of that money? If hon. members will look at the statement for 1921, they will find that that statement on page 16 shows an operating loss of $2,210,724.55. If they will look at the statement on page 16 for last year, they will find that there is an operating loss of $2,384,-189.17. This makes a total of $4,594,913.72. Yet although all these statements show losses in two years of only $4,500,000 odd, the government of this country has voted and asked for $7,560,720 and a surplus of $1,004,233.01, making in all $8,564,953.01. Where has the difference gone? Why did the Canadian Government Merchant Marine want $8,564,953.01 when their deficit, according to their own statement, was $4,594,913.72? It seems to me that it is time a halt was called regarding this matter.

The hon. member for George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs) asked me a few minutes ago what I would have done instead of paying by Governor General's warrant $1,700,000 to this company. The proper thing to have done was to let the bank carry the overdraft, as they were doing, until such time as sufficient ships were sold to pay the deficit. I do not profess to have any legal knowledge; but I noticed the other day that we were discussing all day the question whether it was legal to pay or to lend $2,000,000 to some syndicate to buy or rent a property in Paris. I am not quite clear yet whether we were to buy or to rent this property. I am very doubtful whether this parliament has any legal right to vote to an incorporated company called the Canadian Government Merchant Marine any moneys of this country. This company should stand on its own bottom and pay its deficits out of its assets and not out of money voted by this parliament. As I said, I am not a lawyer, but I am very doubtful if there would be a legal right to pay this. If the money can be paid on a legal technicality, I say that this government had no moral right to pay this large sum of money for that purpose, but the deficit should have been paid out of the assets of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine.

Let us see how the matter stands this year. As the statement has not been placed upon Hansard, I am going to read it. The operating account for the year ended December 31, 1922, is as follows:

Operating Account ending December 31st, 1922	
Revenue from vessels, closed voyages..	$9,672,413 31
Other revenue, profit on operation of government dock, Vancouver..	30,754 13
Commission on handling outside steamers.	2,619 53
Total revenue..	$9,705,786 97
Expenses:	
Operation of vessels, closed voyages.	$11,438,157 21
Stevedoring and wharf expenses.. ..	38,862 14
Operation of agencies..	98,506 61
Interest and exchange..	15,937 25
General expenses—	

This is something to make us sit up and take notice.

Management and office salaries..	$311,629 83
Rent, taxes and insurance..	13,153 33
Travelling expenses..	25,713 14
Printing and stationery..	18,336 54
Advertising..	33,015 59
Postage, cables and telegrams..	56,641 82
Office expenses and supplies..	27,478 13
Miscellaneous..	12,544 55
Total expenses..	$12,089,976 14

Or an operating loss for the year of $2,384,-189.17. It will be noticed that, in addition to the operation of these vessels, that is for the payment of crews, supplies, coal, and so forth, office and management expenses in connection with the project amount to $600,000. That is an amount which is absolutely in excess of what it should take to run this business. Think of $600,000 for management and office expenses of this business! Yet you and I are asked to vote $1,500,000 to-night and we voted $4,500,000 last year and $1,700,000 ten days ago. Next year they will be back again for two or three millions more or, perhaps, more for the deficit on operation this year. It is time that we looked at this matter seriously and decided whether it is in the interest of this country to carry on this operation, or if the whole business should not be cleaned up. In addition to the $2,384,189.17 —this is not the darkest side of the picture —this country had to borrow money to build these ships, money which was subscribed by way of victory loans by the people of Canada and on which the government has to pay five and one-half per cent interest. Mr. Ballantyne told us, when he was trying to paint a rosy picture of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine, that the ships would pay not only operating expenses, and interest on money invested, but a profit over and above those two items. Instead of that, what do we find? We find that outside of $500,000 which was paid on interest account in 1920 not one cent has been paid since, with the result that there is an amount for interest accrued for a year on notes due to the government, $4,-078,277.74; interest on government advances, $118,759.67; reserve for depreciation, $2,932,-130.14; reserve for outstanding liabilities $40,-000; reserve for doubtful debts and claims $96,122, making a total of $7,265,289.55, or a gross loss for the year of $9,649,478.72.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is, including fixed charges.

Mr. DUFF: Yes, interest and so forth. On the next page, 17, there is a deficit account. This shows a deficit ever since the operation of the steamers. In 1921 there was a loss of $9,116,144.28. Deducting the subsidy received for 1921 for the West India passenger service, of $59,090, this leaves an amount of $9,057,-054.28; to which is added deficiency on insurance recoverable for the ship Recruit of $84,751.90. The loss for the year ended 31st December, 1922, was, $9,649,478.72, making a total deficit for the two years 1921 and 1922 of $18,791,284.90. In other words, the Canadian Government Marine if run as any other business, taking their own statements, has shown a loss of over $18,000,000.

Let us look for a moment at profit and loss account on pages 14 and 15, where it is known as the consolidated balance sheet. The statement reads as follows:

Assets

Fixed Assets:		
Vessels as at 31st December, 1921.. ..		$72,392,352 27
Add—Net Additions during Year.. ..		5,331,513 35
		$77,723,865 62
Less Reserve for Depreciation..		6,026,270 69
		$71,697,594 93
Plant and Equipment as at 31st December, 1921.. ..	$ 68,873 33	
Add:—Net Additions during Year..	16,372 67	
	$85,246 00	
Less Reserve for Depreciation	10,973 81	
		74,272 19
Office Furniture and fixtures as at 31st December, 1921.	$ 38,979 57	
Add:—Net Additions during Year..	2,979 14	
	$41,958 71	
Less Reserve for Depreciation	4,861 85	
		37,096 86
		$71,808,963 98
Department of Marine and Fisheries—suspense..		148,343 71
(Disbursements on Vessels prior to being put in Commission.)		
Current Assets:		
Cash in Banks and on hand.	$287,247 82	
Accounts Receivable, less Reserve for Doubtful Accounts	840,063 91	
Advances to Captains, Crews and Agents..	82,784 57	
Adjusted Losses due by Underwriters..	125,898 68	
Insurance Claims, Estimated Amount Recoverable.. ..	957,326 89	
Inventories of Stores and Supplies..	90,936 40	
		2,384,258 27
Insurance Unexpired..		25,037 88
		$74,366,603 84
Deficit..		18,791,284 90
		$93,157,888 74

Lliabilities

Capital Stock:		
Authorized 10,000 shares of $100 each..	$1,000,000 00	
Issued 6,609 shares of $100 each..		$ 660,900 00
Less—Amount to be Cancelled relative to Two Vessels Lost..		20,000 00
		$ 640,900 00
Notes Payable due Dominion Government..	$79,511,660 59	
(Secured by Mortgages on Vessels)		
Less Payments on Account	1,985,256 87	
	$77,526,403 72	
Add Interest Accrued to 31st December, 1922.. ..	8,670,707 13	
		86,197,110 85
Other Advances by the Dominion Government..	$4,755,104 17	
Add Interest Accrued to 31st December, 1922.. ..	118,759 67	
		4,873,863 84
Accounts Payable..		1,099,854 42
Balances of Uncompleted Voyages.. ..		346,159 63
Contingent Liabilities—None.		
		$93,157,888 74

This shows the assets as at December 31st, 1921, to be $72,392,352.27, with additions during the year of $5,331,513.35, or a total of $77,723,865.62; less reserve for depreciation of $6,026,270.69. This therefore discloses a net balance of $71,697,594.93.

Then there is plant and equipment amounting to $74,272.19 and office furniture and fixtures, $37,096.86. Then there is a Department of Marine and Fisheries Suspense, and there is a footnote in regard to disbursements on vessels prior to being put into commission, the total shown being $148,343.71.

Mr. FORKE: At what page is that?

Mr. DUFF: I am quoting from page 14 of the fourth annual report of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine for 1922, in reference to "Department of Marine and Fisheries, Disbursements on Vessels". I am very doubtful whether that amount should be there at all. I do not understand exactly what it can mean unless the Department of Marine and Fisheries did not pay some of the capital expenditures when the vessels were built. But what difference does it make whether the amount is paid on account of capital expenditure or paid by the Department of Marine and Fisheries? I say that it is very doubtful whether this amount should appear as an asset at all.

The current assets in cash in banks amount to $287,247.82; accounts receivable, less reserve, $840,063.91; advances to captains, crews and agents, $82,784.57; losses due by

underwriters, $125,898.68; insurance claims, estimated amount recoverable, $957,326.89; inventories of freights and supplies, $90,936.40; insurance unexpired, $25,037.88; making a total of $74,366,603.84.

On page 15, there appears a statement of liabilities showing the capital stock at $640,900. Then there are notes payable due to the Dominion government of $79,511,660.59. That is what the ships cost, and for that amount notes were given to the Department of Finance. Deducted from this is an amount for payments on account to the extent of $1,985,256.87. Added interest accrued to the 31st December, 1922, accounts for $8,670,787.13, and other advances by the government, $4,873,863.84. Accounts payable amount to $1,099,854.42, and balance of uncompleted vessels, $346,159.63. So that the total liabilities amount to $93,157,888.74.

Now, the assets, as I read a moment ago, amounted to $74,366,603.84, and in view of the other statements I have just quoted it is apparent that there is a deficit to the country or to the Canadian Government Marine, whichever way you like to put it, of $18,791,284.90. There are one or two amounts here in regard to which I should like to get some information after I am through. One of these amounts appears on page 14, amongst the assets; I refer to insurance claims, the estimated amount recoverable being $957,326.89. I presume this is to be recovered from the insurance companies for some ships lost. But if you will consult the other statement for previous years you will find that they have also made an estimate of insurance they expected to recover the previous year, and instead of collecting the full amount they estimated they fell very much short of it. I would certainly say that in this case instead of $957,000 odd being put down as an asset, this amount will be considerably reduced when the insurance companies pay, if they ever do pay.

There appears also amongst the assets an amount of $840,000 odd for accounts receivable, but I should not be very much surprised if that amount were materially reduced when the freights are collected and the expenses in connection with the voyages are paid. According to the statement of the Canadian Government Marine there is a deficit of over $18,000,000. But that is not a fair statement of the present condition of the company. It will be seen at page 14 that there is an amount credited for depreciation of $6,026,270.69. I do not regard this as a fair amount for depreciation considering the value of the ships to-day. According to Sir Henry Thornton's statement, which appears in the front of this book, he admits to the shareholders that the vessels have greatly depreciated in value and instead of being worth $77,000,000 are in reality worth, in his opinion, only $50 a ton dead weight. That in my view is a very generous estimate, but I am willing to accept it for purposes of comparison; and taking Sir Henry Thornton's estimate, it can be readily calculated that the ships to-day are worth only $21,023,865.62. In other words, this country has lost in depreciation on the value of the ships some $56,700,000.

I have here a statement showing the actual financial condition of the company. It is as follows:

Assets	
Total cost of ships	$77,723,865 62
Reserve for depreciated value	56,700,000 00
	$21,023,865 62
Plant and equipment	74,272 19
Office furniture	37,096 86
Department of Marine	148,343 71
Current assets	2,384,258 27
Unexpired insurance	25,037 88
	$23,692,874 53
Loss on operation and decrease in value	69,465,014 21
	$93,157,888 74
Total Liabilities as shown on page 15 of Fourth Annual Report	93,157,888 74

You will find if you will add up these two sets of figures on the asset and the liability side that this country has suffered a loss of $69,465,014.21 on these ships since they were built and put in commission. In other words, whilst the ships cost $77,000,000 according to the books of the company, to-day they are only worth $8,000,000, the difference representing depreciation and loss on operation. That is the exact state of affairs of this Canadian Government Merchant Marine. Whether the country desires to go on paying these deficits year after year is for parliament to decide. As far as I am personally concerned, I do not think it is good business to vote any more money to make good these deficits.

Mr. FORKE: Of course, the figures given by the hon. member do not represent the actual depreciation of these ships but are due to the cost of construction having dropped from $165 a ton to $50. Can he give us the actual depreciation in value assuming that the cost of construction had remained at $165 a ton? Does the hon. member understand my question?

Mr. DUFF: I do. The cost averaged about $192 per dead weight ton. In answer, I would say that the company itself has

written off $6,026,270.69 for depreciation. My own opinion is, and it was admitted by Mr. Ballantyne, that there should be an allowance for depreciation of 5 per cent per year, but it will be noticed that the company has not made such an allowance, because 5 per cent on $77,000,000 for four years would amount to over $12,000,000. However, I think I am fair when I read this statement and show that we have lost over $69,000,000. In other words, if these ships were sold to-day at $50 per ton, which is more than the current value of ships of the same character in other countries, we would suffer a loss of $69,000,000 on their building and operation.

In view of these facts, as I said a moment ago, is it wise for us to continue making up these deficits year after year? Are these ships necessary to do the country's business? I claim they are not necessary, and in this opinion I am upheld by a number of eminent authorities in various parts of the Dominion. For instance, the Ottawa Journal, in an editorial which appeared shortly after this annual statement was issued by the Canadian Government Merchant Marnie, said:

> The worst feature of the whole proposition is that this loss is sustained without any visible advantage. True, the statement shows that the vessels turned over certain freight and passengers to the Canadian National Railways but the figures cannot be considered as even the shadow of justification for a nine million dollar deficit. Moreover, the corporation operating the ships apparently made them part of an Atlantic combine for the heightening of freights; this, at a time when there was a surplus of shipping, making them of no value whatever to the Canadian exporter.

In addition to this criticism, the Montreal Gazette—which perhaps is one of the sanest papers in Canada—has published several editorials severely condemning the slowness of this government and its predecessors for allowing these vessels to be operated any longer, and in every one it has shown conclusively that their continued operation is not necessary in the interests of the country. Then another paper, the Journal of Commerce, had this to say:

> Canada's state-owned merchant marine, according to reports published by the Department of Commerce, returned a deficit of over $9,000,000 on a gross income of a little better than $10,700,000 during 1921. According to the best information available this condition was not improved during the calendar year 1922. The latest complete financial statement available (1921) illustrates the possibilities of government ownership of merchant vessels.

It has been argued by the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Ballantyne) and one or two other hon. gentlemen that these ships were in a combine with a New York Canadian National Railways. I do not think that any shipping man will agree with such a statement, because if the Canadian National Railways have efficient freight agents there is absolutely no reason why they cannot arrange with shipping companies to take freight at the seaboard for transportation overseas at a cheaper rate than it is costing us to-day by the Canadian Government Merchant Marine. I would suggest that the company sell these ships and transfer the general manager and any other gentlemen who may be necessary to the Canadian National Railways staff so that they may look after the transshipment of freight when it reaches the seaboard. That is the business way. There would be no difficulty whatever for the Canadian National Railways to make contracts with ship owners to carry freight which originates on the system. After all, what percentage of the goods handled by the Canadian National Railways to Vancouver, Montreal, Quebec, Halifax, St. John or Portland, was taken overseas by the Canadian Government Merchant Marine? Why, a mere bagatelle. It is not worth talking about, because unless they have changed their

11 p.m. way of doing business within the last few months most of the cargoes carried in their bottoms were from foreign ports. They were compelled apparently to go all over the world looking for freight. So the percentage of goods handled by the Canadian Government Merchant Marine and originating on the Canadian National Railways is very small compared to the total amount of freight transported by our great railway system.

It may be argued also that so long as we have the Canadian Government Merchant Marine it will have a salutary effect on freight rates charged by other shipping lines. I cannot discuss what happened before a committee of this House which is still sitting, but I can go back to three years ago when I told this House that instead of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine helping our shippers and producers to secure lower shipping rates that the company belonged to what was known as the "New York Pool." If hon. gentlemen will look up Hansard of April 7th, 1921, they will find that statement in the speech which I then made. I referred to that fact and proved conclusively that these Canadian Government Merchant Marine ships were in a combine with a New York pool to keep up the freight rates. This will be found on page 1713 of Hansard of April 7, 1921, where I said this:

> We find that somebody in an endeavour to promote business for the government boats entered into an arrangement with certain New York shipping interests

to come into what is known as the New York Shipping Pool. Now a gentleman who does not know anything about shipping, and who goes to New York among the shipping sharks to enter into an arrangement with them, well, all I can say is Heaven help him. Somebody entered into an arrangement on behalf of these 47 or 63 boats, whereby they agreed not to cut rates, that is to say, the Canadian boats were to take no lower rates from Canadian ports than the New York boats were getting from New York ports. The result was that thousands of barrels of apples from King's county and Annapolis county which were ready to be shipped to the London market and were offered to the Canadian Government Merchant Marine, had to be refused because they had entered into this agreement with the New York pool. Were these apples shipped on Canadian steamers, on British steamers, on United States steamers? No, on Norwegian steamers.

Then I gave a list of the ships that were chartered at Halifax to carry these apples because the shippers could not make an arrangement with the Merchant Marine to do this business because they could not cut the rates.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Does my hon. friend think that the Combines Bill of the present government will have any effect on this combine?

Mr. DUFF: I have not read it yet, and I do not know what it contains, but evidently the government has not done much so far to get the Merchant Marine out of the New York combine. Our steamers are still in this combine. That was admitted by the gentleman who is at the head of the freight department of the Merchant Marine. He said that they still sat in when these rates were fixed. I want to say that is a pretty poor excuse for the freight manager of the Merchant Marine to give to the people of this country, that these ships were not in the combine and that all he did was to sit in when the agents of the other lines were discussing rates. I say that no business men in this country would allow any other man who was not in agreement with them to come into their office to a directors' meeting and listen to all that was going on unless they knew he was in hearty agreement with what was proposed at that meeting. So I say the Merchant Marine were in the pool, and I think it is likely they are still in that New York ring.

An hon. MEMBER: They were not according to the last account.

Mr. DUFF: That is because your committee frightened them.

Mr. BROWN: Does the hon. member think it is necessary that that condition should continue now that we know the facts?

Mr. DUFF: I say that in spite of the fact that the Canadian Merchant Marine were keeping up the rates to the same figure as the other lines they had a deficit in two years of $18,000,000, and does my hon. friend want to argue that we should have their rates reduced and bring about a deficit of say $25,000,000? I do not think he wants that.

Mr. BROWN: They may get more business in that case.

Mr. DUFF: They cannot get more business because the other ships can get business ahead of them every time. All the Merchant Marine ships get is what is left and the little that the Canadian National Railways put their way. Just look over the ships of the Merchant Marine in the different ports. While they have cargoes when they leave this country, and most of them are cargoes of lumber which any old windjammer can carry, coming back they have practically no cargo at all.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Why do they not get cargoes? Is it due to mismanagement or to the class of vessels?

Mr. DUFF: I do not think it is mismanagement at all. I think the gentleman in charge of the Merchant Marine had a pretty hard row to hoe. The government should never have thrown these sixty-three ships at him. No other shipping company in the world ever bought sixty-three ships inside of twelve months. They buy one, two, three or four ships and gradually build up their holdings. Consequently I say the gentleman in charge had a pretty hard row to hoe, and he has done remarkably well under the circumstances. There are other causes why these ships do not pay and one is that they are suitable only for carrying bulk cargoes. They can take lumber but everybody knows that for the last two years there has been no money in that. They can carry coal, and yet they have lost money in spite of the fact that the Canadian Government Railways paid the ships of the Merchant Marine I think it was $2.80 per ton to carry coal from Sydney to Montreal when other ships were carrying it for $1.10 a ton. These ships are not suitable for carrying bulk cargoes of coal. Their expenses are too great. I thought I had the figures with me. I think it was $3.80 or at all events $2.80 that the Merchant Marine boats were paid for carrying coal from Sydney to Montreal while other ships were carrying it for $1.10 a ton.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Why did these other boats not regulate the New York pool if they were able to do it?

Mr. DUFF: Which boats?

Mr. MACLEAN (York): You say that these boats could beat out the Merchant Marine. Were they in the pool?

Mr. DUFF: Yes.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): You say the pool was charging excessive rates. The Merchant Marine were in the pool and these other boats were beating them out. Why did they not beat the pool?

Mr. DUFF: I do not think my hon. friend could have heard me. I said that this New York pool was broken when these apples were carried to England by Norwegian steamers.

Mr. MARTELL: Steamers have to be constructed for special trade. Landlubbers do not understand it.

Mr. DUFF: Here are a few of the steamers which carried those apples from Halifax to the Mother Country because the Canadian government ships refused the shipments. The Caxambu carried 14,000 barrels at $1.50; the Angelica Maresk carried 12,000 barrels at $2; the Knut Hamsun carried 20,000 barrels at $1.75. There were about a dozen of these ships that carried the apples and they made prices outside the pool price, which was $2.50 a barrel. The average price that was charged by these Norwegian steamers was from $1.50 to $2.

Mr. MILLAR: Were they tramp steamers?

Mr. DUFF: Yes, ordinary cargo steamers carrying from fourteen to twenty thousand barrels.

Mr. BROWN: Was the reason the Canadian ships did not get that trade because they were not fitted for carrying it or because they were in the pool?

Mr. DUFF: I think the reason they did not get that business was because they were in the New York pool.

Mr. BROWN: Granting that, could they have handled that trade constructed as they are if they had not been in the pool? Were they fitted for that traffic?

Mr. DUFF: Most of them are not, and for two reasons. One is that if you put 20,000 barrels of apples in what is called a single hold where there are no 'tween decks, before they arrive at their destination four or five tiers of the apples will be smashed. Another reason is that they have no cold storage or at least only one or two of them have. They are ordinary bulk steamers. They are not suitable for carrying coal, grain or practically anything else at a profitable rate.

[Mr. W. F. Maclean.]

Mr. BROWN: It is pretty hard for us to understand that.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Were these Norwegian steamers that carried the coal from Sydney to Montreal?

Mr. DUFF: No. The Norwegian steamers carried the apples. What I said about coal was that the Canadian National Railways in order evidently to help the Merchant Marine, paid them over 100 per cent more for carrying coal from Sydney to Montreal than they could have had it carried for in other vessels, and in spite of that the Merchant Marine had a deficit of over $9,000,000 on its operations for the year. Now, if they cannot do business on a basis of a hundred per cent more payment than other ships how can they compete with other vessels in the carrying of lumber, grain, or any other commodity and so make enough to save themselves from a deficit on their operating expenses?

Mr. LUCAS: What class of commodities were these ships supposed to carry when they were built?

Mr. DUFF: I do not think anybody knows what they were built to carry. The contracts were awarded during the height of the war and my own opinion is that the hon. gentleman who was then in charge of the Marine department let the thing run away from him. There was no attempt at all to build any special line of ships, and that is the reason why the management of these vessels is making such a poor showing.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): More blundering.

Mr. DUFF: They were war brides, yes.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): I said more blundering.

Mr. DUFF: Yes, it was a blunder. However, that is the reason matters have reached the position in which they are to-day.

Mr. JACOBS: Is it not a fact that these ships were built mostly for the West India trade?

Mr. DUFF: I am glad my hon. friend asked that question, because the other night when the Minister of Trade and Commerce was endeavouring to get his estimates through a discussion arose as to whether or not this subsidy should be paid, and whether the ships of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine could not be used in the West India business, instead of the ships of the Royal Mail Packet Company or some other vessels. The hon. member for Bow River twitted me with the speech I made in 1919 when I was sitting in opposition.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I may respectfully suggest to the hon. member that I had no intention of twitting him.

Mr. DUFF: You reminded me of it then.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Yes.

Mr. DUFF: I will take my remark back and say the hon. gentleman reminded me of the speech I made—

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Thank you.

Mr. DUFF: —in which I opposed the granting of subsidies. I am still opposed to the granting of subsidies if it is possible to avoid it.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Hear, hear.

Mr. DUFF: But we have a situation such as we have in the case of protection, and it is pretty hard to get clear of it.

An hon. MEMBER: Let us try it.

Mr. DUFF: I am willing to try it but I am endeavouring to show my hon. friend how, in my opinion, we can get clear of paying this $338,000 subsidy to the Royal Mail Packet Company, or to any other company on the West India route. Here is my idea of how to do that: This subsidy has been paid for a number of years either to the Royal Mail Packet Company or to some other company. At the time this subsidy was paid freight rates were much lower than they are at the present time, and there was not as much freight offering for West India ports, with the result that, perhaps, it was necessary for previous governments, whether it was a Liberal government or a Conservative government, in order to keep up the traffic between the West India Islands to give a subsidy to a line of steamships. But during the war years when the Royal Mail Packet Company was running on this route the business and the rates of freight were sufficient and they did not require a subsidy. That is the reason why I opposed the subsidy of $388,000 to the Royal Mail Packet Company in 1919. But what has happened since? Here is what the late government did and what the present government are now doing. Both governments are eqully to blame in my opinion and here is what they did. When the war was over, I think it was in 1919, the Canadian Government Merchant Marine management deliberately put four steamships, if I remember correctly, on the same route or practically the same route over which the Royal Mail Packet Company plies. The result was that immediately both these lines of ships were dividing the freight that was offering. Consequently there was not enough cargo offering for both ships to be filled. Both lines of ships were carrying half cargoes and their holds were half empty. Sometimes on the return trip the vessels of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine hardly had enough molasses for the crew to eat on the way home and the ships of the Royal Mail Packet Company were almost as bad.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Did they feed the crews of the ships on molasses?

Mr. DUFF: Well, they needed a little molasses to mix with their rum. After that when it was found that the Royal Mail Packet Company were losing business due to the fact that there was a competing line of government ships, or practically government ships, the manager of the former company came to Ottawa. He showed his statement of operations and demonstrated that there was a very large loss with the result that he got the government to increase the freight rates 50 per cent on goods going to the West Indies. Immediately the Royal Mail Packet Company increased their rates the Canadian Government Merchant Marine did the same. They had to. In spite of this fact however these ships, ever since they were operated by the Canadian Government Merchant Marine have been losing very large sums of money on the West India route.

Mr. JACOBS: Do I understand we were subsidizing the Royal Mail Packet Company and at the same time competing against them?

Mr. DUFF: Absolutely, that is the whole thing in a nut shell. We were paying $338,000 out of one pocket, and then taking a large portion of $9,000,000 out of the other pocket and paying part of the deficit on the operations of vessels of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine competing on the same route. If you call it good business for any department of government to do that I do not. That is the crux of the whole situation.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Surely the hon. gentleman does not contend that the whole deficit of $9,000,000 was incurred on that route?

Mr. DUFF: I did not say that, I said a part of the $9,000,000 deficit was incurred on that route. Now, we have never seen a statement of the operations of the government vessels on any one route.

Mr. MARTELL: May I ask a question?

Mr. DUFF: Let me finish the sentence first. I say we should ask the minister, before we

vote this large sum of money, to produce to this House and to the people statements showing the results of the operations of these steamships on the different routes, the profit or loss on the routes on which they run. Then we should get some information about this matter. But we have gone at it blindly. We did that last year, and I am as much to blame as anyone else. In half an hour we voted $4,500,000 for deficits on the operations of the Government Merchant Marine, and we voted this year $1,700,000 to cover expenditures under Governor General's warrant. Is that the way to handle the people money? I say it is not, and I for one am not going to do it again.

Mr. MARTELL: Does my hon. friend contend that we are subsidizing the Royal Mail Packet Company and at the same time running boats of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine in competition with them?

Mr. DUFF: Yes I think I answered that question before. That is quite true. Not only are we doing that but we are subsidizing lines to Australia and also running Canadian Government Merchant Marine boats in opposition to the Australian boats to which we are paying subsidies. Is that good business for the government to carry on? I think you will agree with me that it is not.

I was asked to explain the reason why these government boats could not run on the West India route. I think I got as far as to say that both lines were losing money and they came to Ottawa and got the Minister of Trade and Commerce to increase the freight rate 50 per cent. Now the way to stop the existing situation is this: The Minister of Trade and Commerce is to-day calling for tenders for a contract for a term of years. My candid opinion is that if the minister would say to the tenderers "We will take the boats of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine off those routes if you will do without a subsidy," if the steamship companies got that guarantee they would not want any of the existing subsidy or very little of it.

Mr. FORKE: Who would fix the rates if that were done?

Mr. DUFF: The law of supply and demand would regulate that every time. You cannot fix rates on the ocean. You may fix them for a little while but they are bound to break in the long run.

Mr. FORKE: You say that if the boats of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine were taken off that route the vessels of the other company would easily carry on the business without a subsidy?

[Mr. Duff.]

Mr. DUFF: Yes.

Mr. FORKE: That is all right.

Mr. DUFF: I say that if the Minister of Trade and Commerce would say to the persons who are likely to tender for this new contract that the management of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine would take their steamers off that route so that these men will have sufficient business—because they have to compete with other steamers and other sailing vessels anyway—they would be able to make a profit on their investment and put money to rest without the government having to pay them any subsidy.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Would you not suggest putting these government boats on the West India trade and paying them the subsidy?

Mr. DUFF: No. One reason is that the boats are not suitable for the West India business. They are single-decked boats.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Are they good for anything?

Mr. DUFF: I do not think they are good for very much. In answer to the question of the hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. Campbell) I wish to say these boats are not suitable for that route. It is a well known fact on that route passengers and mails are carried in addition to cargoes. In order to pretend that they were doing something, the Canadian Government Merchant Marine fitted up accommodation on three or four of these boats for a few passengers; one, I think, could carry about 37 passengers. That is quite enough for my argument, that such a boat would not be suitable for this traffic. Boats on this route carry three classes, steerage, second-class, and first-class passengers. In addition to that, they are supposed to carry His Majesty's mail. Men who do business in the West Indies take passage on these boats, and go there. In addition, men go there as second-class passengers and as steerage passengers. They also come from different parts of the West Indies to Canada. Therefore, the Canadian Government Merchant Marine vessels are not suitable for passenger boats. In reply to my hon. friend, I say it is impossible, without the expenditure of a large sum of money, to make these boats suitable. I noticed in the newspaper the other day the statement that it is the intention of the merchant marine to spend money in fixing up some of these boats to carry cattle to England. I was rather amused when I read that item in the paper. I do not know whether it is true or not. Perhaps the minister can tell us. These boats, of course, are not suitable to carry cattle. They

could only carry a small number of cattle, even if fitted up. It would be impossible for them to carry any large quantity of cattle. At $20 per head these boats could not carry enough cattle to pay for the coal used in crossing the Atlantic. Yet somebody states in the paper that they were going to fix up seven or eight steamers to carry cattle. The reason that information is given out is, I surmise, that Sir Henry Thornton wants to placate the people who have cattle in this country, and make them believe the Canadian Government Merchant Marine vessels are fit for something. Carrying cattle is the last thing under God's heaven that they are fit for, and I say the Canadian Government Merchant Marine have no business spending money fitting up these boats for that trade.

The other day we heard my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) and a number of other learned members on both sides of the House discussing a fine legal point as to whether Sir Henry Thornton had a right to take $2,000,000 from the treasury and use it in connection with the purchase of an hotel in Paris. The legal point raised was that the law was against Sir Henry in that proposition—that under the law he had no right to take that money for that purpose.

Mr. GRAHAM: I never admitted it.

Mr. DUFF: The minister, like myself, is not a lawyer. I was talking about the question of law. It he had no right to take money out of the treasury for that purpose, and if the law in relation to the Canadian Government Merchant Marine says that before any moneys are spent on capital account they must be voted by this parliament, where is Sir Henry Thornton going to get the money to fit up those ships to carry cattle? This will be capital expenditure, and I say that somebody should tell Sir Henry Thornton that he has no right to spend any money fitting up ships to carry cattle. Even if these ships were fitted up for this purpose, they would not be much good, because they could only carry a few cattle. They cannot carry them on deck across the Atlantic, and how many cattle could they carry on vessels running from five tc eight thousand tons gross tonnage? They could only carry a few when they are fitted up. Are the directors of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine going to allow Sir Henry Thornton and the management of the steamship company to spend large sums of money putting in 'tween decks to carry cattle? If they are going to keep the cattle in the hold in bulk, they would not be in good condition when they reached the other side. They must have 'tween decks put in, if they carry cattle.

Mr. FORKE: I think I saw them loading one Canadian Government Merchant Marine ship with cattle last summer, along with the passengers. I was told it was one of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine on which they were loading cattle.

Mr. DUFF: Does the hon. member know how many they carried?

Mr. FORKE: No.

Mr. DUFF: I say they are not fitted to carry cattle. If they are fitted up to carry cattle and a large amount of money spent on them, they will only carry such a small number of cattle that it will not pay. I say the government should not allow any further expenditure on capital account by Sir Henry Thornton or anybody else. Hon. members understand that, in order to carry cattle, the ships must be properly constructed, so that they can carry cattle in one part of them.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Does the hon. member argue that Sir Henry Thornton is deliberately deceiving the public in this matter?

Mr. DUFF: I am sorry the hon. member should suggest that I insinuated that Sir Henry Thornton was trying to deceive the public.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I did not mean that at all. I thought I heard the hon. member state that apparently the press statement that these ships were to be fitted up was intended to placate certain western interests.

Mr. DUFF: I did not say western interests; I said the people with cattle to ship. That is a different thing from saying Sir Henry Thornton was trying to deceive the public. The trouble with Sir Henry Thornton—and let me say it in the best of spirit—is the same as the trouble of my hon. friend from Bow River (Mr. Garland); that Sir Henry Thornton knows very little if anything about operating ships of this class, and less about the trade they are engaged in.

An hon. MEMBER: Nothing.

Mr. DUFF: Nothing. What does any director of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine know about operating ships? Nothing. —except John Sinclair. He is the only man on the directorate that knows anything about it. Not another man knows the first thing about it.

Mr. MARTELL: The hon. member is right there.

Mr. DUFF: I ask in all kindness, does the Minister of Railways know anything about operating ships?

Mr. GRAHAM: He does not know anything about the operating of railways either.

Mr. DUFF: Yes, he was Minister of Railways for many years, and had a chance to acquire some knowledge with regard to them.

Mr. PARENT: And he was in charge of canals also.

Mr. DUFF: But the operation of ships is an entirely different matter. I say that, inasmuch as the directors are practically without any knowledge of ships, and the deputy minister has no knowledge of ships, it is not fair to the taxpayers of the country who have to be taxed for everything they get, that they should pay this $18,000,000 deficit.

Mr. JACOBS: Do those men know as much about the running of ships as they do about the running of railways?

Mr. DUFF: Sir Henry Thornton knows something about running railways.

Mr. JACOBS: But the directors?

Mr. DUFF: I thought Sir Henry Thornton was a director of the National Railways. He is manager and director, without any shares in the company. I say that, in view of all the circumstances, in vew of the fact that these ships were built during wartime, in view of the fact that the right and proper thing to have done with the ships was to have sold them after they were built, when we could have realized something for them, in view of the fact that we have a deficit on operating expenses and interest to the amount of $18,000,000, and in view of the fact that these ships have depreciated to the extent of from sixty-five to sixty-nine million dollars, and nearly all the money which was used in construction is gone, it is time for the people of the country to say what they want done with these ships. I say these ships are not necessary to the business of the country.

The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Church) states they should be used on the Great Lakes for the carrying of grain. How are these little ships, which could carry only a few thousand bushels of grain, going to compete with ships which carry five and six hundred thousands of bushels of grain? It is ridiculous and there is no sense in it. It is useless for anybody to try to make out that these ships can make any money and pay their way or do the business of this country. I want to argue further that even if these ships were making money, even if they never lost a dollar and even if we could see into the future that these ships were going to earn money, it is not fair to this country that this government should carry on a ship-operating business. There is no necessity for it. It is not fair for private enterprise; it is not fair for people who have invested money in ships throughout this country and in other countries, and the government has no right to carry on this ship-operating business any longer.

Mr. FORKE: Will the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) allow me to read this sentence of Mr. Ballantyne's statement?

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.

That is from Mr. Ballantyne's speech in the session of 1920.

Mr. DUFF: That is quite true. Of course they did place ships on the Great Lakes.

Mr. FORKE: He says that they are of big enough size.

Mr. DUFF: He only thought so. He was speaking, of course, in good faith at the time, and he thought he might be able to work them in. The trouble was that they gave those contracts; the ships were being built; they had to take delivery of them; Mr. Ballantyne or the manager had to do something with them, and some of them were put on the Great Lakes, some on the Atlantic and some on the Pacific. The very fact that a number of those ships on the Great Lakes are laid up and not operating, proves conclusively that they are not suitable for Great Lakes business. I think it is a fact that some of them are laid up. The same thing applies on the Atlantic. A number of these ships have been laid up, and an announcement was made three months ago that twenty-seven of these ships were going to be sold. Why would they be sold if they could be used for some purpose?

Mr. FORKE: In Great Britian a good deal of coasting trade is done. Would they be suitable for coastal trade, say between Edinburgh and London,—for a short passage, what they call coasting trade, say between Leith and London?

Mr. DUFF: Of course I do not know very much about shipping in the Old Country, but I think they would be suitable for short distances and small bulk cargoes like coal from Swansea or Newcastle or somewhere else.

Mr. JACOBS: They could be used for rum-runners.

Mr. DUFF: Yes they would be very useful for that.

Mr. GRAHAM: They could not run fast enough.

Mr. DUFF: As I was saying, the fact that twenty-seven of these boats are according to announcement, going to be sold, proves conclusively that the company and the directors think that they are not suitable for the business of this country. In spite of the fact that this announcement came out three months ago, and in spite of the fact, that I think, it was the old directors who decided about a year ago to sell the boats, no attempt has been made to sell them. This money is all lying idle. If Sir Henry Thornton or anybody else knew anything about this business, they would try to sell these ships and get clear of them, at least the twenty-seven that they are supposed to sell. So far as I can see, no advertisements have appeared and nothing has been done to try to get rid of these twenty-seven ships. I believe it is in the best interest of the country that the full number of ships be sold at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): They would be no good for anything, according to the hon. member's argument.

Mr. DUFF: But we would be clear of them, whether they are good or not. This country should not be running them at a loss. The hon. member for York (Mr. Maclean) will agree with me that he is not favourable to this scheme of losing $9,000,000 every year in interest on the money.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): I want to get the hon. member's argument.

Mr. DUFF: My argument is that the government has no right in the shipping business at all.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Have we a right in the railway business?

Mr. DUFF: The government should sell these ships at the earliest possible moment, take what they can get for them and clean this thing up. The argument about these ships bringing business to the Canadian National Railways has nothing in it. If they get some business on both the Atlantic and the Pacific, there is no difficulty at all for the head of the government railways to arrange with other shipbuilding companies to get business. If Sir Henry Thornton wants to do something for his railways, he could sell these ships and get, perhaps, ten to fifteen million dollars for them. Then if he thought he had to buy some ships, he would have some money with which to buy passenger and freight ships to compete with the Canadian Pacific railway. You have heard in this House no doubt, Mr. Chairman, the argument we had about the Canadian Government Merchant Marine, that the Canadian Pacific has ships. Most of the ships of the Canadian Pacific are of a different class entirely from these ships. Either they are ocean liners. freight and passenger ships combined, or they have turned their old passenger ships into cargo boats and fitted them up properly for that purpose. They are a different class of boats altogether from the ships of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine, and consequently nobody can make any comparison between the ships of the Canadian Pacific Railway and these tramp steamers which are owned by this country at the present time.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Would the hon. member suggest or advocate or support the policy of selling these boats which he regards as unsuited, and investing in boats that would be suitable for the trade?

Mr. DUFF: I would not suggest that because I do not think it is necessary. But if Sir Henry Thornton wants to stay in the shipping business, it would be far better for him to sell these boats, realize ten or fifteen million dollars for them, and put that money into ocean steamships which would carry passengers to this country from Paris or wherever he is going to have that big hotel. I do not think, however, that is necessary. The $15,000,000 that can be realized on these ships can be placed in the public treasury to reduce partly the $78,000,000 which this country has invested in this project. The reason why it is not necessary to have these ships is that Sir Henry Thornton or the manager of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine can go to-morrow and make an arrangement with the White Star line or the Cunard line to run to Montreal, Quebec, Halifax or St. John and connect with the Canadian National Railways both going across the Atlantic and coming this way, delivering cargoes from St. John and other points to the Old Country and bringing passengers and cargoes to ports in Canada for our railways.

Mr. KNOX: The hon. member said just now that these vessels might be used for carrying coal from Swansea. Would it not necessarily follow, if they are suitable to do that, that they might be used in carrying coal from Sydney?

Mr. DUFF: I do not think the hon. gentleman was in when I said a moment ago, to

prove that there is not much in that statement—

Mr. CARROLL: Coasting trade.

Mr. DUFF: Let me answer the question in my own way. A few moments ago, to prove my argument that there is not much in that, I said that the Canadian National Railways, that is the railway owned by you and me, allowed to the ships of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine, I think it was $3.80 but I will say $2.80 a ton, to carry coal from Sydney to Montreal when other ships were carrying it from Sydney to Montreal for $1.10 and later on for $1.25 a ton. Consequently, I think the hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Knox) will agree with me that Canadian Government Merchant Marine ships are not suitable to carry coal from Sydney to Montreal or anywhere else.

Mr. KNOX: Would the same thing not apply to Swansea?

Mr. DUFF: No, it would not apply to Swansea at all. That is a different trade, a different business, a shorter route, and the expenses are very much lighter over there. There are several reasons. I do not care what anybody did with the ships as long as they bought them and took them off our hands. I am not interested in what they do with them; but this government has no right to be in the ship-operating business. Our friends once in a while taunt us with the fact that a Liberal government built the Grand Trunk Pacific railway. Whether that was a mistake or not, the Grand Trunk is in a very different position from the ships of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine. When that railway was built it invited people to go in and settle along the line, and from M ..cton to Cochrane or Winnipeg, wherever it ends, people went in and settled after the railway was built. Consequently, we cannot abandon it, and so the railway proposition is entirely different from the shipping proposition. Nobody will be hurt if the ships of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine are tied up to-morrow and offered for sale. If I were selfish—I am likely to lose votes by the speech I am making to-night. Some of the best captains of the government ships are from my own county; I might say the very best captains belong to that part of the country, one of whom, Captain Sprague, was four years in a German prison.

Mr. MARTELL: Not better than the captains from Hants?

Mr. DUFF: So that if I were selfish I would not advocate the selling of these ships. But I say that in the interests of the country this is the only proper course for the government to take. Now, this government has had sixteen months in which to decide the question. It came into office in December, 1921, or in January, 1922, and while I can quite understand that the late Minister of Railways did not have time to look into the problem, nevertheless the government has now had ample opportunity to study the whole situation and to make up their minds on the matter. Instead of voting this $1,500,000, and supplying further amounts during the recess—because the Government Marine will need more money—the government should at the earliest possible moment suggest to the Merchant Marine that they sell some of these ships. No one would be injured by the transaction and it would be in the best interests of shipping in this country. The rates would not be increased on cattle or grain or coal or lumber, because there is no trouble for any man who has a cargo to get tonnage to carry it. For that reason therefore I urge upon the government again, instead of paying this $1,500,000 over to the Canadian Merchant Marine, to instruct that corporation to sell some of these ships and pay to the banks the money it owes them and later on try to sell the rest of the ships for whatever can be obtained in order to meet as far as possible the principal the government has advanced on this undertaking.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: There is not much mystery about the position of affairs in regard to these boats, or as to why they were built. The leader of the Progressive party (Mr. Forke) wants information. Well, the matter was started, as pointed out by my hon. friend (Mr. Duff), in 1918 when civilization had suffered losses amounting to some fifteen millions of tonnage, and the insistency for boats was tremendous. So that we went into the boatbuilding business. In 1919, there was still a tremendous shortage of boats, Canadian commerce could not move, and there was great need for further shipping. We went into the business as other people did and we know what has happened. We have had a collapse in every direction in connection with the earnings of boats. But this is not only a matter of government experience; it is the experience of private companies and owners as well. I can pay the hon. member this compliment, that he is just recommending the course he and other vessel owners have had to follow themselves. I heard someone sympathizing very much the other day with the hon. member because of the difficulties he had experienced, having

gone into the boatbuilding business believing that there was a great necessity for more tonnage. He lost a great deal of money in consequence and therefore got out of the business. There are many others in a similar position. The International Marine, one of the largest corporations of the kind in the world, wound up their whole operations last year, if the newspapers are correct, with a rather uncomfortable deficit. But I do not know that the matter is really as bad as the hon. member would have us believe. I want to get a little information from the minister.

Mr. FORKE: I asked a question earlier in the debate, but it has not yet been answered. Who was responsible for designing and building a type of ship that apparently is not useful for anything?

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Horse marines.

Mr. FORKE: I do not wonder at there being losses in depreciation and so forth, but surely there should have been built ships that would have been suitable for some kind of trade. Someone must be responsible in the matter.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The ships were built under the supervision of first class naval architects. They are staunch, strong, seaworthy general purpose boats, that have made money in the general carrying business. I do not know how things are to-day, but I know it has been stated by boards of trade that general purpose ships are renumerative, and I know that some of the trips of these vessels were of that character. The boats are good; there is nothing the matter with them.

Mr. JACOBS: Does the hon. member think they could carry raisins from Australia without danger?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: No doubt the hon. gentleman is looking forward to tremendous shipments in that particular trade and he may ask his question of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Robb) in whom he has tremendous confidence. Looking over the report, it seems to me that while it is accurate as a matter of bookkeeping—

Mr. MARTELL: Will the hon. member permit me a question?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Let us finish this question first. We will get to Hants later on.

Mr. MARTELL: The best seamen come from there.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: We may discuss that later on. It seems to me that a good many of these losses are hardly worth debating on the issue as presented by the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff). They are not operating losses. I find, according to the statement—and I wish the minister would check me as I go along—that the net loss on operating account to date is $3,559,711.75.

Mr. DUFF: For one year?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: For the whole time.

Mr. DUFF: Where does the hon. member get those figures?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The total deficit given by my hon. friend was $18,791,000 odd, and I am taking off the different interest items and depreciation. The whole total of these interest items and depreciation items is $15,231,573.15. I have just added it up roughly, but I think I am approximately right.

Mr. DUFF: No doubt the hon. member heard me say that when the government pays over this vote it will have paid to the Government Marine some $7,500,000. In addition to that it will be observed that there is a surplus of $1,000,000, which makes a total of $8,500,000. If what the hon. member says is correct, that there is a loss of only $3,000,000, what have they done with the other $5,000,000?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That is what I want to find out. It seems to me that some of the other items were cross entries, and the government have been asking for something that has not to do with deficits in operations. The most I can make out of the real deficit of operation is $3,559,711. I think that is pretty nearly the conclusion reached by the hon. member for Lunenburg.

Mr. DUFF: Only I think I made the deficit something over $4,000,000. But there is still $4,000,000 gone somewhere.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Over and above that?

Mr. DUFF: Yes, there is no sign of it in the statement. Why do they want this money to-night?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It does seem to me, Mr. Chairman, that really all the money that need be voted to look after this service is sufficient to cover the actual out-of-pocket losses, just as we do with our railways. We do not vote depreciation and interest payments to the railways when we own the in-

vestment ourselves. For example, we do not vote anything to cover our investment in the Intercolonial or in the Transcontinental. The only money we ever vote on interest account for the railways is something that the railways must pay, not what they owe us. So it does seem to me that nothing ought to be voted except the actual out-of-pocket loss in connection with the operation of this line. In other words, whatever the actual out-of-pocket payments are, those ought to be the full extent of our liability.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is exactly what it is.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: No, I think my hon. friend will find he is wrong.

Mr. GRAHAM: No.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Well, the hon. member for Lunenburg narrated a series of votes—I confess I did not have the figures before me. For last year he gave us $4,000,000, and for this year he said the vote would be in excess of $4,000,000, and I think he got it up to over $8,000,000.

Mr. DUFF: The money that has been voted and will be voted, if this item goes through, is over $7,500,000. In addition to that, the company showed a surplus in 1919 of $1,000,000, which added to the $7,500,000 makes $8,500,000. Now, the very most that can be shown as deficits is some $4,000,000 odd. In other words, they will have about $5,000,000 more than the deficits amount to. Why do they want all that money?

Mr. GRAHAM: I am afraid my hon. friend has got mixed in his figures. In the first place, the surplus, if surplus there was, in the year he mentioned would I presume have to go to pay interest on loans.

Mr. DUFF: No, nothing was paid.

Mr. GRAHAM: It does appear in this statement.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: There was only half a million dollars paid.

Mr. DUFF: In 1920.

Mr. GRAHAM: It is not $7,000,000, it is $6,000,000, and I am going to show how it is made up. The amount provided was as follows:

Main Estimates 1922-23..	$4,360,720 00
Further Supplementary Estimates 1922-23 (including Governor General's warrant, $1,000,000 of November 20, 1922).. ..	1,700,000 00
Total..	$6,060,720 00

Operating deficit for the year ending December 31st, 1921..		$2,210,724 55
Operating deficit for the year ending December 31st, 1922.. ..	$2,384,189 17	
Less amounts received for subsidy West Indies Service	59,090 00	
		2,325,099 17

Here is something that I explained in the beginning, but my hon. friend has not taken it into consideration because it was not in the annual statement. The calendar year is the business year of the Merchant Marine, but the estimates of this House are made up to the 31st March. This explains the following:

Operating deficits for months January, February and March 1923, $457,770.13.

That was in last year's vote and in this year's calendar expenses.

Mr. DUFF: You are still losing money this year.

Mr. GRAHAM: Last year.

Amount advanced July 15, 1922, for working capital..	$ 930,697 68
Capital expenditure to March 31, 1923..	55,564 55
Balance of appropriation not required.	80,865 92
Total..	$6,060,720 00

The amount we are asking for is the estimated amount of what the deficit will be. The figures I have given are not for this year.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: How can my friend make that out unless the returns given by the company are all wrong? The hon. member for Lunenburg starts out with this surplus of 31st December 1920. I assume that is an operating surplus.

Mr. DUFF: That is what the report says it is.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Very well. Then we have the two other years 1921 and 1922. Accepting these figures of loss just as given by the hon. minister we have got $4,594,913. If that be the operating surplus, as is shown—

Mr. GRAHAM: Deficit.

Mr. DUFF: Operating loss.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: But we ought to deduct the operating surplus of $1,056,767 from that loss before we get our net position.

Mr. DUFF: Absolutely.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not see any escape from that when the company bring down the result of the whole of their trading in their last annual report. The minister is quite right if he takes the last two years by themselves, but we have everything brought down in the last report signed by Sir Henry

Thornton. I think if the minister looks into that he will find I am correct.

Mr. GRAHAM: In what are you correct?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I want to get at how much ought to be voted, and how much we are going behind. I was taking out of that statement items which, while they are very real to the investor, so far as we are concerned to-day, are book-keeping entries. I find the total of book-keeping entries on this consolidated balance sheet of the report of 1923, $15,231,573.15, leaving real out-of-pocket charges of $3,559,711.75.

12 m.

Mr. GRAHAM: I cannot follow my hon. friend's calculation.

Mr. DUFF: I think my hon. friend is right, because if you deduct the $1,000,000 surplus from my amount the figures agree.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Yes, it is checking it another way.

Mr. DUFF: Absolutely.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I would ask the minister to look into that and see if we are not right.

Mr. GRAHAM: I would suggest that when you pay half a million dollars into the Receiver General's receptive hands you cannot get it out without a vote.

Mr. DUFF: That was paid a long time before the surplus of $1,000,000 was shown on the books. It was paid two years before.

Mr. GRAHAM: No.

Mr. DUFF: I beg your pardon, it was. It was paid before this $1,000,000 surplus was shown.

Mr. GRAHAM: What year was the $1,000,000 surplus shown?

Mr. DUFF: December 31, 1920.

Mr. GRAHAM: There was a deficit of over $2,000,000 in 1920.

Mr. DUFF: On December 31, 1920, the account shows a surplus of $1,000,000. Previous to that this $500,000 was deducted from the earnings of the company. It is useless for the minister to say that this $500,000 was paid out of the $1,000,000 surplus.

Mr. GRAHAM: We will not argue about it, as we will get a full statement to-morrow. There would be no place to put it but in the Receiver-General's hands and there would be no way to pay it if there was not a surplus.

Mr. DUFF: The statement of 1919 shows a profit of $1,400,000; the 1920 statement shows a profit of $600,000; that is $2,000,000 altogether. The $500,000 was paid out of this $2,000,000 and after allowing for depreciation left a surplus of $1,000,000, the amount my hon. friend stated. The $500,000 was deducted a year before the $1,000,000 surplus was shown. What good is it for the minister to argue that the $500,000 came out of the $1,000,000 surplus? It came out of the $2,000,000 profits that the company was supposed to earn.

Mr. GRAHAM: We will have a statement made up to date to-morrow concerning all the transactions.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The hon. member for Lunenburg asked a rhetorical question as to what Sir Henry Thornton would know about boats. Well, to be fair to Sir Henry Thornton I should think he operated in England just about as many miles of ocean traffic as he did land traffic. Certainly for fifty per cent of his total mileage he would have water mileage to the same extent.

Mr. DUFF: That is coastal boats and passenger boats.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: No, boats to the Continent and back, to Flushing and other points. I think Sir Henry Thornton has had a good deal of experience in regard to boats.

Mr. MARTELL: What was the extreme distance between the termini of the route of these ships?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: If we were to follow up that question it would lead to other considerations concerning Sir Henry Thornton and I do not care to follow the subject. Certainly there is just as big a difference between the termini in this country, from the Pacific on the one side and the Atlantic on the other as there is on these water routes in connection with the railways in England. But I do not think that is a fair way of looking at it. I just wanted to point out that he knew something about this marine business.

I should say for the benefit of the leader of the Opposition who asked as to the cost, that the cost of construction was greater than he thinks. The original cost was $191.95 per ton on the average. With that can be compared the cost of the American Shipping Board for the work done at the same time, which was $215 per ton. Our work actually was $23.05 a ton cheaper than was the work done in the yards that are nearest to us and where the fairest comparison can be made. I wanted to ask a further question, and that is, is it true that the business of the Canadian National Railways is carried on in so far as

lake and water services are concerned at a charge 100 per cent greater than there is any justification for? The minister shakes his head. I think that was a very serious charge made by the hon. member for Lunenburg. If it be true that the practice of the railway is to subsidize these boats by paying them twice as much for their services as would be paid to other boats, it is rather an extraordinary situation. The hon. member has given the exact figures here to-night. It may be that he is entirely mistaken in his information, but I think the minister should go into that and let us have some information on that point. On the other hand, to be fair, Sir Henry Thornton, who knows about shipping because he has done almost as much shipping work in England as railway work, says that these boats have been a great feeder to his system. I would like to know what the minister thinks of that.

Mr. GRAHAM: If hon. gentlemen will permit me, as we do not intend to pass this vote to-night I would like the item to stand. With regard to the figures given by the hon. member for Lunenburg I think if the hon. member looks at his figures as to charges made by these boats of the Merchant Marine he will find that he has made a mistake. This is my information. However, that can be looked into.

Would the committee allow me to put through item 358 for the running of the canals all over Canada? This item is some $33,000 less than last year. It is for the purpose of the working of our canals.

Mr. MARTELL: Before we leave the Merchant Marine, some time ago I asked a question of the ex-Minister of Finance in regard to shipping and he told me that he wanted to finish his sentence. He was a long time finishing it.

Speaking of shipping, I represent a county that built the largest sailing ships that were ever built in Canada. The W. D. Lawrence was built at Maitland in the county of Hants. I did not rise for the purpose of prolonging this discussion. I heard some very pertinent questions put to the minister and the hon. member for Lunenburg by the leader of the Progressive party, and I did not hear him get many answers. I simply want to say that I absolutely agree with the hon. member for Lunenburg in the criticism which he has made of the Merchant Marine. The time has come in this country when the Merchant Marine should be disposed of. I believe that we are running riot as regards government ownership of all sorts of things. My hon. friend from Toronto in the course of his address asked if these ships were thoroughly equipped in every manner for the purpose of carrying on business. Now, any person who knows anything about ships or who has ever lived near the sea shore and has seen some of the ships of the Merchant Marine knows that they are absolutely unfit for ninety per cent of the trade which offers to-day. Any person who goes aboard them knows that the hatches are so situated that it is absolutely impossible to load or unload with quick despatch. Nor as my hon. friend from Lunenburg says, are they fit for the transportation of cattle. It is true they may be able to take over a few cattle, but they cannot take them over with profit to this country. I think the quicker we get clear of these boats the better. If we are going to have a shipping trade at all, let us get ships that are able to take the trade offering to the Old Country, ships of the proper type, not the ships of the Merchant Marine built not for the purposes of trade but for the purpose of supplying employment to people during the war and giving contracts to friends of the late government. The quicker we get rid of them the better it will be in the interests of Canadian industry.

I would suggest with all due deference to the Minister of Railways, who is an excellent man, that the quicker the administration of shipping in this country is put in the hands of men who are seamen—and if he wants me to find him seamen and will give me the patronage I will bring them up even from that historic county of Hants—the better it will be, but so long as the shipping interests of this country and its ships are to be run by a bunch of landlubbers so long will the people of Canada be compelled to pay an immense amount in deficits. It is not fair to the people of this Dominion that we should go on year after year voting money to pay deficits on these ships. It is all very well to vote the money. Then during the recess Governor General's warrants will be issued for the purpose of supplying money to a lot of landlubbers to carry on the foolish scheme, and if I or any other hon. member goes to the minister and asks for something in the way of improvement of port facilities or improvement in the trade facilities in his constituency he is told that he cannot get it because the Finance Minister has not got the money for it and could not make that particular grant. But in the meantime we are voting millions of money to the Canadian National Railways —and the quicker we get rid of that the better, though that opinion may not be received with joy by most people in the country but

we have them upon us and we have to take care of them—and millions more for the Merchant Marine. Let us get rid of these ships of the Merchant Marine, this great octopus. If we cannot do anything better with it than we have done in the past I would ask that it be given to some son of Israel to be put on the dump pile. It is not fair to the people of this Dominion to go on voting money to make up deficits on the Merchant Marine year after year. I was hoping the hon. member for Lunenburg would move for the cutting out of the vote. Liberal as I am, I would vote against any government that persisted in continuing votes for the Canadian Merchant Marine.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I was not intending to speak on this question but when we have such great authorities as we have heard tonight differing so much about the utility of these boats it seems to me the only way to settle it is to give them a better trial than they have got yet. I have listened to the ex-Minister of Finance and he tells me that these vessels are of modern pattern and built like freighters, and are as good as could be put into the service. I want to believe that story because we are in need of boats. On the other hand the hon. member for Lunenburg and the hon. member for Hants tell us almost that they are not worth the powder to blow them up. Now which is true? I do not know. Coming from the West, as my hon. friend says, I am supposed to be classified among the landlubbers. Well I do not object to being that at all but I tell you what I want: I want to get some of these boats that will carry cattle overseas. We have been in correspondence with Sir Henry Thornton and he has finally decided to try out six of these boats for this purpose, and before they are blown to Kingdom come I want to give them a trial. We have been discussing this thing three or four times this winter and spring. Now we have got to it again and fitting them up temporarily it is probable that without very much expenditure they will probably be ready in ten days or so. After a trial we will know more about them. They will have served their purpose, for three months they will have had a fair trial and then we shall know definitely one way or the other. We shall probably then have some information as to what disposition ought to be made of these particular vessels, or some larger ones that may be put into service for this special purpose we have in view.

Item stands.

Progress reported.

VIMY RIDGE MEMORIAL

THANKS OF FRENCH PRESIDENT FOR JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the following letter:

OTTAWA, 12th June, 1923.

Sir,—I have it in command from His Excellency the Governor General to transmit to you copy of a despatch from the Secretary of State for the Colonies enclosing copy of a note from the French Ministry for Foreign Affairs, conveying the thanks of the President of the Republic for the joint resolution of the Canadian Houses of Parliament regarding the gift of land on Vimy Ridge by the French government.

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

(Signed) JOSEPH POPE.
Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs.

The Hon. Speaker of the House of Commons, Ottawa.

DOWNING STREET, 29 May, 1923.

My Lord,—With reference to my despatch No. 193 of the 28th of April, I have the honour to transmit to Your Excellency, to be laid before your ministers, the accompanying copy of a note from the French Ministry for Foreign Affairs, conveying the thanks of the president of the Republic for the joint resolution of the Canadian Houses of parliament regarding the gift of land on Vimy Ridge by the French government.

I have the honour to be, My Lord,

Your Lordship's most obedient humble servant.

(Signed) DEVONSHIRE.

His Excellency,
The Right Honourable
Lord BYNG OF VIMY, G.C.B., G.C.M.G., M.V.O., etc., etc., etc.

(Translation)

French Republic

Ministry of Foreign Affairs

America.

Monsieur l'Ambassadeur,

I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of the letter dated the 28th April last, and in which Mr. **Eric Phipps** was kind enough to enclose two copies of a resolution adopted by the Canadian parliament, to accept the gift by France of a parcel of land, on Vimy ridge, where it is proposed to erect a monument recalling the achievements of the Canadian soldiers.

Monsieur le President of the Republic, to whom these documents were presented in pursuance of the wish of the Canadian government, requests me to convey his thanks and wishes you to transmit to the government of Canada the expression of his gratitude.

Mr. Millerand has appreciated most highly the so cordial terms which the Canadian parliament made use of to express its gratefulness to the French government.

Kindly accept, Sir, the assurances of my highest esteem.

(Signed) POINCARÉ.

Paris, May 15, 1923.

On motion of Mr. Fielding the House adjourned at 12.20 a.m. (Wednesday).

Wednesday, June 13, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

BIOLOGICAL BOARD ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 206, to amend the Biological Board Act.

He said: The Biological board, as it consists to-day has two members appointed by the government, and one representative of each university that carries on biological researches. The purpose of this bill is to add three members, one representing the Department of Marine and Fisheries and two others representing the fisheries industries both in the East and in the West.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

WHEAT SHIPMENTS FROM QUEBEC

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

1. How many bushels of wheat were received in the public elevator at Quebec and exported from that port in the years 1914-15-16-17-18-19-20-21-22?

2. How many bushels of other grains were received in the public elevator at Quebec and exported from that port in the same years?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. Year	Wheat received	Wheat exported
1914	75,174	Nil
1915	2,519	Nil
1916	1,162,066	1,137,461
1917	9,764	Nil
1918	3,257,368	2,936,104
1919	3,943,393	3,606,563
1920	113,780	513,028
1921	1,265,967	1,243,285
1922	2,009,207	1,810,911
2. Year	**Other grains received**	**Other grains exported**
1914	639,556	Nil
1915	264,739	Nil
1916	913,612	638,742
1917	941,277	Nil
1918	2,365,860	1,255,260
1919	249,430	69,352
1920	337,006	Nil
1921	4,345,277	2,838,893
1922	1,666,133	138,723

NAVAL BASE AT SINGAPORE

Mr. MACLEAN (York):

1. With reference to the proposal of the British government to expend £10,000,000 upon the creation of a naval base at Singapore, is it a fact, as stated in the British House of Commons on first of May last by Mr. Eyres-Monsell, Financial Secretary of the Admiralty, that—"This work was approved by the Dominion Conference in 1921 and it was most strongly represented by the Dominions"?

2. Is it a fact that Mr. Eyres-Monsell, at the same time and place, said, with reference to the expenditure, that—"he had great hopes that the Dominions, which had a very direct interest in the work, would see their way to co-operate with us in this direction"?

3. Is it probable that the hopes of Mr. Eyres-Monsell will be fulfilled?

4. Is it a fact that Colonel Amery, First Lord of the Admiralty, at the same time and place said—"He had no doubt that the Conference to be held in the autumn would endorse the conclusions arrived at by the Conference of 1921"?

5. Is it probable that the prediction of the First Lord will be fulfilled?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): The government has no information with respect to the several questions asked.

WELLAND SHIP CANAL

Mr. CHURCH:

1. What amount of money has been spent and what work completed to date on the new Welland Ship Canal?

2. What contracts are being undertaken this year?

3. How much of the total work yet remains to be finished?

4. Is the work being done by contract or day labour, and will the Government in future allow tenderers to use their own plant on contracts?

5. When is it expected that the new Welland Ship Canal will be open for traffic, and will the work be expedited?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. $34,813,512.84 to April 30, 1923.

Percentages of principal items of work completed: earth excavation. 48 per cent; watertight embankment, 60 per cent; reinforcing steel, 40 per cent; rock excavation, 31 per cent; concrete, all classes, 31 per cent.

2. Probably the upper entrance and guard lock will be placed under contract.

3. Answered by No. 1.

4. Contract; yes.

5. If annual appropriations necessary to economic construction are voted by Parliament, and no serious interruptions are encountered, it is hoped to complete by 1927.

DETERMINATION OF A SHIP'S POSITION

Mr. HOCKEN:

1. Has the attention of the government or the department of Marine been drawn, since the Great War, to the methods constantly employed in the North Sea and elsewhere whereby the exact position of a ship in a fog can be accurately determined, those methods being to explode a small depth charge on the ship, the resultant sound being recorded at two wireless stations; or the simpler one of sending wireless messages to two or more stations which can by comparison of results, fix the position of the ship?

2. If so, has provision for the use of either of these methods been adopted by the erection of suitable substations at Cape Race near which the S.S. Marvale recently went down, by either of the government of this Dominion or that of Newfoundland?

3. If not, why not?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. Radio direction finding: Yes. Sound ranging: Yes.

2. Radio direction finding: Yes. The Canadian government erected radio direction finding stations at Cape Race, Canso, and Chebucto Head in 1918. They have been in constant operation 24 hours a day since they were opened. Cape Race is 21 miles from the reef on which the Marvale struck. Sound ranging: No.

3. Radio direction finding: Answered by No. 1 and No. 2. Sound ranging: No sound ranging stations of the type mentioned are in practical operation as an aid to navigation in any country of the world. The department is keeping in touch with the development of these systems and does not consider it would be justified in recommending any expenditure in this reference at the moment.

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY—TIES

Mr. HANSON:

1. Were tenders called in 1923 for a supply of ties to the Grand Trunk Railway, such ties being for use in or to come from the Matapedia Valley in the Province of Quebec?

2. If so, who were the tenderers, and at what rates?

3. Who obtained the contract and why?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM: I think on reflection my hon. friend will agree with me that the detailed information asked for in this question is such that it would not be in the interest of the Canadian National Railways that it should be made public. That is my answer.

GREAT LAKES—DIVERSION OF WATERS

Mr. CHURCH:

1. Have any complaints been received from the Dominion Marine Association, or harbour commissions on the Great Lakes in reference to the illegal diversion of the waters of the Great Lakes through the Chicago drainage canal?

2. Is the Government aware that this diversion of the waters of the Great Lakes to the Gulf of Mexico is having disastrous effects on the carrying capacity of ships and on the levels of the lower lakes and the St. Lawrence?

3. What does the government propose to do in the matter?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. Yes, but not recently.

2. The government believes that the diversion at Chicago has injuriously affected the navigable capacity of the connecting channels of the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence river.

3. The matter is under consideration.

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

TERMINAL ELEVATORS AND THE GRAIN TRADE

Hon. Mr. STEVENS:

1. (a) How many public terminal elevators in Fort William and Port Arthur have private terminal elevators which are owned by the same company, or practically the same company, or whose shareholders and executives are interlocked and associated in both enterprises; and how many of these said elevators have facilities for direct connections for transferring grain from the private elevator to the public?

(b) Has any direct transferring between a public and private elevator ever been done, or reported to have been done?

(c) Is the practice being carried on at the present time?

(d) By whose authority was the transferring, if any, done?

(e) Does the Canada Grain Act not state that a private and a public elevator shall have no physical connection?

2. Is all the grain at a terminal point, as provided by the Canada Grain Act, officially weighed in and out of all elevators?

3. Are all elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur weighed up annually as provided by the Canada Grain Act? If not, why not?

4. Does the Inspection Department inspect grain and issue certificates according to section 27 of the Grain Act?

5. (a) In the loading of grain on boats at waterfront elevators situated at Port Arthur and Fort William, what method of inspection is carried on by the Inspection Department?

(b) Are samples taken from the belt in the tunnels of the elevator, or are the samples taken from the running stream of grain when it is running into the boat, or is it taken both in the tunnel of the elevator and from the running stream?

(c) In the case of a difference between the sample taken at the tunnel and the one taken from the running stream into the boat, which sample is considered official?

6. (a) Does the Inspection Department determine the amount of excess moisture that is contained in tough, damp and wet grain, and place same on each certificate issued for off-grade grain?

(b) Does the terminal elevator take out the excess moisture above normal, when drying grain as per their tariff?

(c) Are moisture tests made before grain is dried in public terminal elevators to ascertain what shrinkage or loss will be charged the owner of the grain by the elevator performing the drying? If not, how is the shrinkage arrived at?

(d) Does the Inspection Department verify and see that terminal elevators take out all excess moisture over normal on grain they are drying according to their tariff?

7. What authority does the Inspection Department demand of a terminal elevator as to ownership or authorized agency, before any parcel can be loaded out; and is inspection made accordingly to ensure that the quality of grain or grain by-products ordered out by the owner or authorized agent is up to that received by the elevator from the owner?

8. Does the Inspection Department issue and charge a fee for inspecting grain or grain by-products that do not represent the quality as ordered out by the owner or authorized agent?

9. If contract wheat contains one to two per cent of small and shrivelled wheat, does the Inspection

Department make this car a "clean to clean," or do they put one or two per cent dockage, as the case may be, on this car?

10. What are the charges levied by the government for inspection and weighing grain in each consecutive year since 1912?

11. Is grain arriving at a public terminal elevator in the Western Inspection Division, carrying a grade certificate and binned under government supervision, as provided for by the Canada Grain Act, subject to another inspection charge on being loaded out? If so, why the duplicate inspection?

12. Are the weighing and inspection charges based on the actual cost of the service rendered, and how is this determined?

13. Is the owner of grain, the grade of which is in dispute with the Inspection Department and placed for survey, entitled to a sealed portion of official sample the survey is determined on? If so, from whom does he obtain same?

UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR PRODUCTION OF PAPERS

CANADIAN MERCANTILE MARINE

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

For a copy of all correspondence, telegrams, papers, writings and documents of any kind, passing between any member or department of the government and the Canadian National Railways or Canadian Mercantile Marine managers or directors or officers, since January 1st, 1922, relating in any way to the vessels of the Canadian Mercantile Marine, their use or suitability, or making in any way recommendations as to sale or other disposition of said vessels.

SOLDIERS' CIVIL RE-ESTABLISHMENT

VANCOUVER EMPLOYEES

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. H. S. BELAND (Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment): I should like to supply some information that was asked for the other day by the hon. member for St. John City and Counties of St. John and Albert (Mr. MacLaren) in connection with some employees whose services had been dispensed with in Vancouver. I have a statement from the secretary of the department to the effect that the contention of my hon. friend is right that the names of Messrs. Cruit, Flewin, Irvine and Beattie should have been included in the original answer. They were left out through an error on the part of the record clerks who prepared the information for our office. It is to be noted, however, that these names were not actually struck off our pay roll until the 30th April and that they were given notice on the 31st January, not on the 28th February as stated by my hon. friend. That is probably the reason for the error.

NAVAL BASE AT SINGAPORE

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): I desire to call the attention of the House and the government to the answer of the Prime Minister just given to question Number 4, asked by the hon. member for South York. He said that the government had no information. As regards the first question, which is the pith of the questions, the government has not only information, but all the information. The question is:

With reference to the proposal of the British government to expend £10,000,000 upon the creation of a naval base at Singapore, is it a fact, as stated in the British House of Commons on first of May last by Mr. Eyres-Monsell, Financial Secretary of the Admiralty, that—"This work was approved by the Dominion Conference in 1921 and it was most strongly represented by the Dominions"?

The government has the full report of that conference in its possession, and can certainly give an answer to this question.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): The government has not any information as to what happened in parliament in England.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is not the question.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The House has the report and it is open to any hon. member to examine the report. The government has received no information as to whether any such statement was ever made in parliament.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The question is: "Is it a fact that this was approved at the conference?" The government has the information as to whether or not that is a fact, and the question whether it is contained in the report does not matter. The government is asked a question in the House and should answer it, because it has the full information.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The report of the conference has been laid on the Table of the House, and it is open to any member to examine it. I will be pleased to lay it on the Table again, if desired.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The blue books are laid on the Table, but that does not absolve the government from giving an answer to a question regarding them, much less does it excuse the government for giving the wrong answer.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): I would like the House to have an opportunity before the session closes, of discussing in committee what took place at that conference.

PUBLIC DEBT—MATURING OBLIGATIONS

Mr. W. C. GOOD (Brant): I would like the Minister of Finance to state if the government will provide an opportunity, before the

end of the session, to discuss the question of meeting our obligations which are due this year, before next session. I understand nearly $200,000,000 will have to be paid before next session.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): I think on a motion to go into Supply is the proper occasion for such a discussion, and the hon. member will have opportunity to discuss this matter then. I do not think it requires any special order.

ALIEN ENEMY PROPERTY

CLAIM OF GOVERNMENT OF CANADA AGAINST UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

On the Orders of the Day:

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): I observed in the press some days ago, but made no mention of it pending the return of the minister concerned, that a section of the government had gone down to Washington with a considerable retinue. There were the Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin), the Secretary of State (Mr. Copp) and the Hon. William Pugsley.

An hon. MEMBER: Who is he?

Mr. MEIGHEN: He was in the retinue. There were also Mr. Mulvey, Under Secretary of State, Mr. Newcombe, Deputy Minister of Justice, and some others. Could the Minister of Justice report to us results commensurate with the size of the delegation?

Sir LOMER GOUIN (Minister of Justice): If the House wishes that I should state the object of our visit and the result, I will do so. The object of the visit to Washington was to press the settlement of a claim that our government has against the government of the United States in reference to the seizure of certain properties seized by the Custodian of Alien Enemy Property of the United States. In 1918 and 1919 the Custodian of Alien Enemy Property of the United States government proceeded to seize certain certificates of shares and bonds of Canadian companies which were owned by enemies residing in Germany, which certificates and bonds were then deposited with different institutions in the United States. Our own custodian, proceeding under our war measures act, had also seized some, if not all, of the same securities. Some of the companies which had been ordered by the American courts to pay their dividend to the Alien Property Custodian paid some of the dividends and then ceased to pay, on account of the vesting orders which had been issued by our own courts. We tried to arrive at a settlement "à l'amiable." The Alien Property Custodian of the United States government came to Canada. The hon. ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) was then our custodian. I understand that he had some conferences with the representatives of the American government, and Mr. Mulvey was a party to the conferences. The question under discussion was whether we had any right in those securities, or whether they were to be left in possession of the American government. It was important that the dividends should be paid or deposited in the hands of one of the two governments. It was agreed that, pending the discussion, the dividends should be paid to the American government, and that the question of law should be decided by an arbitrator or by a judge of Canada or of the United States. Some of the Canadian companies continued to pay the dividends to the Alien Property Custodian of the United States. After a certain time that very question which was in doubt and discussed between the two governments was decided by the American court, at the request of the American officer, in reference to certain certificates of American companies which had been sequestered by the Alien Property Custodian of the Imperial government, and which certificates were deposited in England. The question was debated and decided in favour of the American government. Taking advantage of that decision, our attorneys tried to induce the American government to turn over to the Canadian government those certificates and bonds. Proceedings have been going on for some years—since 1920. After consultation with our attorneys we were advised that it would be preferable that we should try and arrive at a settlement with the American government without litigation, and we were advised that if we had the opportunity of meeting the President of the United States, the Secretary of State and the Attorney General of that country, perhaps, after those three decisions—there were three decisions on that very same point—the American government would consent, without arbitration and without litigation, to hand over those securities to our government. Accordingly our custodian, the hon. Secretary of State (Mr. Copp), Mr. Newcombe, Mr. Mulvey, and myself decided to go to Washington. Hon. Mr. Pugsley was not one of our party. We met the Secretary of State of the United States, who declared that he was perfectly willing to turn over to Canada the securities mentioned but thought the

President would be governed in the matter by the advice of the Attorney General, and that the only trouble in the way was the fact that after the orders had been rendered by the American courts, vesting those securities in the Alien Property Custodian of the United States, they did not see how that officer could take it upon himself to turn those properties over to Canada. We answered that we should invoke the three judgments which were rendered by the American courts at the request of the American authorities, and we did not see that there was any necessity of litigation any more, since the case had been decided in favour of the American government and, consequently, in our favour. The same objection was repeated that there was a distinction also, because registration had been made of those same stocks in favour of the American officer, and they were of opinion that it was necessary that a judgment should be rendered by some tribunal. We had the advantage of meeting the President and repeating the same argument. We were told that the American government were heartily disposed to liquidate the situation as promptly as possible, and that they would be willing to expedite any case that might be instituted by our government before any of the courts of the United States. We suggested that we would prefer to proceed before one of our courts as the American government did in proceeding before one of their judges. Later on, after those two interviews, a conference took place between the Assistant Attorney General and our representative, Mr. Conboy, and it was then agreed that to expedite matters, if we were to institute one or two cases in Canada, assigning one or two companies to appear before such court to be instructed to deliver to the Canadian government certificates for those same stocks, the American government would appear, so that the judgment would be binding upon the American government and upon the companies. This we found most satisfactory.

As to the bonds, there may be some distinction to be made. Certificates of stocks are only evidence of property, while a bond is something by itself. We contended all the same that no distinction should be made. There is also the question of dividends which were paid to the American government. Our intention is to proceed, as I said, in one or two cases, to have the principle decided of the property in the stocks. If the judgment goes in our favour, necessarily we shall be entitled to dividends paid to the American government. As to the bonds, something has to be done. We are now considering what is to be done, and when and how it should be done. On the whole we consider that we have accomplished something, and we hope that after a comparatively short delay, we shall get the securities to which we are entitled.

[Sir Lomer Gouin.]

SUPPLY

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

CANADIAN GOVERNMENT MERCHANT MARINE

Loan to the Canadian Government Merchant Marine Limited, repayable on demand with interest at a rate to be fixed by the Governor in Council, upon such terms and conditions as the Governor in Council may determine, and to be applied in the payment of deficits in operation of the company and the vessels under the company's control during the year ending March 31, 1924, $1,500,000.

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals): Last night I promised to bring a statement down for the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton). I had to send to Montreal for the material and I expect it some time during the afternoon. If the discussion on this item goes on, I should be glad to give the information to my hon. friend a little later on.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I should like to ask an explanation from the minister regarding a statement made yesterday evening. I do not in any way question the accuracy of the statement. The hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) said that it was a fact that the Canadian Government Railways paid the ships of the Merchant Marine, I think it was $2.80 a ton to carry coal from Sydney to Montreal, while other ships were carrying coal for $1.10 a ton. Is there any explanation?

Mr. GRAHAM: I intimated last night that I thought the hon. member for Lunenburg must have been misinformed. The rate was $1.50.

Mr. DUFF: Might I say that the hon. member for Lunenburg was not misinformed. If the hon. member will turn up the Auditor General's report—I forget the page, but I will get it—I can prove conclusively that my statement was absolutely correct.

Mr. CAMPBELL: The hon. member for Lunenburg referred last night to an item of $96,122, reserve for doubtful debts and claims. That is an item on which we should have a little explanation. Has the Canadian Government Merchant Marine been in the habit of running accounts or giving credit for goods transported? Is it unable to collect some of those accounts at the present time?

Mr. GRAHAM: I cannot give my hon. friend the item offhand; but, of course, in a business of this magnitude, there are some claims outstanding. I know in my own business, when I am making a statement, I set aside a certain amount for doubtful claims that may be paid hereafter or that may turn out to be worthless.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I have never known any transportation company, railway or steamship, to take any chances on claims for freight. I understood these were always collected before the goods were delivered and in many cases before the goods were received for transportation. I can hardly understand the Canadian Government Merchant Marine running monthly or weekly accounts for freight charges, if that is what this means.

Mr. GRAHAM: In many accounts for transportation, three or four different companies are interested because of interchange of freight, settlement of rates; and this is a reserve amount put aside to meet any of those settlements that might be unsatisfactory. This might not mean that the private individual had not paid his freight to some transportation company.

Mr. McBRIDE: I do not think there has been any other question asked as often in this House as the question: Why cannot the Canadian Government Merchant Marine be made to pay? This question has been repeated again; and again I might say that I was a little disappointed yesterday evening when the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) took his seat and, in my opinion, did not make even an attempt to explain the matter.

Mr. DUFF: It is pretty hard to satisfy everybody.

Mr. McBRIDE: I claim to have had just a little experience in connection with steamboat work, and I have made the statement at least twice on the floor of this House that the smaller boats up to, say, 5,000 tons will never pay. I think it is incumbent upon me to explain that statement and show why, in my opinion, they will not pay. I am not criticizing the building of the boats; I am not criticizing the workmanship; nor am I criticizing the captains and the crews that operate these boats. But I do criticize the man who was responsible for the designing of them; I criticize the architect. I do not know who he is; I have never heard his name; but in my opinion it is evident that he never had any practical experience so far as freight boats are concerned. He may be a first-class architect from the standpoint of passenger steamers, but freight boats are an entirely different proposition.

Let us consider the construction of some of these freight boats of 5,000 tons or less—I am referring to those that I have seen. They have a fair, clean run behind, but from the centre they taper off more in the fashion of passenger boats towards the bow. A freight boat should carry its beam well forward to the bow; the boats to which I am referring are less than five thousand tons and ought to have had anywhere from ten to fifteen feet more of a beam to give them carrying capacity. If that were the case they could carry at least a third more freight than they are able to take as they are, and it would not interfere with their speed to any extent. In a steamer that makes from eight to ten knots, it does not affect the speed to any appreciable extent to have a blunt bow, and this affords added carrying capacity. These boats are not built in that way; they are more like passenger boats. Then their engines and boilers are placed in the centre, which should not be. The engines should be placed in a freight boat as near the stern as it is possible to get them. The boilers should be placed in the stern of the boat, taking up as little room as possible, just giving the firemen space enough in which to work. The firemen do not require more than room enough to enable them to attend to the boilers. In the bow of the boat there should be a bulkhead or watertight compartment, or tanks to hold water, so that when the boat is running light the tanks can be filled to prevent the ship from pounding in the sea. A boat in which the machinery is situated in the stern must have some ballast in the bow, because if she pounds in the sea she is bound to do herself material damage. These boats are not constructed in that manner. The centre of a freight boat of this size should be left entirely free for freight, but, as I have already pointed out, the machinery in these particular steamers is all in the centre. There should be two hatches instead of, as is the case with many of these boats, the whole decks covered with hatches. I think the architect sacrificed utility to beauty. Undoubtedly the boats do look well at sea; but that is not the main consideration in freight steamers. These boats should have carrying capacity, which is not provided in these particular steamers. As regards the boilers, any person who has had any practical experience in connection with machinery will admit that a boiler in a freight boat should have a lead anywhere from 25 to 35 per cent over the engines, for the simple reason that when inferior coal is being used the firemen

can still keep up steam. And, besides, it is much easier on the boiler. These boats have not got that feature; at least I have not seen it in any of those that I have looked over. I consider the boiler of a steamer the most important part of its equipment. When you have to force a boiler to keep up steam by forced draft, you are apt to have trouble with the combustion chamber, and the probability is that you will spring a leak. On getting into port with such boilers the first thing that has to be done is to draw fire and cool off the boiler, and it takes anywhere from 36 to 48 hours to cool one of those large boilers. Furthermore, it requires a considerable time to get up steam to do justice to the boilers. During all that time the boat is lying in port and expenses are running up. I am of the opinion, therefore, that it is a big drawback to these boats that the boilers have not a lead over the engines. The disadvantage would not be so great if they could use oil fuel, I am referring to boats that are using coal. There is another consideration, too. If the boilers had the lead I suggest, the boats could use slack instead of good coal. The firemen would have no difficulty in keeping up steam with slack coal, which is about one-third the price of first-class coal, and in that way a great saving could be made.

It has been suggested that these steamers should be provided with passenger accommodation. In my opinion they are not built for that purpose and never will be a success as passenger carriers. There is no doubt in my mind about that; and if any more money were invested to provide for passenger accommodation on these steamers it would be only so much more money thrown away.

Taking these things into consideration, I believe that the best thing that the government could do would be to get rid of the smaller boats as best they can. We have got into this mess and we must get out of it. But I want the House to understand that the government is not the only one that has got into difficulties in connection with shipbuilding. There were some people in Vancouver who built boats for the government, and when the government refused to give any more orders they formed a company and built ships for themselves. Some of these ships cost over a million dollars, and one in particular was sold last fall, I think, for $250,000, or less than one-quarter what it cost originally. Parliament should understand therefore that the government is not the only one that is faced with this proposition. I cannot see how these boats will ever pay running expenses, and when these ships cannot take care of themselves and pay the running charges, surely the sooner the government get rid of them the better it will be for the whole country. I do not propose to offer any opposition to this item, but I do think that the minister should give the House some guarantee that he will endeavour to get rid of the boats in whatever way he can before another session of parliament is called. We should not be asked to vote a sum of money year after year to keep up something that is of no benefit to the country. What right has this House to vote the money of the taxpayers each year in the way of a bonus to keep in operation these boats that are competing with ships owned by private companies? I do not think it is fair to the other companies. Those other companies have to pay their crews, and interest on their investment, and, in a great many cases, income tax. Why then should this government vote sums of the taxpayers' money year after year for the purpose of competing with private companies that are doing a legitimate business? I do not think it is right, and I certainly hope that before another session comes around the minister will see his way clear to have some at least of the boats disposed of.

Mr. DUFF: I rise to apologize to the House for the statement I made last night which the minister referred to a moment ago —that freight was paid to the Canadian Government Merchant Marine boats on coal carried by them from Sydney to Montreal at the rate of $2.80 per ton.

Mr. GRAHAM: It was a member over there who said it.

Mr. DUFF: Somebody said it anyway, and I said so, too. The minister points out today that I made a mistake and that the freight rate charged was $1.50 per ton. Well, I have to apologize to the House because I made the rate too low. I do not know where the minister got his information, but if he will turn to the Auditor General's report for 1922 he will find the following at page W-116:

Freight on coal, Canadian Government Merchant Marine: Sydney to Lévis, 3,110 tons at $4 per ton—

An hon. MEMBER: What!

Mr. DUFF: Four dollars per ton, when other boats were carrying coal for $1.10 per ton.

Mr. GRAHAM: What year?

Mr. DUFF: I am quoting from the Auditor General's report for the year ended March 31, 1922. Continuing my quotation:

Sydney to St. John and Halifax, 19,202 tons at $2.60; Louisburg to St. John and Halifax, 29,337 tons at $2.60.

I am quite sure that other boats would have carried this coal at half the rate to the two latter ports, and at less than half to Levis. And yet the minister says the coal was carried at a rate of $1.50 per ton.

Mr. GRAHAM: We will have that checked up. The item referred to goes further back—

Mr. DUFF: This is the last report of the Auditor General.

Mr. GRAHAM: That would be for business done in 1920 I imagine. It goes back further than the business I was referring to, which was done in 1921. I thought that would be far enough back. The manager told me last night that he thought $1.50 was the rate. He telephoned to Montreal this morning and his figure was confirmed. It referred to 1921, a year later. I will have the item looked into; there may be some explanation of the very high rates quoted.

Mr. DUFF: I just wanted to show that I was right in my statement.

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend might be right in that statement, but the other half of the statement, that privately-owned boats were carrying coal for $1.10 per ton, might be wrong. The two years might have got confused.

Mr. DUFF: Oh, no, it was the same year.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Mr. Chairman, of all hon. members here I can make no pretence to any practical knowledge of either shipbuilding or the shipping business, but I think it is due to the House that some short review should be made of the history of the Canadian Government Mercantile Marine, to clear away any misconceptions that might arise from these discussions.

While I do not disagree—as I usually have to, very reluctantly—with everything said by the hon. member for Lunenburg, (Mr. Duff); because a part of his review of the history of the matter is not out of accord with my recollection—I fear the House would get the impression that something approaching insanity, something unaccompanied by the slightest sense of public duty, had animated the late government in its mercantile marine policy, that in our hurry to get rid of all the funds of the country we had put them into expensive vessels which when built were not fitted to carry passengers, package freight, cattle or coal, indeed, were not much good for anything save as a spectacle of extravagance and waste; and that having committed this folly, we proceeded to add another, to seek to operate these vessels under a board, none of whose members had any financial interest in their operation.

I think hon. members are fairly well acquainted with what has taken place, and in that respect the hon. member for Lunenburg, to do him justice, was not grossly and violently wrong. It was in 1918 that the enterprise of shipbuilding was first launched upon. It was not in 1918 that the first public agitation to that end was commenced. Well I recall in years previous from the benches of the then opposition a determined campaign was opened to compel the government to establish for Canada a mercantile marine. The champion of that agitation he who was most eloquent and most persistent, he who excelled in both those qualities, was the Hon. William Pugsley, now seated in a less contentious post. Previous to that agitation we did not undertake the work. The demands upon the Treasury were very great, the prospect of a large government railway mileage was not immediate, the success of the German submarine campaign was much less a menace than it became later on, and the call for ships the world over was nothing at all in 1916 and 1917 to what it became in 1918.

In 1918, $25,000,000 was appropriated to help meet the situation on the part of Canada. The Prime Minister of the day came to parliament and secured approval of that appropriation, and he set out before the House the entire programme as then contemplated by the administration. Up to this point I do not think the two accounts of what has happened differ.

Previous to the armistice contracts were let for forty-five ships, and these included the smaller ships that are now the subject of so much discussion. These smaller ships at that time could be built quickly, they were needed quickly, they had a very, very pressing service immediately to perform, and therefore they were included in the ships first laid down. The contracts went on. In the spring of 1919, though the armistice had been signed and peace was almost certain to be declared, it became evident not only to this country, but, I think, to every other country that the need for ships was even greater than it had been twelve months before. When I say it became evident, I fortify the phrase by the assertion that every other country answered to the demand at least in equal degree proportionately to what this country did; some countries answered in much greater

proportion. I mention in this regard particularly the United States of America.

Then, in 1919, other circumstances came in sight of very great and immediate consequence relative to the shipbuilding programme. Not only was the world's shipping depleted and the world suffering seriously from such depletion at that time, but Canada, having already acquired at the close of 1917 the Canadian Northern Railway, had in view the acquirement of the Grand Trunk Railway. Indeed, its acquirement seemed to be inevitable by one process or the other. Hence there could be seen in view a tremendous railway system owned and operated by the government in competition with the other great Canadian transportation system, the Canadian Pacific Railway. There were other circumstances as well, the force of which does not now come home to the mind with the same weight and by anything like the same pressure with which it was brought home to the minds of hon. members of this House of all political persuasions in 1919. Those were the days of very rapid demobilization. Our soldiers were coming back by the hundreds of thousands, and the country was utterly unable to absorb with the speed of their return the men who had done service overseas. Unemployment is at all times a very serious subject matter for a government's consideration. But unemployment when suffered by men returning from a terrific conflict differs from other unemployment. The demand then must be met; public opinion will permit nothing but that it be met to the full power of the government. The pressure for these ends I can, of course, very easily recall; I was in the midst of it. I ask hon. gentlemen to keep in mind that pressure of that kind is a just pressure, and, what is more, it is an irresistible pressure. Money spent in providing employment, even if we assume it is spent in the construction of something of no great value, is not wholly money wasted; if we had not provided it in one form or the other we would have paid it out in cash. The situation had to be confronted and surmounted. It was confronted and surmounted, and the construction of more vessels was one of the methods by which this end was attained. Now, I have mentioned three circumstances; all were of consequence. Others I might review, but those three circumstances, I say, were of exceeding consequence indeed. I emphasize again that among the vessels first laid down, contracts for which were signed, executed and in process of completion at the time the armistice was signed, the smaller were included; a sufficient number of the larger vessels for other purposes was not included in the first laid down. The government, therefore, in April, 1919, laid before parliament proposals for the construction, I think it was, of eighteen more —at all events, of the balance.

Mr. DUFF: That is right; eighteen.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I ask hon. members to recall that included in that government were hon. members who now sit opposite; included in that government was the former leader of the Progressive party. All concurred in submitting to parliament proposals for that construction, and I do all of them justice when I say that they were moved to that view by the considerations I have sought now to impress again on the committee. Not only did we ask for the money for the purpose—that is to say, for such amount of it as could reasonably be expended in 1919-20, but we informed parliament of the character of the vessels to be constructed; informed parliament of all the details that parliament has a right in every case to be furnished with before being asked to approve of the proposal made. The approval was given in 1918; the approval was given in 1919, and I doubt if any subject matter has ever been placed before this House that received in each case so unanimous an approval on the part of parliament as did the subject matter of our mercantile marine construction. In 1918 I can remember no dissentient note whatever. The hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) refers to a doubt expressed by the then member for Red Deer. I do not dispute it. I have not had time to look it up; my recollection was that was in 1919 rather than 1918. However, beyond the doubt expressed by him, which, I think, was based on the view he so consistently held that everything except raising wheat could be done cheaper in England or Scotland than in Canada—outside of that I know of no dissentient or discordant note of any kind from any quarter in the Canadian House in either year. In such form the estimates passed and the contracts were subsequently let for these additional vessels. I ask hon. members to keep in mind this fact: Though the vote was passed the government was not bound to go ahead; the government had the authority of parliament to do so, but had circumstances altered it would have been quite justified in changing its policy and coming to parliament later with an explanation. But the circumstances that obtained in the fall and winter and spring of 1918-19 were just as pressing and just as powerful all through the summer of 1919.

4 p.m.

ROYAL ASSENT

SITTING SUSPENDED FOR ROYAL ASSENT TO BILLS

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

Mr. Speaker, His Honour the Deputy of 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,

And having returned,

Mr. Speaker informed the House that the Deputy of His Excellency the Governor General had been pleased to give in His Majesty's name the Royal Assent to the following bills:

An Act to incorporate La Banque Rurale.
An Act respecting The Dominion Fire Insurance Company.
An Act for the relief of Frederick Wesley Graham.
An Act for the relief of Catharine Gunyo Chatterson Odell.
An Act for the relief of Marietta Isabel Wilson.
An Act for the relief of Marian Eugenie MacCordick.
An Act for the relief of Elizabeth Frankland.
An Act for the relief of Arnold Carrington Burke.
An Act for the relief of Emily Margery Chrimes.
An Act for the relief of Lyle Johnson.
An Act for the relief of Annie Belle Wilson.
An Act for the relief of Henry John Burden.
An Act for the relief of Ethel Olmsted.
An Act for the relief of Edward Lewis Britton.
An Act for the relief of Ruby Minnie Stallworthy.
An Act for the relief of Christopher Campkin.
An Act for the relief of Andrew George Suffell.
An Act for the relief of Joseph Ross Wallace.
An Act to make lawful the marriage of a woman to her deceased husband's brother or such brother's son.
An Act respecting a certain patent of Arthur R. Wilfley.
An Act respecting certain patents of Charles A. Channell.
An Act respecting certain patents of Albert Manvers.
An Act respecting a certain patent of Hans M. Olson.
An Act respecting The Nipissing Central Railway Company.
An Act respecting The Ottawa, Northern and Western Railway Company.
An Act respecting The Quebec Central Railway Company.
An Act respecting The Essex Terminal Railway Company.
An Act respecting The Manitoba and North Western Railway Company of Canada.
An Act to amend the Northwest Territories Act.
An Act to amend The Criminal Code with respect to publication of Evidence in Marriage or Divorce Proceedings.
An Act respecting the Royal Guardians.
An Act to amend the Act Incorporatng La Société des Artisans Canadiens Français" (English and French versions).
An Act respecting certain patents of Leonard Clayton Ridge.
An Act respecting a certain patent of Henry Matthew Wells and James Edward Southcombe.
An Act respecting certain patents of Clarence P. Landreth.
An Act respecting a certain patent of Robert A. Campbell.
An Act to incorporate The Protestant Federation of Patriotic Women of Canada.
An Act respecting a certain patent of James M. Richardson.
An Act respecting Canadian Press Limited.
An Act for the relief of Violet Gardiner.
An Act for the relief of Frederick Fong Young.
An Act for the relief of Thomas Percy Eversfield.
An Act for the relief of Jean Elizabeth Burgess.
An Act for the relief of Thomas Wesley Scott.
An Act for the relief of Fannie Boyle.
An Act for the relief of James Forbes.
An Act for the relief of Julia Tracey Kay.
An Act for the relief of Charles Philip Roy McCabe.
An Act for the relief of William George Haden.
An Act for the relief of Gertrude Irene Wood.
An Act for the relief of James Murray.
An Act for the relief of James McAllister.
An Act for the relief of David Albert Clayton.
An Act for the relief of Hugh Russell Fulton.
An Act for the relief of Maybelle Elizabeth French.
An Act respecting the Canadian Niagara Bridge Company.
An Act to incorporate Buffalo and Fort Erie Public Bridge Company.
An Act respecting The Rutland and Noyan Railway Company.
An Act respecting The Huron and Erie Mortgage Corporation.
An Act to change the name of Rio de Janeiro and Sao Paulo Telephone Company to Brazilian Telephone Company.
An Act respecting Montreal, Joliette and Transcontinental Junction Railway Company.
An Act respecting The Community, General Hospital, Alms House and Seminary of Learning of the Sisters of Charity at Ottawa.
An Act to change the name of The Penny Bank of Toronto.
An Act to amend The Dominion Forest Reserves and Parks Act.
An Act to amend the Animal Contagious Diseases Act.
An Act respecting the Canadian National Railways.
An Act for the relief of John Darton.
An Act for the relief of Minnie Eileen Biggs.
An Act for the relief of Thomas Henry Bottomley.
An Act for the relief of William Ritchie Dowd.
An Act for the relief of Eliza Harvey Northgraves.
An Act for the relief of Olivette McMaster.
An Act for the relief of Mahlon Beach.
An Act for the relief of Alfred William Kelly.
An Act for the relief of Wilmot Austin Pickell.
An Act for the relief of Annie May Vogelman.
An Act to amend the Militia Pension Act.
An Act to amend the Irrigation Act.
An Act respecting the Testing, Inspection and Sale of Seeds.
An Act to amend the Radiotelegraph Act.
An Act to extend the period of the Canada Highways Act.
An Act respecting the Canadian National Railways.
An Act to amend the Trade Mark and Design Act.
An Act for the relief of Mabel Gertrude Johnston.
An Act for the relief of Wilfrid Charles Brown.
An Act for the relief of Gertrude Andrews.
An Act for the relief of William Henry Davidson.
An Act for the relief of George Robert Webb.
An Act for the relief of Katharine Bryans.
An Act for the relief of George Austin Trow.
An Act for the relief of Ethel Jean Buchan.
An Act for the relief of Louisa Wemp.
An Act for the relief of Edgar Lindsay.
An Act for the relief of Charles Marigoli Hare.
An Act for the relief of Esther Levin.
An Act for the relief of Hilda Marguerite Watt Black.
An Act for the relief of Abigal Aileen Beryl McCrea Tull.

An Act respecting a certain Trade Convention between His Majesty and the King of Italy.

An Act to incorporate Trans-Continental Assurance Company.

An Act to incorporate National Surety Company of Canada.

An Act to Prohibit the Improper Use of Opium and other Drugs.

An Act to amend The Dominion Lands Act respecting the sale or other disposal of coal lands and coal mining rights.

An Act to amend and consolidate the Acts respecting Live Stock.

An Act to regulate the Sale and Inspection of Fruit and Fruit Containers.

An Act to amend and consolidate the Acts relating to Patents of Invention.

An Act to amend The Copyright Act, 1921.

An Act respecting a certain Convention of Commerce between His Majesty and the President of the French Republic.

An Act to amend The Petition of Right Act.

An Act to amend the Civil Service Superannuation and Retirement Act.

An Act to amend the Canada Shipping Act.

An Act for the relief of Christina Julia Hamilton.

An Act for the relief of Smith Kain.

An Act for the relief of Gladys Malcolm Mushett.

An Act for the relief of William Francis Rafferty.

An Act for the relief of Gladys Teague.

An Act for the relief of Elizabeth McKinley.

An Act for the relief of Algernon Cecil Aubry Moran.

An Act for the relief of Emily Adlene McCausland.

An Act for the relief of Winifred Scatcherd.

An Act for the relief of Grace Lees Smiley.

An Act for the relief of Laura MacBrien.

An Act for the relief of Chester Abbott Redmond.

An Act for the relief of James Dunnett.

An Act to provide for the investigation of Combines, Monopolies, Trusts and Mergers.

An Act respecting The Northern Trusts Company.

An Act respecting The Subsidiary High Court of the Ancient Order of Foresters in the Dominion of Canada.

An Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the financial year ending the 31st March, 1924.

SUPPLY

The House resumed in Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have carried the record of the decisions of parliament up to the spring of 1919. In that summer the balance of the contracts were let. In the spring of 1920, the government came to parliament again, not with any new proposals at all, but with an estimate of the amount that would be required to proceed with the work on the proposals that parliament had adopted the year before, the amount that would be required for the then ensuing year, because, of course, ships of the size then being built could not be constructed even in that year. Parliament voted that money. It was merely a vote carrying out the previous programme unanimously adopted, without a dissenting vote in the House of Commons. I think I am safe in saying, although I have not had time to review the debates of 1920 for the purposes of this discussion, that there was no contention in the House even in 1920 against going on with works that were under way; nor was there reflection passed upon the wisdom of the course that had been adopted finally in the spring of 1919. The facts were that at that time other countries were excelling themselves in the same way; that the demand for space, instead of falling off, was as strong as ever; that though conditions in Canada were improving somewhat, the necessity for keeping employed those still at work on our ships, a large proportion of those men being returned men, was just as great and pressing as before. So the work proceeded, and it was almost completed in 1920, only a relatively very small appropriation, I do not know whether it was $2,000,000 or $3,000,000, being required in 1921. This appropriation was determinedly opposed. By this time changes had taken place in the whole mercantile work. By this time deflation was under way. By this time there was a surplus of ships. There was no demand any longer for more; indeed ships were a glut on the markets of the world. Certain hon. gentlemen then saw their chance, and they who had voted for the entire project and for its continuance, turned around and held parliament up in a determined effort to prevent the vote from going through.

Mr. BLACK (Huron): What time was that?

Mr. MEIGHEN: That would be in the month of April or May, 1921. The opposition was a little belated, but I am not dwelling on those matters now. I am not criticizing hon. gentlemen opposite for their concurrence in the policy adopted, because I think that policy of ship construction was right from a business standpoint at the time we were carrying it out, because the demand for space in Canada, for the use of our docks and harbours for building ships came from all parts of the world. We had to prohibit the building of ships even for neutral countries all through 1920, and at the time we were refusing to build ships of a certain character wooden ships, we were importuned by private owners, private constructors to be allowed to build the same class of ships in this country.

Mr. MARLER: The right hon. gentleman said a few moments ago, if I mistake not, that there was great unemployment in 1919.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. MARLER: If there was a demand from other countries to build ships in our docks, what was the necessity of our occupying the docks in 1919?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not say that we could have had them in 1919; but we could have had them in 1920, and I am not sure that we could not have had them in 1919. I will tell my hon. friend why we did not. We felt that it was better at that time, when Britain and her allies were sadly in need of ships to make up what the German submarines had destroyed, to keep the docks for our own purposes. I well recall—and I say this with no idea of making a contentious matter of what the present Speaker said at that time—the strong approval coming from the then hon. member for Maisonneuve because we did this with a policy of holding our own ports and harbours for the construction of vessels for ourselves and our allies. Great Britain was building ships in Canada at that time through the agency of the Imperial Munitions Board.

This carries us through the programme of ship construction. Now it is said: "Very well; you were right so far as that goes; you did what the best minds and the best judgments in the world, trained and experienced in the subject, were doing at that time. But after they got through, you should have sold them when the price was high. You should not have started to operate them yourselves. You should not have formed a company to operate them. You should not have sought to operate them as a government enterprise. You should have sold them when the price was good and the selling was good." I admit that the selling was good and the price was high. Doubtless, even though we needed the ships later on, it would have paid to have sold them and later on to have bought others. I wonder if that is not the experience of everybody in this world? Is there in the world to-day a business that would not be far better off now if it had just sold its assets two or two and a half years ago and then bought what it needed later on? When did this demand arise in parliament for the sale of our ships? Did any hon. gentleman hear it in 1919 when some of the ships were on the way to completion, when some of them were completed? Did any hon. gentlemen hear it in 1920 when most of them were completed and when the company was formed, in operation, and showing a profit to this country? Nobody ever heard such a claim. The demand came, as it always comes in private life, after the event. You always know the market after the event. Then the complaint came that we should have known this before and sold when the price was good. But there are other considerations that affect a government than merely the level of the market. By this time we had acquired the Grand Trunk Railway; by this time we were owners of a system of 23,000 miles of railway, and what is more, we were in competition with the best organized, biggest and, perhaps, best managed single business enterprise in the known world, the Canadian Pacific railway. We were in severe competition with them in every line of activity, and we found our competitor with 440,000 tons of shipping at its command ready to serve its system in this country, ready to drain from all the ports of the world the world's business to the Canadian Pacific in Canada. Was it to be thought that we were to face that competition, and while we were addressing ourselves to facing it, disarm ourselves of what mercantile marine we had? Certainly, if we had known the market and known we could have later on bought more cheaply, that would have been the course. But aside from a prevision of the market, I do not see that any argument could be made that we should have adopted any such policy. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company have to-day in their annual statement a mercantile marine asset of some $59,000,000 at cost of construction. The Canadian Pacific fortunately built their vessels at a much cheaper cost than we did. Why? Because they built them sooner; they built them before the war, in the main, although it is true they have built some since. But their average cost of construction is below ours, their tonnage being above ours. The Canadian Pacific Railway to-day have, proportionately to their mileage, far more mercantile marine tonnage than have the National Railways. I doubt not they have double the amount: I think they have double, proportionately to their mileage, the tonnage that the National Railways have.

Some complaint, however, is made. It is said: "You did not build cheaply enough; you should have built by tender, and you could have justified your vessels at the time you built them because it was a war necessity. When the whole enterprise was entered upon you could have got them built more cheaply." Well, I venture to say this, and I am glad of the chance to say it in justice to an hon. gentleman who is no longer a member of this House: No enterprise of the Canadian people was ever better managed from a business point of view than was the construction of the Canadian Mercantile Marine, and I invite hon. gentlemen opposite, if they have any question as to that, to be good enough to follow their policy of commission-making just a little further and appoint one, two, or

three experienced shipbuilding men—and they can appoint a judge of their own choosing at the head—to investigate the whole subject of the Canadian Mercantile Marine I would welcome, and every hon. member on this side of the House would welcome, such an investigation; and certainly no one in this Dominion would welcome it with more avidity than the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Our Mercantile Marine was not built by tender for the simple reason that it could not be done. You cannot let by tender for the building of ships when you have fourteen docks in Canada, all of which must be engaged; nor can you build at the same price in one as you can in another. What country in the world does build its ships by tender? I do not know of any. I know that when we were building our 65 vessels, the United States were building 1,553, and they did not do the work by tender. Great Britain was building too at a very rapid rate, but she was not building by tender. We asked for the construction of a vessel of a certain type; we asked for quotations on that type of vessel to be built at a certain place; and we did not accept the lowest quotation. In every case, I think, the lowest we considered too high, and after the lowest was in a price was fixed and the builders were told that if they could not accept that price they could not get the work. The result was that we built our marine at an average cost of $191 per ton at the same time that the United States were building ships of poorer quality as the event shows, at $50 to $100 per ton more. At the same time, too, Great Britian was building at a cost equal to our own.

Mr. JACOBS: I understood that we were building in order to provide work for the unemployed.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes in part, but that did not mean that we would pay more for the ships than they were worth. The provision of work for the unemployed was one of the reasons for the building of the ships, but I did not say it was the only one. I stated three main considerations, one of which was work for the unemployed, and I venture to say that had the unemployed factor been the only consideration, and we had not yielded to it, the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, and the exceedingly alert-minded member for Montreal (Mr. Rinfret), would have been at the head of a delegation to press upon us the need of the unemployed of their city.

Mr. MARLER: What other hon. member for Montreal did the leader of the Opposition refer to?

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: I referred to the hon. gentleman who first interrupted me, the member for George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs), but I have equal confidence that the tender heart of the member for St. Lawrence (Mr. Marler) would also have been moved. I have not a doubt of it.

Mr. JACOBS: May I suggest that they did not require my services inasmuch as Mr. Ballantyne was looking after Vickers and other large concerns.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, Mr. Ballantyne was looking after the workingmen, and the services of the hon. member were not required. But I say that if Mr. Ballantyne had failed in his duty the hon. member's services would have been enlisted and most willingly given—

Mr. JACOBS: As an opposition member—

Mr. MEIGHEN: —to get the ships built.

Mr. JACOBS: —I should have had a fine chance.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member did not show any opposition in 1919. The time he began to oppose the thing was after the whole programme was under way and nearly completed and when there was no danger on earth of anyone being thrown out of work by this opposition.

Mr. JACOBS: I was merely an observer at that time.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, I know that, and the hon. gentleman came into opposition at a time when there was no danger that his opposition could possibly cause anyone in his county to lose work. Nobody was going to leave a ship three-quarters built, and when the hon. gentleman began his opposition he was perfectly aware that it could endanger no one in his constituency. What was the reason of the laughter of the hon. member for St. James (Mr. Rinfret)?

Mr. RINFRET: I always enjoy my hon. friend's speeches whether they convince me or not.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I admire the ingenuousness of the reply. Now what about the quality of the ships at the prices paid for them? I have read a speech of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell), who has become an expert on the subject of shipbuilding and the use of ships. I had lots of time and I read the speech; and one would gather from it that these were ships of a very poor quality. There was nothing that the hon. gentleman knew of which they could carry at all; at least I did not come across, anywhere

in his speech, anything to indicate that he thought they were fit for any purpose whatever. And I listened to the speech of the hon. member for Cariboo (Mr. McBride) this afternoon. Does anyone imagine that the government of this country put $70,000,000 into ships without getting at least the best opinion at its command as to the nature of the ships required? Does anyone suppose that the government did all this without having availed itself of the best inspectors to supervise the execution of the work and to pass upon the soundness of the design? If hon. members have any doubt and believe that there was carelessness in that regard, again I invite them to institute an inquiry, and I venture to say that they will find that no better ships were built by any country or any individual firm than the ships that were built by us, nor were there any ships more suited to the needs of the time.

Mr. JACOBS: What are they suited for?

Mr. MEIGHEN: They are suited for anything. What are they not suited for? We are told that they cannot carry package freight. Well, twenty of them were specially built to carry package freight. Of these, 18 have 'tween decks for the purpose, and 2 of them have three decks. They were built for package freight, and built by the best designers whom we knew anything about.

Mr. JACOBS: Can they carry cattle?

Mr. MEIGHEN: They were not fitted to carry cattle and they were not carrying cattle because there were no cattle to carry. But all they need is stanchions for the purpose, and they will carry cattle the same as any other ships. The hon. member, with his astute mind, must have noticed that in the quotations from the letters read by the Minister of Agriculture, that hon. gentleman always took great pains not to read the whole of any letter. He read little quotations to show that the ships were not fit to carry cattle, but on examination of the quotations it will be found that the letters referred to the smaller ships and the smaller ships only. There is nothing whatsoever in the quotations to indicate that the larger ships were being referred to. The smaller vessels are intended for the Newfoundland, the West Indian and the lake trade. They are fitted for that trade and have operated successfully. They are well fitted for coal and ordinary freight. But more; there has never been any evidence yet of any defect in the construction of a single one of the 65 ships.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Some hon. member smiles. Will he tell me what the evidence is? There is not a tittle.

Mr. FORRESTER: One is at the bottom of the ocean.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, and the insurance is collected. But that did not show any defect in this ship. The Titanic is at the bottom too, and the insurance is not collected. No, I say again, there has not been a tittle of evidence, nor a suggestion of any defect in construction of a single vessel. They are well constructed of the best material. I have heard men say, who ought to know, that there are no other vessels so well built as these. I go so far only as to say that there are no better vessels in the mercantile marine of any land. And again I invite that the statements I make be tested. I do not know any other way of convincing hon. gentlemen.

Mr. JACOBS: How many of these vessels have been wrecked?

Mr. MEIGHEN: One has sunk, one at the time of the last report I read had been rammed. I am not certain that because a vessel is rammed by another it is an evidence of faulty construction. Beyond that I do not know of any of these vessels having been wrecked. But the best ships on earth may be so lost. Ships do not control the weather, nor the rocks, nor the meanderings of other vessels.

Mr. RINFRET: Neither do governments.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Nor do private companies. So that seems to be the close of that incident.

Mr. FORKE: I should like to make a suggestion, if I may interrupt the right hon. gentleman. I know that the members in this quarter of the House are very, very anxious to get the fullest information about these ships. When I was in Montreal last summer there were no ships idle in the harbour but three or four of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine. What is the reason for their idleness? I hope the right hon. leader of the Opposition will understand that I am not finding fault, I am not blaming anyone in this connection. Indeed, I do not think there is really any severe criticism of our Government Merchant Marine. What we really want is information, because it does seem lamentable that we should own millions of dollars worth of ships that we cannot do anything with. I mention this so the right hon. gentleman may know the feeling in this part of the House in regard to this subject.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I find that the hardest question to answer. I was in Montreal, too, a little while ago and saw three or four of our government ships idle, while ships of the same kind, as I was told by men who know, were busily engaged. I am afraid I must express the fear that there is lack of sympathy in the management of these ships, lack of a desire to make them a success. It may be a fact—and I do not feel in a position to argue to the contrary at the present time—that the purpose for which these ships were built immediately having been served, it might be the part of wisdom to dispose of some of them. That would apply, I fancy, if it applies at all—I do not admit that it does apply at all—to the smaller vessels and it would be no reflection on the wisdom of the original policy. In my judgment it could not apply in any way whatever to the larger vessels. It is true that these vessels could be bought to-day for a much smaller sum, but $191 a ton was low relative to the cost of construction of other ships at the time these were built. The Americans built wooden ships at a cost of $200 a ton at the same time as compared with our cost of $191 a ton for steel ships. We were importuned to build wooden ships too. Many were the errors that were avoided, and that was one.

Mr. DUFF: If my right hon. friend will allow me—the government did build, or start, four wooden ships.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No.

Mr. DUFF: Oh, yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No. A loan was made to a private company, and this was solely for unemployment purposes at Victoria. But those were not government ships.

Mr. DUFF: The government lost money by them.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, I think we did. In fact all money that went toward unemployment was lost money. I do not know any other way of attending to the unemployed except by losing money. Of course, there is a way of avoiding this loss, by throwing the unemployed overboard, leaving them to their own resources. But it was a question of helping the unemployed, and we thought that was an avenue through which some help could be given. The United States government built 226 vessels, and not one of those ever got to sea.

Mr. GRAHAM: Those were wooden.

[Mr. Forke.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes. But the hon. minister should remember that his next door neighbour to the present Minister of Finance urged the government at that time to build wooden ships, but we resisted his importunity. And his was not the only importunity; from every end of this country we were pressed to build wooden ships, and the main credit goes to the business judgment of the then Minister of Marine that we did not build any such ships. He was the piece de resistance against that policy.

Mr. JACOBS: Would they not have cost less?

Mr. MEIGHEN: They cost the American government more. I think they would have cost this government less, but in the light of subsequent circumstances they would have been worthless. Ships that the American government built of wood and concrete never got to sea either. The American government spent $700,000 per ship on these 226 wooden ships, that is, $160,000,000. They were junk when they were built. In a word, the American government spent more on those wooden ships twice over than the whole cost of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine. I am not sure that I can tell from memory just how many wooden and concrete ships they built, but a considerable number, and I know that those, too, were junk when built. The American government is to-day operating about two and a quarter million tonnage—a small part only of what they built. They built eleven million tonnage at a time when we were building three hundred thousand tonnage. My figures may be wrong.

Mr. DUFF: Three hundred and fifty thousand.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes. That eleven million tonnage cost the American government $3,500,000,000, and on the portion they got rid of they lost colossal sums, and they are not over the liability yet, because they had to make contracts with the shipbuilding companies, and these will have to be arranged. On the small portion they operate of two and a quarter million tonnage their loss, irrespective of interest on cost and of depreciation, is $50,000,000 per annum. The total loss to the American government now on the ships they built amounts to $20,000,000 per month, or $240,000,000 per year.

Mr. JACOBS: Have they not advertised them for sale?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think they have sold the wooden ships for junk. But the American government have not the same reason

for a mercantile marine that we have. They have no national system of railways to operate in competition with a big privately owned system; they are in a wholly different position. They did not manage the construction of their mercantile marine as well as did the Canadian government, the scale of operations was far greater than ours and far more faulty, and, further, the use to which the ships were afterwards put could never at all be compared with the sound judgment of the course pursued in this country.

I was about to dwell for just a moment upon the effect which the possession of our National Railways should have on any argument on this question. Hon. gentlemen say: Get rid of the ships. Well, confidentially—if I may use the term in parliament—I am not very much afraid of the government selling the ships, I am not very much afraid of their selling the National Railways.

Mr. JACOBS: Who will take them?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I know there are men to-day who would take the National Railways infinitely more quickly than anyone would have been ready to take them when we were rescuing their component parts from bankruptcy in private hands. They have a system to-day that would attract capital from anywhere, and they know it. Hon. gentlemen smile. I know something about this subject. I had invitations even at the time we took these railways over, but I am not afraid of the government selling the system. There are hon. gentlemen in the government who can sense public opinion a little more accurately than that. The anti-government ownership campaign was made for campaign purposes, it was not made for practical business results when they were in power. And the same is true in large degree of the mercantile marine. They may sell some of the ships. While I do not feel disposed to say—because I do not pretend to be an expert on the quality and purpose of ships—that no sale would be justified, I say determinedly that anything like a wholesale disposal of our mercantile marine would be folly in the light of the position of this country to-day. I do not feel any fear that the government will commit this folly, notwithstanding all the importunities of perhaps some of their supporters and doubtless of other interested persons throughout this country.

How are we going to compete with the Canadian Pacific without a ship at all, when they are carrying trade to their system from every quarter of the world? Besides, we could not to-day have our trade treaty with the West Indies, which trade treaty is worth something, which trade treaty is not a detriment like some trade treaties which have been since. We have a preference to-day, not only better than we had before, but better than other countries have, with Jamaica, for example,—with whom we do considerable business—of 25 per cent. We could not continue that; we could not have had it—

Mr. JACOBS: Are we not subsidizing vessels to other parts of the world?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, we are subsidizing the Royal Mail Steam Packet vessels at $400,000 a year, and if we get rid of our Canadian Forester and Canadian Fisher, which run down to the West Indies, we will subsidize a lot more. It simply means an extension of the subsidy policy. Why, all over the world to-day we have to subsidize. And still we are thinking of disposing of the ships we have—at least, we are talking about it; we are not thinking very seriously. Yes; we could not have had our trade treaty with the West Indies if we had not had these two freight vessels of, I think, 10,500 tons each, and with a capacity for 30 passengers on each, running down to these islands. One benefit we get from the vessels is the trade that results therefrom—we have had a lot more, and hon gentlemen know it—is this: We succeed in capturing a considerable share of the American lumber trade on the Pacific. Our vessels running from the Pacific coast to New Zealand and Australia have been a paying enterprise, and what is more, our others are not losing at the figure hon. gentlemen would like us to believe. There is a 4 per cent charge for depreciation here. I am assuming in what I say that the very best management is taking place, although I must admit there are consequences that I cannot harmonize with that assumption. We have a charge for depreciation of 4 per cent. Well, at 2½ per cent, out at interest—the same interest as that on which the computation is made in the statement—the whole capital cost would be disposed of in twenty-five years. That is an actuarial computation.

Mr. MARLER: The boats would not last that long.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They would not? Hon. members opposite are just through voting $400,000 to the Royal Mail Packet steamers that are from thirty to forty years old—an old type of vessels, nothing like the type of the ones we are discussing. And the hon. member says ours would not last 25 years. Why not?

Mr. MARLER: I say that a vessel twenty-five years old of this character is absolutely antiquated.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Antiquated? How is it that vessels thirty-nine years old are not antiquated?

Mr. MARLER: Because vessels thirty-nine years old were purchased or built at a very much lower figure than these vessels.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What difference does the figure make as to whether they are antiquated or not? The 2½ per cent applies on the whole cost.

Mr. MARLER: But 2½ per cent on a large cost is very much more than 2½ per cent on a comparatively small cost.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly, but there is 4 per cent here on the total cost. The cost does not figure in the question when the 2½ per cent will run out.

Mr. MARLER: They are not earning 4 per cent.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am not talking about earnings; I am talking about what sum in depreciation will take care of the whole capital cost.

Mr. MARLER: How are you going to write it off if you do not earn it?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am not talking about writing it off. The hon. gentleman has missed the point altogether.

Mr. MARLER: I do not think so.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If 2½ per cent of the capital cost will take care of the whole capital cost in twenty-five years, then I say 2½ per cent is sufficient. The hon. member said they would not last twenty-five years, and he gave as a reason that they had cost so much.

Mr. MARLER: No, I did not give that as a reason.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, that is the reason he gave me.

Mr. MARLER: I said nothing of the kind. The question of their costing so much does not make them last a longer or a shorter time. What I said was this: The boats are not earning sufficient to write off what my right hon. friend says is sufficient for depreciation, 2½ per cent.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not claim they were.

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. MARLER: How does the right hon. gentleman expect to write it off if the boats are not earning it?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Well, there is 4 per cent written off now.

Mr. MARLER: That 4 per cent is a book-keeping entry, it is true.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Well, I say 2½ per cent would be ample.

Mr. MARLER: So you would reduce simply the book-keeping entry?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly, in order that we may know what the loss is.

Mr. MARLER: I think the hon. gentleman is speaking very theoretically.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Well, the book-keeping entry is theoretical if what I am saying is theoretical. What I am saying is that the loss shown is greater than the actual loss, for the reason that the 2½ per cent, instead of from 4 to 5—I think it is between 4 and 5—is a sufficient depreciation to take care of the whole capital cost in 25 years, and the vessels should last very much longer than that and still be of use.

Mr. DUFF: Will the right hon. gentleman allow a little explanation? He is
5 p.m. quite right in saying that 2½ per cent will take care of the first capital cost in thirty years.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Twenty-five.

Mr. DUFF: But there are other reasons why depreciation must be set to rest. One reason is that ships can hardly ever be insured at their full value, and in case the company should lose some of them during the thirty years it is necessary to put a certain amount of money for depreciation to rest to take care of the difference between what the vessels are insured for and what they cost. That is one reason why it is necessary to put to rest for depreciation a larger amount than 2½ per cent or even 4 per cent. Then, there is another reason: It may be found necessary during the twenty-five years to spend a large amount of money for the repairing of boilers and engines or to make other extraordinary expenditures in connection with the ships.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Well, I can see some force in the first; at least, I can not say that it is valueless as an argument. But in the second I cannot, because any cost of that kind is included in the annual charges.

Mr. DUFF: Not extraordinary expenditures.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not see why they would not. However, what I set out to show was that the figures are at least a very ample presentation of the present loss. And how absurd after all it is to be charging 5½ per cent interest against the war cost, especially of 45 ships that had to be built for the purposes of war. That is a charge against the war; that cannot be computed in the decision as to what our loss is and in giving us some idea whether or not we should proceed.

Then, I have another complaint to make: I do not believe we are getting the benefit of these ships that we ought to get. I never have very much faith in an enterprise that is being managed by those unsympathetic to it. Up to the time we got the Grand Trunk into the system there was some excuse for the Grand Trunk business going to an American line—the White Star line, but since then I do not know of any excuse; I would like to hear of one if there is any. We ought to be getting the business that is going to the White Star line for the Canadian Mercantile Marine, thereby adding not only to the returns of the mercantile marine but to the returns also of Canadian railways. Why should our business be going there? My information is—I hope I may be wrong; I hope a change has been made—that that business is not coming to us yet. If we had the business the White Star line had for the Grand Trunk and which we now ought to have for the Canadian Government Merchant Marine, then there would be a very considerably improved showing, if not, indeed, a favourable showing in the total. I know of no reason why those who can manage a railway cannot manage a mercantile marine. I think the results of the last three years show that a railway can be managed by a business directorate even though it is owned by a country. What insuperable obstacle is there to prevent the managing of a mercantile marine when its management is necessarily associated with a railway?

Now, what I have said I have stated with a view to placing fairly before the committee the reasons that actuated the late government in the course it took, and in order that hon. members may have some idea of what we really have, instead of the idea they too easily get from some of the speeches made in this House, namely, that we really have nothing of value. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell), said "Oh, they are too slow; they do not go fast enough." Well, the speed of these vessels varies from 11½ to 13, or at the lowest, 11. What I am saying is not something which I give merely on my own authority; the speed of every vessel was tested before we took it over. I do not know whether or not any of those assisting the minister at this hour can give the official records, but I know the Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries can do it, because he has the records. The records run, for all the vessels except the two largest, the Forester and the Fisher, 11½ to 12; the Forester and the Fisher are 13. Now, what I say is this: If there is any just criticism it is that they are fast. Freight-owners do not want fast freight vessels because it takes too much in coal to operate them. Eight and a half and nine knots an hour is about what they want, and as a matter of fact though the vessels owned by the Canadian Mercantile Marine can run at eleven and a half to twelve knots and two of them at thirteen knots they do not actually do it for the reason that it is a more expensive operation; but the capacity of the vessel is there and it is utterly absurd, indeed, it is an injustice to this House, for the Minister of Agriculture to tell us that the vessels are of slow construction. They are fitted for all the purposes for which good vessels are fitted, and they are designed by the best designers that could be found. They are of British design and they are of a design, let me inform my hon. friend the member for Cariboo (Mr. McBride), that the British are now using in the construction of their vessels. Thirteen of them have cold storage facilities, and all of them are equipped with the telemotor for steering. A great many of them I think, or nearly all of the larger vessels, are oil burners and some combine oil and steam. They are modern in every particular in respect to construction, and they are of the design that is being used at this time. Of course if we could have foretold conditions, had we had some superior wisdom that nobody in the world has had, we might have made money by a sale which, however, I think would have necessitated new purchases later though at a smaller sum. Outside of that the course pursued has been wise having regard to all the circumstances of the period.

Mr. DUFF: Is it not a fact that the old directorate of which Mr. Hanna was the president decided to sell twenty-seven of these ships more than a year ago?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is a fact that the old directorate recommended a sale of the smaller vessels, and they may have been right in so doing.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): May I compliment the right hon. the leader of the

Opposition on at last offering to the House some reasonable praise of these ships, and the policy of the government that built them. I am not going to commend that policy or defend it. I thought at the time that it was a foolish if not a wasteful one. Experience has shown that the policy was wasteful but has not yet definitely proved that it was foolish. It may be interesting to those of us who are looking on with the attitude of laymen rather than expert seamen to notice that most of the attacks on this policy come from hon. gentlemen on the side of the House that is not at all sympathetic towards public ownership. That is, perhaps, one of the most significant features of this debate. I would submit to the committee that if they look at the history and situation of the Canadian Pacific Railway there is hardly a gentleman who will contend that the great position it has reached in the world to-day could have been attained had it not expanded steadily in the direction of sea control. It is with great pride as Canadians that we look on the extraordinary expansion of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's business in the Orient, on the Pacific, in the South Seas, on the Atlantic, in fact everywhere ships go. I cherish the ambition that our own system will experience a similar expansion. I would like to see our business expand in corresponding degree with that of the Canadian Pacific, and I hope that in time it will even excel it.

An hon. MEMBER: Oh, oh.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Has my hon. friend from Jacques-Cartier (Mr. Jacobs), who expresses a certain amount of derision at that observation not got a similar ambition? I hope he has. The time may come, I hope it will, when the Canadian National lines will be in the ocean business an equal with the Canadian Pacific.

Mr. JACOBS: As a publicly-owned concern?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): As a publicly-owned concern.

Mr. JACOBS: My hon. friend is an optimist.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I have faith in the people which perhaps my hon. friend has not. May I suggest also that there is rather an inconsistency between the attitude of hon. gentlemen opposite in defending a vote of $2,000,000 for the purchase of a hotel in Paris with a view to expanding the business of the Canadian National Railways in Europe and their present attitude in regard to the Canadian Mercantile Marine. They argued in favour of development of business in Europe with a view to its transfer to the Canadian National lines. That, perhaps, is not an immediate possibility but we hope it will be realized in the future and we expect that the Canadian National lines will expand with the development of that European trade.

The hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) yesterday delivered a speech which, to me at any rate, displayed moderation and a knowledge of the subject that was encouraging. I wish to congratulate the hon. member on his speech which is one of the best he has made in this House. But during his remarks he quoted from the Ottawa Journal, the Montreal Gazette, and another paper. The only remark I have to make with respect to these quotations is that they were all from papers that are violently opposed to national ownership. That also is significant.

Mr. DUFF: That is something in their favour.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): That depends on the point of view. As for the quality of the ships themselves the leader of the Opposition has dealt very fully with that phase of the subject. But there is one little item in the press, that may be of interest to the members of this committee. It deals with the seaworthiness of one of our ships, the Canadian Fisher. It is very rarely that a vessel has to endure the buffeting of a gale of a type such as the Canadian Fisher had to endure and comes through safely. I think the hon. member for Lunenburg will agree with me that the vessels which come safely through that kind of experience are wooden sailing ships, and others of buoyant character. Now, the article I wish to quote appeared in the Montreal Gazette of October 3rd, 1922, and it is headed:

> Government ship in cyclonic gale.
> Canadian Fisher successfully weathered violent hurricane near Bermuda.

I simply wish to place this article on Hansard in order to indicate to those who have spoken so freely in condemnation of the utter uselessness of the ships of the Canadian Mercantile Marine that in reality they are very seaworthy. Now this is what the article says:

> Passengers who arrived in port on the Canadian Forester, of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine, had exciting tales to tell of the cyclonic gale which swept over the Atlantic on Thursday, September 21, causing considerable damage in Bermuda. These passengers were on the Canadian Fisher, also of the C.G.M.M., which was caught at the edge of the vortex and was buffeted for eight hours in a

wind which records taken on board the Mutive, the survey ship, indicated a maximum velocity of 103 miles an hour, with an average velocity of 98 miles an hour.

Mr. DUFF: On the edge of the cyclone?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): On the edge of the vortex of a cyclone.

Mr. DUFF: Travelling at a velocity of 103 miles?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): So the article reads. It says that the average velocity of the wind was 98 miles an hour. Does the hon. member question the statement?

Mr. DUFF: I do certainly.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Does the hon. member question the statement that a cyclone can have a velocity of 98 miles an hour?

Mr. DUFF: The centre of a cyclone will have that velocity but not the edge.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): To resume the quotation:

The Canadian Fisher, Captain Fergus Ferguson, proved to be a stout ship and weathered the gale wonderfully well. All the boat covers were ripped free, while the canvas dodgers on the bridge were torn to pieces. One piece held on to a stanchion on Monkey Island and the force of the blow bent the upright. The heavy plate glass windows on the wings of the bridge were shattered into little pieces. Some damage was done to the Marconi house and the engine room telegraph on the poop deck was wrecked.

There were only two casualties, a fireman receiving a scalp wound after having been pitched against some fittings, while Mr. Stoddard, the second officer, was struck by the end of a broken signal halliard, which whipped across his face and left him a cut and a black eye.

The Fisher was near Bermuda when the cyclonic gale broke and Captain Ferguson swung around so as to give the ship plenty of sea room. The wind started out of the northeast and swung around the compass, the Fisher shouldering her way around with the wind. She was driven at full speed and made about a knot an hour, meanwhile being driven thirty miles sideways.

Calm Night Followed

The wind blew with indescribable fury, whipping heavy rain across the mountainous seas. It was an amazing revelation of the power of an angry sea. After the gale had blown over and while the sea was yet running high, the sun came out in the afternoon and was followed by a glorious starlit night.

The Fisher had been warned of the approach of the cyclonic gale by heavy seas and also by wireless. The barometer dropped very rapidly, falling to 28.10, which is a very low mark. The barometer rose as rapidly as it fell.

On arrival at Hamilton the passengers subscribed to a memorial to Captain Ferguson expressing appreciation of his seamanship, courage and resourcefulness, and also praising the actions of the other officers, the crew and more particularly the engine room staff.

And the crew, and more particularly the engine room—

Mr. DUFF: It does not say she used oil.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Regardless of what she used the feat performed by a steel built freight ship going through a cyclone of that character, close to land, with little or no sea room, having to drive seawards, and only able to make a knot an hour, while the force of the gale drove her thirty miles sideways, is a tribute to the seaworthiness of the vessel.

Mr. DUFF: These thirty-year-old ships of the Royal Mail Packet Company and ships of other lines have to contend with these hurricanes every trip they make.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): That may be true, but it does not take away from the merit of this particular feat.

Mr. DUFF: Not at all.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): On a previous occasion I cited the case of one of the Government Merchant Marine ships which on her maiden voyage made 13,000 miles with untried engines without a single breakdown. These are instances that have come to my attention that prove much that the right hon. leader of the Opposition has said on behalf of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine. It was very encouraging to one who has hopes for the development of national ownership in this country that he should have so wholeheartedly expressed the opinion that these boats could carry anything, and after listening to the speeches of the right hon. member, I must say that my opinion coincides with his.

There has been considerable criticism of the size of the ships and the necessity of getting rid of the small boats, because they cannot make money. As a layman, it is very puzzling to find such conflicting evidence given, not only from all corners of the House, but from the press itself. I picked up a copy of the Boston News Bureau, a daily financial paper, of Monday, March 19, 1923, where, in an article headed "British Shipping Languishes" I find the following:

In some trades ships of about 9,000 tons are proving too big for the cargoes offering with boats of about half this size of more manageable proportions. Owners who recently have added larger sized ships to their fleets are in many cases regretting it.

Much that has been said by the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) with regard to the expense of building these ships, the vast amount of money the taxpayers have had to pay and may have to pay in the future has truth, but the amount of this vote is unquestionably warranted. After all, can we

not look at this question in the spirit, at any rate, of recognizing the disabilities that exist, accept the Merchant Marine as a war legacy, and then set to work to endeavour with sympathetic minds, with the best interests of the Canadian National at heart, to do what we can to improve the Canadian Government Merchant Marine and make it a paying part of our system? After all, we can hardly expect that line to pay on the original capital cost, but that is what some hon. members opposite appear to expect to-day.

Mr. DUFF: Is it not a fact that the statements for the last two years show conclusively that whether the ships cost $200 a ton or $100 a ton, they could not declare a dividend on their cost?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Would the hon. gentleman tell us what line makes money now?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): That is exactly the question I had in mind. I am much obliged to the right hon. leader of the Opposition because the same thought was in my mind—what shipping line has made money in the last two years?

Mr. DUFF: Quite a few.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I would like the names of the lines similar in traffic and tonnage to this line which have made money. I doubt if the hon. member can cite a single instance. This, at any rate, is one point worth considering—how can we expect these lines to pay on the original capital cost? It is utterly out of the question, and cannot be done, considering the present conditions. May I say further that that point might be emphasized by adding that one cannot expect the Canadian Government Merchant Marine to pay as long as the vessels are being used simply as supplementaries to other lines, or other steamship services now in existence. The other day I read a despatch, I think it was from London, England, in which comment was made regarding the establishment of a new passenger service from Canada to the West Indies by the Canadian Government Merchant Marine. The article winds up by saying:

> It is to be hoped that the passenger line between Canada and the West Indies will be as great a success as the freight service they have established between the two countries in the past 18 months.

Another despatch from London, England, dealing with the fact that the Canadian Government Merchant Marine are entering on west coast business, says:

> The policy of Canadian Government Merchant Marine throughout has been to supplement rather than to compete with existing service.

I would respectfully suggest to the committee and to the hon. member for Lunenburg that if we would transfer to the Merchant Marine the subsidies we are paying to the Royal Mail Packet Company in connection with the West India service, the Australian service and other service, the outlook for our marine would be much improved.

Mr. GRAHAM: When the Merchant Marine inaugurated the Australian services the subsidy lapsed, I think in 1921. It was $140,000.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I sincerely trust there will be no attempt made to renew the subsidy, and I am confident that may be one of the reasons why the Pacific service is showing a reasonable profit. One point that might be of interest to hon. members in this part of the House will be found in a despatch from Toronto on October 2, last, which reads:

> Six Canadian Government Merchant Marine vessels which have been lying idle all summer in Goderich and Midland have now been ordered into commission by October 10, to handle grain from Fort William to Georgian Bay ports. Each vessel has a capacity of 100,000 bushels of grain. The crew for each boat will number twenty.

And so on. It is an interesting thing to us and has puzzled many members from the West why the Merchant Marine was not used in connection with the lake service. Everyone knows how the combines on the lakes raised the price for handling grain to a point that was out of all reason. Great use in my opinion could be made of our Canadian Government Merchant Marine to break the combine on the lakes, and if the government intends to bring in legislation in this regard I would suggest that at any rate it take its marine out of all combines, keep it out of rate combines and use it in order to break them.

It may be quite true there are several of these small boats that will not pay. If that be the case, if an investigation by the minister indicates they will not pay, by all means let us tie them up till we can sell them, but let us keep the boats as to which there is a reasonable hope that they will pay, and make use of them to the best advantage, and around these, as a nucleus, let us develop our great Canadian national fleet of the future. I think there is great hope in this service. I would not like to see it done away with, or sold or given away. There is too great an agitation at the present time for

it, and as far as I am concerned I think we can support this vote.

Mr. GRAHAM: The question of public ownership of the Merchant Marine has come to us as the result of the war. I will not discuss how or why it came, but it is here. What are we going to do with it? I know some of my friends believe that we should dispose of the Merchant Marine to the highest bidder.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member means the lowest bidder.

Mr. GRAHAM: I would not think that. It is easier to say these things on the outside looking in than it is to do them on the inside looking out. First as to the stability of the ship, I have never heard any person question the stability of these ships that form the Canadian Government Merchant Marine. Whether it was wise to build them or not, so far as I have been able to find out, they were built well. The United States constructed a large number of ships. I had the honour of being at the launching of some of them that never got any further than the bay in which they were launched. I refer to the wooden ships. The United States are in a great dilemma now with a large number of ships on their hands, with overhead charges piling up, with interest accumulating and no business for many of them. The head of the Shipping board, Albert D. Lasker, has made a report to the President that might be of interest. I will not read it, but I will give just a short synopsis of it. He recommends the formation, for the operation of 450 ships, of eighteen subsidiary companies with a central company to which these eighteen subsidiary companies will be responsible. That would, I think, be 25 ships to a company, if each company had the same number of ships. But the division is not made in that way, as I understand the matter; but rather the ships on each route will be managed by a company, and the 450 ships are thus divided. It is interesting to know that Mr. Lasker, at the conclusion of his report, advised the government of the United States that they should continue to keep in mind the ultimate destiny of the ships, and that was the return of them to private ownership. That may take many years, and the life of the ships may be pretty well exhausted before that time arrives. In the meantime, the United States is endeavouring to make these ships useful and self-sustaining so far as possible. This much must be remembered: Supposing we sold all the ships—and I am in favour of selling some of the smaller ones—that would reduce our annual interest charge, but it would not wipe it out; we would have an annual interest charge to all eternity on the amount of our loss. So, as regards that, selling these ships would not rid us of that annual expenditure.

A question was raised by my hon. friend as to the speed of the larger ships. It is true that in tests they did run up to 13½ knots an hour, but no ship can well be run in fair weather and bad weather up to its full test, because that would be very expensive. For instance, as regards a locomotive on one of our express or freight trains, sometimes a difference of ten miles an hour in speed will nearly double the consumption of coal. There is a limit to which a locomotive or a boiler can be driven; if you go beyond that limit, you increase the cost very much more materially than by pushing it up to a certain point. But the average rate of the vessels in fair weather and bad weather is from 10 to 11½ knots an hour. 11½ knots, I think, being the speed of the two larger vessels. Freight shippers contend that for perishable goods that speed is not sufficient, but that the ships should have a speed of several knots an hour more than that in order to carry perishable goods across the ocean. Whether that be true or not, I am not an expert and I cannot say.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That would depend on whether they have cold storage or not. Twenty of ours have cold storage.

Mr. DUFF: Every man wants to get his goods to the market as soon as possible.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is one of the questions raised. As to the arrangement with the White Star and the Cunard lines, I must say in reply to the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) that I did not find anything but sympathetic feeling towards the Merchant Marine except for the smaller boats. In fact, Sir Henry Thornton and every one of the directors with whom I have conversed are strongly of opinion that we ought to keep the larger boats and sell the smaller ones, and they are very sympathetic in the belief that the larger boats are very useful. I think, before the Grand Trunk came into the organization, the Canadian Northern had a working arrangement with the Cunard line. Now they have the Cunard and the White Star. The committee can readily understand that the Canadian National is endeavouring to get its share of immigration, that is, passenger business. Our ships up to date are not prepared to carry passengers to any great extent, and

in order to get a share of our immigration traffic, arrangements must be made with some lines of steamships that are capable of carrying that immigration and that carry both freight and passengers. I am strongly of the view that if the Merchant Marine is to be useful, its greatest use, perhaps, will eventually be in connection with the Canadian National line. I do not want to tell tales out of school, but I might intimate to the members of the committee that the returns from some of the routes are looking much better this year up to date than last year. It is true that last year was a fairly disastrous year for shipping, and many of the larger companies lost money. I will not give any details, but I am informed that some companies that we imagine are making large amounts of money on certain routes, last year lost very large amounts of money on those routes. My idea is this—and I think it is the idea of the government; my hon. friend wanted me to state it—that the question of government ownership and going into government ownership is one thing, and the question of doing the best you can with it is another. I am not going to discuss the question of public ownership. We have public ownership, but we want to do the best thing for the people of Canada with it. Unquestionably the small ships are very staunch ships, but on the Great Lakes this is what they have to compete with. To do any business on the lakes they have to be specialized, as I understand the matter. The lake trade is ore, coal and grain, and if these vessels cannot carry grain on the lakes, with prospects of getting some return cargo, we cannot get a cheap rate. Take one of these vessels of ours on the lakes, staunch though it may be, a good ship for its size; admitting all that, it cannot to my mind possibly compete in the grain carrying trade with a ship of the whale-back kind. Such a ship is specially constructed with its machinery in the stern with practically the entire remainder of the ship open for cargo space.

Mr. DUFF: It carries five times the cargo.

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes, and it is loaded or unloaded twice as easily. One can readily see that in order to get the best results, we cannot, with a small ship, compete with that class of vessel. For package freight I think our smaller vessels are well adapted, and for coasting trade, for instance on some of the routes in the Old Land that were named by my hon. friend, I believe these smaller ships would be specially adapted. I hope for possibly that particular route for which they would be specially adapted, a fair offer may be made for the smaller boats. This question was put to me the other day at one of the elevators. It is nothing against those smaller boats except for that particular grain carrying trade. One of our own elevators at Port Colborne suggested that they should be allowed to charge the smaller vessels an extra rate for unloading. We asked why. To me it was rather peculiar that a government elevator should charge the government boats more for unloading. They proved to me conclusively that in the case of the larger boats they could unload twice as quickly as they could in that of the smaller boats, being able to use both derricks. I do not wish to go into further details. We want to do the best we can in regard to the suggestion made by the preceding board and the present one that we should, if possible, dispose of the smaller ships and in the meantime put to the greatest advantage the larger ships that we have.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): I agree largely with what the minister says, but I wish to protest against the attitude of the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff), not because of his antagonism to the National Railways, but because of his attempt to discredit the railways owing to some reputed failure in connection with the boats built by the government of Canada.

Mr. DUFF: No; the two things are altogether separate.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): They undoubtedly are separate, but an attempt is being made to associate them in an effort to damage the National Railways. If it can be shown that these ships have failed it is believed that the National Railways, in conjunction with which the marine is being operated, will be discredited in consequence. So far as I can see the idea is gaining ground rapidly in Canada that the acquisition of these railways was a splendid thing, and I think that the ships that are necessary to handle traffic in connection with the railways should be maintained. Shipping is complementary to railways in the transportation system, and I hope that the pledge the government gave some time ago that they would give the National Railways a fair trial will be comprehensive enough to include an equally fair trial of the boats which we have paid so much to secure and which are now in our possession. Some of these boats, I have no doubt, can be successfully operated and they would help to solve the transportation problem. I believe the government would be

amply justified in carrying out a fair policy in this respect even if it did cost a little, because, from now on, the National Railways, I am convinced, will prove a valuable asset to this country. If these ships can be operated successfully—and I do not see why they should not be—they will constitute an important adjunct of the National Railway system, and we shall see that we made no mistake whatever in nationalizing our railways. I am quite confident that from now on the returns from these railways will surprise the people of Canada. As I said not long ago in this House, the greatest railway system in the world to-day is owned by the people of Canada, who are its only shareholders. And in the United States there is no salvation for the great American roads unless the government of that country comes to their relief. Those railways cannot finance themselves to-day; they cannot get the money. Everything considered, therefore, I think we have every reason to congratulate ourselves on our National Railways; and so far as the ships are concerned, I wish to tell the hon. member for Lunenburg that they are not tramps. I was more than surprised last night to hear the hon. gentleman refer to them as ships of poor quality, tramp ships, of which he was ashamed. I am glad the testimony has come out to-day that they are not tramps, which is not a proper term to use in reference to them.

Mr. FORKE: The term is all right as applied to steamers.

Mr. DUFF: What would you call them?

Mr. GERMAN: The hon. gentleman will understand that a tramp ship is not necessarily a poor ship.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): I know quite well what a tramp ship is. The point has been made that if the ships were really properly organized under a company they could handle the business better. A tramp ship is supposed to go around from place to place looking for cargo wherever it can find it, and when reference is made to our ships as being tramps I take it that that sense is implied. And that is what I object to. Now, I repeat that we have not an inferior class of ships for the money that we paid for them. The United States have a large number of poor ships on their hands, and the man in charge of their marine has recommended a national policy in connection with them. We are not going to sell our ships as mere junk. Let us keep them until we can find reasonable employment for them. It has gone out now that the government is prepared to receive proposals for the smaller ships, and I believe that if we keep the larger vessels and really make an effort to get work for them we shall find the Canadian flag in various parts of the world.

Mr. DUFF: In a statement which the minister made last night he said that there was a loss on operation of the vessels for the first three months of 1923 of $457,770.13. A statement was issued by Sir Henry Thornton for the period up to December 31, 1922, showing certain items. I have not got that statement by me, but perhaps the minister can find it. However, I have my own notes. In the consolidated statement, the profit and loss account, the minister will find certain figures. One has reference to accounts receivable, amounting to $840,063.91. That could only mean the amount for freights owing to the different ships in commission. On the liability side there is an amount, balance of uncompleted voyages, of $346,159.63, which can only mean, if I am right, the probable expenses in connection with these vessels. If that is correct, then these two items in the statement show a profit of $493,904.28. I want to have an explanation of that. The minister says there is a deficit in the three months' operation of some $457,000, but if these two items are correct, then apparently there is a profit of $493,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: In these accounts some of the amounts receivable may be in the banks on the other side of the water. The losses to which my hon. friend refers are from January 1, to March 31, of this year. The others were for last year.

Mr. DUFF: That cannot be right because it says, "Balance on uncompleted voyages."

Mr. GRAHAM: That is for last year.

Mr. DUFF: But the ships were still on the voyages and would complete them this year.

Mr. GRAHAM: This is completed voyages.

Mr. DUFF: There is something wrong somewhere.

Mr. GRAHAM: I suppose that is the cost of the uncompleted voyages.

Mr. DUFF: Which would be completed in the three months of this year?

Mr. GRAHAM: That might be accurate. It would only be an estimate, I suppose, of the actual cost of the uncompleted voyages.

Mr. DUFF: Very good. Then what is the $840,000 for accounts receivable? Is that for uncompleted voyages or for voyages which have been completed and freights which have not been remitted?

Mr. GRAHAM: I imagine it would be largely freights unremitted from some other companies. It might be interchange of freight, due maybe from the Canadian National Railways or some other lines. But it would be bills receivable generally speaking.

Mr. DUFF: Would not some of it apply to these uncompleted voyages?

Mr. GRAHAM: I think not.

Mr. DUFF: Then these vessels on the uncompleted voyages would have no freight to go against the $840,000?

Mr. GRAHAM: I would not say that.

Mr. DUFF: There is another matter I would like cleared up. I find that last night the minister spoke about the $500,000 paid in interest coming out of the surplus of $1,000,000 shown on December 31st, 1920. Will the minister state if he has some further information in regard to this?

Mr. GRAHAM: I find I was too modest. There was a difference last night in regard to $1,000,000, if I remember correctly, out of which I said I understood $500,000 had been paid in interest. Whenever there are any surplus earnings from these boats they pay interest on the notes the government holds against the companies. Now, that whole $1,000,000 was paid in interest.

Mr. DUFF: When?

Mr. GRAHAM: As per statement on page 17 of the annual report for 1922. So the whole $1,000,000 we were discussing last night was returned in interest on notes held by the government.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is by boats that were paying?

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I want to say a word with regard to the reason given by the minister for handing over to the White Star line Canadian National freight. He intimated that the Canadian National Railway Company was anxious to get part of the immigration business. My comment is that I do not think passenger traffic is of very much value to a railway. It is true it is better to have the maximum number of passengers for the trains you are running; but this is not the paying traffic of a railway, it is the freight that makes a railway go. So I do not see on that basis why we should be catering particularly for passenger traffic at the expense of freight. But the case doubly deserves consideration when we have a Mercantile Marine too. We want passenger traffic for it, whatever it may be. Passenger traffic I think pays on the water, but it does not pay on the land. Consequently we want all the traffic we can get for our Mercantile Marine. I cannot subscribe to the theory that we ought to be giving our Canadian National freight to the White Star line in order that we may get a few immigrants off their boats. I suggest to the minister that he get all the freight he can for his own line, and by so doing he will get all the passengers he can for his ocean lines.

Mr. DUFF: There is another question I would ask. The $1,700,000 does not appear in the 1922 statement. When was this passed over by the government to the Canadian Government Merchant Marine?

Mr. GRAHAM: That would be passed over, I think, in November. I am only speaking from memory. There was a $1,000,000 expenditure by Governor General's warrant, and then $700,000 was added in the estimate that went through but a few days ago. I imagine that the two sums were to pay accrued indebtedness for the past year.

Mr. DUFF: The money was paid over then before December 31st, 1922, when the last statement was made up?

Mr. GRAHAM: Not all of it. The million dollars would be, but the seven hundred thousand dollars only went through the House the other night.

Mr. DUFF: That has not been paid?

Mr. GRAHAM: I would not say, I do not know.

Mr. DUFF: It was not paid in 1922?

Mr. GRAHAM: No.

Mr. DUFF: I notice by the statement they only account for something over $4,000,000 paid by the government to the Merchant Marine. We voted $4,200,000 last session and $1,000,000 by Governor General's warrant, but the statement only shows, $4,750,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: It might not have been paid over before December 31st. It was late in the autumn when it was passed. Of course, it was to pay accounts for that year.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: As representing a western constituency, I wish to emphasize that this is not a matter merely of eastern or local importance. It should be clearly understood, it seems to me, that the Canadian Government Merchant Marine is an essential part of the great transportation system of which the

Canadian National Railways form the main portion. Two questions have arisen in the course of this debate, one as to the suitability of the boats. While that has been emphasized by some hon. members, I do not think it has been made clear that these boats are not suitable for the trade, or could not readily be adapted for it. But we have had put forward frankly as the major contention, the fundamental opposition on the part of some members to government or national ownership. I for one was very glad to hear the minister state that the government intended to give the Canadian Government Merchant Marine a fair trial.

I should like to say that in visiting some of these boats and talking with the officers and men I was struck by the fact that already there is developing a very great loyalty on the part both of the officers and crews towards the Canadian government service. Further than that, some of the men who know the shipping history in the provinces down by the sea have urged upon me that we should preserve our Government Merchant Marine as a safeguard against the shipping trust—shall I call it?—which has grown up on the Atlantic seaboard. They say that some years ago a great many Canadian seamen were practically driven from Canadian waters because of the encouragement given to other boats, ordinarily called "Norwegian" boats, which were then introduced. Later the same group who had assisted the Norwegians became interested in steel, coal and other industrial concerns and were given special consideration at the expense of Canadian seamen. Still later, oriental crews were employed in the coastwise trade. It also should be pointed out particularly that some of these same big interests are today operating on the Great Lakes, as has been revealed in the reports of the commission investigating those matters. It would appear that if we are to prevent a monopoly of the financial and industrial interests which might very readily control the shipping both on the lakes and on the ocean, we shall have to own and control our own ships. We need, of course, in addition, a great deal more in the way of inspection, and also the services of some commission which will deal with the whole question of freight rates. There may be, as pointed out, the advisability of getting rid of some of these ships. Undoubtedly we ought to mark their present values down to present market prices. Some hon. members tell us that these ships are of very little use, and that they would have to be sold for very little. I suggest they be marked down to the fair market value of to-day, and then we can treat with the profit and loss on that basis, not on the basis of any inflated or fictitious war value. These are details of administration but I should urge that we would do nothing whatever to impair the present service or make it difficult to carry out the underlying principle of government ownership and control.

Mr. DUFF: Is it a fact that Sir Henry Thornton, who is president of Canadian Mercantile Marine, Limited, is also a director of Canada Steamships, Limited?

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes: The Grand Trunk system has been represented on that board for some years; there are traffic arrangements between them. Sir Henry Thornton holds no stock in Canada Steamships Limited and has no interest in that concern except to the extent of seeing that we get our full share of the lake traffic. Mr. Dalrymple, I think, had represented the Grand Trunk on that board, and Mr. Hanna himself the Canadian National. Upon the two being amalgamated they asked the president to go on the board. It is immaterial whether he is on or not; one of the other directors would do just as well. As I say, Sir Henry Thornton has no interest whatever in Canada Steamships except to see that the Canadian National gets its share of the business.

Mr. DUFF: We cannot expect lower freight rates if Sir Henry Thornton is a director of Canada Steamships Limited. I say it is a mistake for him to be a director of that line.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Two years ago it was much worse than a mistake; it was a "crime."

Mr. DUFF: A crime, then. I am still willing to call it a crime.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I can remember that the hon. member for Lunenburg was at that time even more emphatic on the subject than his leader was. There were assertions about an "interlocking directorate—"

Mr. DUFF: All right; I have not changed my views in that respect.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I notice that. "Interlocking directorates"; "inter-related business," "superorganization,"—all these things were the curse of the country and the outstanding instance was the presence of Mr. Hanna on the board of Canada Steamships Limited.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Has any effort been made by the government to prevent the Canadian Government Merchant Marine from going into the areas covered by these steamship lines? It is repeatedly emphasized in

this debate that the Canadian Government Mercantile Marine should be used in an effort to break up these combines. We have undisputed evidence at the present time that there is a combine which is helping to raise the rates. I had some extracts to read on this point, but it is a little late now. If the vote is held over till after recess I might deal with them.

Mr. GRAHAM: That matter will be discussed when a report from the committee of the House is presented; it is not discussable at this stage, or I would have dealt with it during the consideration of these items.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. CHURCH: I do not wish to unduly detain the committee as I understand the minister is anxious to get away and I think he has been very patient throughout this discussion. But I wish to enter my protest against the proposed sale of twenty-seven ships of the Canadian Mercantile Marine. I have had twenty-five years' experience as a harbour commissioner and solicitor for vessel owners in the district from which I come and I wish to say that if the National Railway system is ever to become a success it must have lake and ocean services. One of the main reasons why the Canadian Pacific Railway has been such a striking success is because it has vessels engaged in the ocean and lake service as feeders. It is now proposed to sell these twenty-seven ships. Why do the management not sell their hotel and railway services also? If they are going to get rid of one agency for the building up of their business, why not dispose of them all? For my part I would not sell a tug, or a scow, or a dredge on the strength of the information that has been placed before the committee during this debate. I will go further and say that I do not believe the proposed sale commends itself to the wisdom and judgment of the country. The people who are concerned in shipments on the Great Lakes to-day want competition. A commission has conducted an inquiry into lake freight rates and practically before its report has been brought down, certainly before it has ever been considered by the House, and after the commission has taken considerable evidence, the recommendation is made that these twenty-seven ships be sold. These vessels were not built altogether for use to-day; they were intended to meet the needs of the future. I do not know of any other country in the world that is proposing to dispose of the ships in its possession in the manner that is contemplated here. Of what avail is the expenditure which Canada has made on its inland harbours, its ocean ports, and its canals if, before we have actually established the necessary ocean and lake services that are so urgently required, we cripple one of the agencies necessary to bring about cheaper transportation? With all due respect to the gentlemen who compose the Canadian Government Merchant Marine, Sir Henry Thornton is not a "cure all" for the transportation ills of this country, far from it, some of the things recommended by the management of the National Railways and Merchant Marine do not commend themselves to us on this side of the House. How is it that so many private people all over Canada and the United States want to buy these vessels? It is said that these ships cannot navigate the lakes. I would point out that nine of them were built at Collingwood, others at Port Arthur, and others again at Toronto, Midland and other places and they can do lake work on the Great Lakes. I wish to enter my emphatic protest against the proposed sale. I do so as the representative of an inland port which is spending twenty-six millions on harbour improvements.

As showing the need for improved transportation facilities on the lakes, I would point out that there is a Kirkwood shed in Toronto to-day twice the size of this chamber which is so full of freight that no more can be squeezed into it. The Kirkwood Company have illustrated with one vessel the success which can be made in operating on the lakes. They have applied to the government to be allowed to take over two or three more vessels, having demonstrated to the municipalities along the shore of lake Ontario that they can successfully manage lake shipping. I am very much surprised at the action of the government in recommending this sale. Stress has been laid upon the fact that these ships were built during the war and some ask why they were built at all. This is not relevant but they were built for war emergency, to add to shipping tonnage and help unemployment.

During the years 1916, 1917, and 1918 the unemployment conditions were such that the shipbuilding industry was a blessing to the large cities of Canada. That industry gave employment to twenty-six different classes of labour including ship carpenters, pattern makers, wheelwrights, engineers, skilled plate

workers, and boiler makers. They were all skilled workers and the most of them consisted of returned soldiers. During their service at the front they were only paid $1.10 a day and on returning to Canada were badly in need of employment. That is one of the reasons why so many of these ships were built. I think the difficulty in the way of the successful operation of these ships would be overcome if the government would engage the services of practical marine men. The whole of the vessels in the Canadian Government Merchant Marine could then be re-routed in such a way as to give results that would not only pay the fixed charges but leave a handsome profit.

It has been said that public ownership is responsible for the situation in which we find ourselves in this matter. That is not the case. If these ships were re-routed in the coasting and lake trade, put to other uses and given a fair trial, it would be seen after the lapse of two or three years what a great success would be achieved. The Canadian Pacific Company has for years had an admirably managed and most successful service on the ocean and on the upper lakes. The Canada Steamship Company has also been operating a lake passenger and freight service. The operation of its ships in the Niagara district and on the St. Lawrence has been a success. Unfortunately this company has frozen out competitors on a number of routes, for example, on the north shore of lake Ontario between Toronto and Belleville. Having freed themselves from competition they can charge whatever they like in the way of passenger and freight rates. The vessels of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine offered us the prospect of relief from these excessive charges but the action of the government seems likely to prevent its realization.

I do not wish to occupy an undue amount of time—I think the House has sat far too long; I would not complain if prorogation were taking place to-night—the federal Australian parliament can do its work in ten weeks, so should we—but I would direct attention to page 51 of the report on lake freight rates wherein it is set forth that a monopoly exists, that there is no competition at the present time, and that conditions are not what they should be. The lake ports are congested, and there is no regulation of the rates on grain, iron ore, coal and package freight. The more I study this problem the more I am convinced that a mistake has been made in regard to the disposition of these ships. I repeat, they were not built simply for the purposes of to-day. What was contemplated was to provide for the needs of the future and if we part with these vessels now we will be making a terrible mistake. No other country in the world is taking such a step as that. Great Britain was wise enough to foresee the possibilities that underlay the combination of coal and steel, and the great part transportation facilities would play in their development.

The greatest industrial expansion of England did not come from Cobdenism and free trade, but from the union of steel and coal. The great British navy started and as a merchant marine fleet. Seventy-five years ago men of war were added to it. There were no dreadnoughts in those days. Drake, Frobisher and Hawkins were men of the merchant marine, and they went out to the seven seas of the world and made England the great maritime country it is to-day. The Americans have taken a leaf out of their book. They had a conference in Washington. Did they adhere to the terms of the conference? No. Have all the war plants been reduced to a peace standing? No. I know that many of the shipbuilding plants have been busy lately constructing ships on the Atlantic seaboard—war plants turned into peace plants and building ships for their merchant marine. You will see they are busy building ships by private contract for private owners and also building some for the government. Very shortly the United States will go out to the seven seas of the world, and they are going out to the seven seas to get the balance of trade; they will catch up with England's merchant marine, surpass her and will they hope become the mistress of the seas, so far as the merchant marine is concerned.

In conclusion, I do not agree with this recommendation. We have spent, I think, $900,000,000 in direct and indirect aid to the railways of Canada. The deficits were last night placed by the minister at about $6,000,000 and all we are asked to vote to-night is $1,500,000. I think that all the money that requires to be voted here to-night is just sufficient to meet the actual out-of-pocket charges, because you do not require to vote depreciation and interest—on railways or the merchant fleet, which you own yourself. Therefore, I say the country can very well afford a million and a half this year to give the Merchant Marine another trial for two or three more years, not only on the ocean services but on the lake services. I believe if the government gives it a trial it will get an increased business; if the ships are re-routed,

they will get not only the coasting trade, but the smaller vessels will get the business on the Great Lakes. There is a great opening for these freighters on the lakes. They can come down through lake Erie and lake Ontario, down the St. Lawrence and go out along the seaboard and also do a coasting trade. That was shown by the report laid before the government a year or two ago. Is it a proper thing to sell ships when the market is flooded and gutted? A large number of boats along the Hudson are offered for sale but the owners will not sell them just now because they hope to get a better price than that offered. At present the market is glutted and it is no time to make the sale which has been proposed. The Merchant Marine can be utilized to carry coal and can be converted into ships which will carry cattle to the Old Country, and other packet freight from the Maritime provinces to the head of the lakes including coal.

It has been said that the Merchant Marine representatives sat in at the meetings of the Atlantic Combine, and they have been criticized for it. Notwithstanding that, the head of the Canadian National Railways becomes a director of the great monopoly, the Canada Steamship Company. Sir Henry Thornton cannot serve two masters. He never should have become a director of this large shipping concern, the Canada Steamships Company, which froze out all the smaller companies carrying freight to Buffalo and Toronto from the head of the lakes. Yet the government allows one of its National Railway directors to become the head of this monopoly. It has been stated that he becomes such a director because the National Railways has an exchange of traffic with the Canada Steamship Company. It has an exchange of traffic with the Michigan Central, Lake Shore and Baltimore and Ohio. Is it right that Sir Henry Thornton should then also become a director of these three American railways as well? I believe it is wrong and that the people will not approve of it.

I wish to utter my protest against the proposal before the Chair to-night. I believe the time will come when we will see that it is a mistake. These ships were built for Canada, to give the National Railways a chance, and to act as feeders for them on the lakes and the ocean, in order to see what could be done in an economical way by assisting water-borne traffic to reduce the great freight charges which the people out West and throughout Canada are paying to-day.

[Mr. Church.]

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): I desire to call the attention of the minister to an inquiry that was made in the Senate and which reads:

> Upon what terms were the freighters T. J. Drummond and J. A. McKee leased to the Great Lakes Transportation Company for the season of 1923 as to the price to be paid for the use thereof and conditions (if any) as to price to be charged for carrying grain.

As I understand it, these are first-class freighters capable of carrying 100,000 bushels of grain, and they are at the present time actually engaged in that traffic. I would like the minister to state the terms upon which these freighters were leased to the Great Lakes Transportation Company, the length of the term, and all the other particulars. Will the minister state whether he considers it wise and proper that at this time, when it is alleged that there is a combination, these vessels should be in the employ of those who are alleged to be in the combine?

Mr. GRAHAM: It is a very general practice to lease a ship at so much per day. I do not know what the rental is. We have a number of ships of our own on the Great Lakes fully equal to any demand that will be made upon us.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): There are three other vessels the Kearsage, the Arthur Orr and the George Orr.

Mr. GRAHAM: Those vessels do not belong to the Merchant Marine.

Item agreed to.

Progress reported.

PENSION ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. H. S. BELAND (Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment) moved the second reading of Bill No. 205 to amend the Pension Act.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

On section 3—Disabilities in respect of which pensions claimed.

Mr. MARLER: I think perhaps a slight amendment would improve this section. The section says:

> Pensions shall be awarded to or in respect of members of the forces who have suffered disability resulting from injury or disease or an aggravation thereof, in accordance with the rates set out in schedule A of this act.

That refers to disability pensions which are always payable to the man himself. I think if the words "or in respect of" were struck

out of the first line, it would be an improvement. Likewise on page 2, at the bottom, I find the words—

And in respect of members of the forces who have died, in accordance with the rates set out in schedule B of this act, when the injury or disease or aggravation thereof resulting in disability or death in respect of which the application for pension is made was attributable to military service as such.

I think if the words—

In respect of which the application for pension is made

—are struck out in that place, and also the same repetition in lines 5 and 6, the clause will be made clearer. I throw out this suggestion to the minister for what it is worth. I have studied the clause with some care.

Mr. CALDWELL: It looks as though it would cut out soldiers' dependents if you cut out the words "in respect of" in the first line of clause 3 (a). As proposed to be amended it would read:

Pension shall be awarded to members of the forces.

The expression "in respect of" would refer to pensions in respect of their dependents. I may be wrong, but that is my understanding.

Mr. MARLER: The pensions in schedule A are pensions payable to the men themselves, not payable to dependents at all. The pensions in schedule B, which is referred to in the following part of the same clause, are pensions payable to dependents. The only man who can receive a pension under schedule A of the act is the man himself.

Mr. BELAND: I beg to disagree with my hon. friend—I am sorry. Schedule A refers to the men themselves, but it also refers to:

Additional pensions for children for above ranks, first child, second child—

And so on. Children are dependents. That is why the words "in respect of" are in the clause.

Mr. CALDWELL: And the pensioner's wife and children are entitled to a certain proportion of the pension as well as the pensioner himself, and this would be cut out if those words were removed.

Mr. BELAND: That is correct.

Mr. LADNER: The first line of paragraph (c) of clause 3, subclause (1) reads:

An applicant shall not be deprived of pension.

He is only an applicant, and until he gets his pension, he cannot be deprived of it. Would it not be better to use the word "denied"? I think that would make the clause clearer. The remainder of the paragraph describes the obstacle that will not stand in his way to a pension.

Mr. BELAND: Of course we have the same purpose in view. Does my hon. friend believe, if we replace the words "deprived of" by the word "denied," that would make the clause clearer?

Mr. LADNER: Yes, and less capable of technical construction.

Mr. BELAND: I have no objection to the change in this case.

Mr. LADNER: I move that the words "deprived of" be struck out in the first line of clause 3, subclause (1) (c), and that the word "denied" be substituted therefor.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. LEWIS: Clause 3 (b) "pre-enlistment disabilities," provides in the fifth line that:

No pension shall be paid for a disability or disabling condition which at such time was wilfully concealed.

It seems to me, if any man has served in the theatre of war and has passed before the army officials and the doctors, the onus should not be on the man himself. I do not see that it is possible for any man to conceal wilfully some disability and pass before three or four doctors at least three times before he gets into the actual theatre of war. If such a condition did exist, if those doctors failed in their duty to find such a disability and the man actually worked in the theatre of war, the responsibility is not on the man himself, but on the doctors and officials who allowed him to pass.

Mr. POWER: What would the hon. gentleman do in the case of a man who went overseas with a glass eye and who did not inform the doctors that he had a glass eye? The doctors, perhaps, did not notice it, or if they did, they passed it over. Would the hon. member grant this man a pension for the loss of an eye if he returned in the same condition as when he went over?

Mr. LEWIS: If the army had any doctors who passed a man with a glass eye and who had no more insight into human nature the blame is upon the government.

Mr. POWER: Would the hon. gentleman give the soldier a pension?

Mr. LEWIS: Who is to prove that he had a glass eye before?

Mr. POWER: I am giving an extreme case. I know of the case of a man who had a glass eye and who went overseas. He is in

perfect health, and he has the same glass eye as the one he went over with. I do not think he is entitled to a pension.

Mr. LEWIS: Is he claiming a pension under the disability clause?

Mr. POWER: Not at all.

Mr. LEWIS: Then the case settles itself.

Mr. LADNER: If we are at the end of section 3, I should like to submit to the committee an amendment to be inserted after section 3 as section 3A dealing with the question of attributability. In paragraph (a) of sub-clause (1) of clause 3 of this bill, we find the words:

> Was attributable to or was incurred during such military service.

There arises the very important question of what is commonly called "attributability." Around that has been built up by the Pension board a procedure in which frequently the onus of proof in such cases, as has been contended by many, is placed upon the applicant. That is, when you have a case of some doubt, like neurasthenia or tuberculosis or something of that kind, the applicant puts in an application, and although the Pension board say that there is no question of onus of proof, yet the experience of many, including my own, shows in fact that there is, according to the interpretation of the act by the Pension board. They say that, in their opinion, "attributability to service" does not exist. The same problem arose in Great Britain, and there they passed a special act this year. I have taken out the main section of that to add as clause 3A to this bill. It is of such importance that I think it is wise to read the proposed amendment carefully in full to the committee so that they will understand it. I propose to add as clause 3A:

> 3A. For the purpose of the Pension Act and amendments thereto and notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the provisions of the said act and amendment thereto, or any other act, where a member of the force who has left the naval, military or air force service is, or at any time after the date of his leaving that service has been found to be suffering from tuberculosis, neurasthenia, cancer, or any other disease or incapacity which could reasonably be attributed to war service, such member shall be deemed to be suffering from a disease attributable to, or aggravated by naval, military or air force service, as the case may be, unless or until it is shown that the tuberculosis or neurasthenia or cancer or other disease or incapacity was neither attributable to nor aggravated by, such service; and for the purpose of this provision, acceptance for such service shall be conclusive that at the time of joining such service the officer or man was not suffering from any such disease or incapacity.

That is practically the provision in the English act which seeks to overcome this difficulty. It will be seen that the applicant must first establish a reasonable case; he must first submit to the Board of Pension Commissioners a prima facie case. The applicant is in a somewhat awkward situation. A widow, for example, may not have available the evidence which the law would make a conclusive case. So that when it is shown that a man enlisted as A1, and apparently was in good physical condition when he went overseas, that he did service, and perhaps was given some hospital attention, and then returning was suddenly found to have tuberculosis, he could perhaps show a prima facie case. The effect of this amendment would be that unless the board could show by evidence or medical testimony that the applicant or the person suffering from any disease or incapacity did not have such disease or incapacity, proof of which must be established in order to comply with the provisions of the act, then the applicant must be entitled to the benefit of the doubt. I do not know whether I have made myself perfectly clear. However, let me state the matter again to put it beyond all possibility of misunderstanding. If it appears that the applicant has all the material facts in his favour, then it is to be presumed that he has a prima facie case. The board may show by medical testimony, or in any other manner consistent with the evidence in cases of this kind, that the applicant is not entitled to a pension because, perhaps, the disease or incapacity was not attributable to war service, or for a number of other reasons which would deprive him of his pension under the provisions of the act. I beg to move the amendment which I have read, a copy of which I am sending to the minister.

Mr. BELAND: I must read it a couple of times before I can say anything upon it; it is rather complicated.

Mr. CARROLL: Tubercular patients, I think, have given to the Pension board more worry than any other class of applicants; and when I say that I simply mean that their cases have been involved in so much medical technicality that, I am sorry to say, I do not think tubercular applicants have received that fair meed of justice which they deserved at the hands of their countrymen. I am afraid, however, that my hon. friend (Mr. Ladner) is going very far in his amendment. If he would just confine it to tubercular and cancerous patients, I would strongly support the amendment, but when he adds the words "or other disease or incapacity" it seems to me he is going far afield. My idea in rising now, though, is to ask the minister to inform the

committee whether the amendments to the Pension Act are in any way loosening up in regard to tubercular patients. I understand that this is one of the very serious questions which the commission, whose report has been submitted, have had to deal with. I have not had time to read the amendments through, and the minister might enlighten the committee as to how tubercular patients are to be benefited under them to any greater extent than they were under the original act.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Hon. members have received a circular from the Dominion Alliance. Have they been consulted in reference to the drafting of the bill?

Mr. BELAND: Everybody has been consulted. In reply to my hon. friend from Cape Breton South (Mr. Carroll) I might make a few observations in reference to the principle of the bill. I might have stated them before the Speaker left the chair, but I will repeat now what I said two or three days ago when the Pension estimates were under consideration. When the original act was passed, what is known as the "insurance principle" was embodied in it. The insurance principle means that a man who served between the declaration of war and the declaration of peace will be pensioned for any disability which has been incurred by him during his service, whether such disability is or is not attributable to that service. It was, as Mr. Rowell said in the House when the bill was introduced in 1919, an insurance principle which was larger than the principle of any pension law of any other country in the world. I repeat, that clause 11 of the bill of 1919—which is the vital clause because it provides for the awarding of pensions—stipulates that a pension should be awarded for or in respect of any disability when such disability not only was attributable to service but had been incurred during service although not directly related thereto. Let me give the House an example. Two soldiers are in charge of a truck loaded with munitions on the way to the front to serve a battery. They stop the truck and one of the men jumps off, crosses the ditch, runs into an orchard, climbs a tree and picks some apples. Whilst doing so he falls and breaks a limb. This is a disability incurred on service but not attributable to service. The other man remaining on the truck has the misfortune to lose an arm and a leg through an enemy aeroplane bombing the truck and exploding the munitions. This man's disability is attributable to service as such. Hon. members will see the difference. In 1919, when the first Pension Act was introduced by the Hon. Mr. Rowell, it was stated that any disability incurred during service would be pensioned. This principle disappeared one year later by the amending act of 1920. I do not want to delay the House unduly, but I think this explanation will enable hon. members to understand the purpose of the present amendments.

When in 1919 Mr. Rowell was in charge of the legislation then introduced he was asked what it meant. In reply he said:

> Under the law as it now stands—

As he presented it.

> —our pension system is really an insurance.

Then Mr. Griesbach—now Senator Griesbach—asked him:

> Why introduce that element?
>
> Mr. Rowell: Our law as it stands is broader than the pension law in any other country, so far as we know. The insurance feature which I have mentioned is not in any other law, so far as I am aware. In that respect we give the soldier the benefit of insurance during the whole period of the war.
>
> Mr. Griesbach: That is the principle that underlies all pensions.
>
> Mr. Rowell: No. The principle underlying all pension is disability due to service. Under our pension law, if a soldier contracts disease under a purely normal condition having no relation at all to service, he becomes entitled to pension. It is really an insurance system.

The law was passed in that form, so that from September 1, 1919, to September 1 of the following year, when the law was amended as I shall point out in a few moments, the principle underlying the Pension Act was that any disability incurred during service was pensionable.

Let us come to one year later when the act was amended.

Mr. CALDWELL: What year was that?

Mr. BELAND: The year 1920. In that year old section 11 was repealed, and the following was substituted therefor:

> The commision shall award pensions to or in respect of members of the forces who have suffered disability, in accordance with the rates set out in schedule A of this act, and in respect of members of the forces who have died, in accordance with the rates set out in schedule B of this act, when the disability or death in respect of which the application for pension is made was attributable to military service.

The first act read:

> Was attributable to or was incurred or aggravated during military service.

When this was proposed to the Pension committee—of which I was a member—the representatives of the Pension board were asked whether this amendment would affect the members of the Canadian Expeditionary

Force, and the answer was, "No, the C.E.F. men are not going to be affected." In order to make my assertion clearer, let me read a few words from the evidence given before that committee by representatives of the Pension board. A question was asked Dr. Burgess—who is one of the medical advisers of the Pension board—as to what would be the effect of the amendment. His answer was:

> Prior to the late war pensions were paid for disabilities attributable to service—

Prior to the late war.

> That was amended for soldiers disabled in the present war, in order that pensions could be paid for disabilities whilst on service It is now the intention, I understand, to return to the previous stand, that is, that pensions should be paid for disabilities attributable to service.

He was asked:

> The point is raised that this constitutes a distinct breach of contract. The men enlisted on the understanding that if anything happened during the period of service the state would pension them.

Dr. Burgess answered:

> This will not affect late members of the Canadian Expeditionary Force injured during the war.

This makes it absolutely clear as to the intention at that time. Further, Mr. Arthurs, one of the present members of this House, said:

> That should be made abundantly clear.

The chairman, who was Mr. Cronyn, then a member of the House, answered:

> We agree to that, and it must be noted.

Further, Mr. Margeson, who was then one of the pension commissioners said:

> We are anxious to make this change because the permanent forces are brought under this act.

So it was made abundantly clear to the committee that as the Canadian Expeditionary Force at that time no longer existed, and as at the same time a certain number of soldiers were remaining under the colours as part of the permanent forces, pensions should be awarded to members of the permanent forces only when the disability or the death was attributable to military service.

Mr. CARROLL: Suppose a person who was in the Canadian Expeditionary Force did not make his application for pension until ten or eleven months after his discharge, say, in 1919, he would come under the act of 1921, and there would be a breach of contract, I would think, with that person. There have been very many complaints on that score.

[Mr. Beland.]

Mr. BELAND: I was coming to that. In 1919 the insurance principle was incorporated in the act. In 1920 the provision embodying that principle was struck out of the act and it was made clear that disability should be pensionable only when attributable to military service. But the statement was repeated in the committee of this House that that would apply only to men who remained on service in the permanent force; that the members of the Canadian Expeditionary Force would not be affected in the slightest degree. That was in 1920. In the following year, 1921, the act was made a little bit narrower by the addition of the two words "as such" to clause 11, meaning that no pension could be awarded unless the disability or the death in respect to which the application was made was attributable to military service as such. Now, I must go back for a moment to the act of 1919, because there is a paragraph in section 11 with which we must be familiar if we are to understand clearly what has happened. The paragraph to which I refer is as follows:

> Provided, further, that when a member of the forces has suffered disability or death after the declaration of peace, no pension shall be paid unless such disability was incurred or aggravated or such death occurred, as the direct result of military service.

The following year this whole clause was wiped out and the clause to which I referred a moment ago was adopted by the House, on the understanding that only the members of the permanent force would be affected by the new clause 11, that so far as the men of the Canadian Expeditionary force were concerned they would be pensionable under clause 11 as adopted in 1919. The proclamation of peace took place on the thirty-first of August, 1921, and the Pension board thereupon proceeded to interpret the act as it had been amended in 1920 and 1921. In other words, we were face to face with a situation which was absolutely untenable, namely, that if a member of the Canadian Expeditionary Force died five minutes before midnight on the thirty-first of August, 1921, his dependents were pensionable, because his death was the result of disability incurred on service but not attributable to service, whereas if he had the misfortune to die ten minutes later, five minutes after midnight, his dependents could not be pensioned, because he had died after the declaration of peace, though of the same disability incurred in the same manner. The Pension board then sent out a circular or a minute in which they informed all the medical advisers that in future pensions should

be awarded in respect to disability or death only when such disability or death was attributable to military service as such. During the last months of 1921 this new principle was applied not only to members of the permanent force but to members of the Canadian Expeditionary Force, and numerous complaints on that account came from returned men in all parts of the country. They were especially numerous and pronounced during the first months of the year 1922, culminating in the presentation of their case by representatives of the veterans in June of last year and the decision to appoint a royal commission to investigate these matters. Now the royal commission has held its investigation on that phase of the subject, and its report is to the effect that there has been a breach of contract with members of the Canadian Expeditionary Force in regard to pensions; that it was made clear in 1920 that any amendment then passed was to be applied

9 p.m.

not to the members of the Canadian Expeditionary Force but only to members of the permanent force, and the commissioners recommended that the act should be restored as it was in 1919. The purpose of this bill ,therefore, is to restore the insurance principle as embodied in the act introduced by Mr. Rowell and passed by the House in that year.

Now, how could we do this? We amend the interpretation clause; we say that the "war" means that period between the fourth day of August, 1914, and the thirty-first day of August, 1921, both days inclusive. Then we drafted a new clause 11. I say "we," because I did not myself undertake to draft the clause. I knew what the spirit of it should be, and I asked more than one experienced draftsman to draft it for me. I have submitted the redrafted clause to a number of eminent lawyers and they say it carries out the purpose the royal commission had in mind and the desires of the veterans generally, and that it fulfils the meaning of the act of 1919. We decided that clause 11 should be in two parts, subsection 1 and subsection 2, that subsection 1 should deal with men who had rendered service during the war and subsection 2 with men who had rendered service after the war. If hon. gentlemen will refer to the bill before them they will see that clause 3 reads in part as follows:

(11). (1) In respect of military service rendered during the war,—

If you read paragraph (a) from first to last you will see that it restores the insurance principle. It says:

(a) Pensions shall be awarded to or in respect of members of the forces who have suffered disability resulting from injury or disease or an aggravation thereof, in accordance with the rates set out in schedule A of this act, and in respect of members of the forces who have died, in accordance with the rates set out in schedule B of this Act, when the disability resulting from injury or disease or the aggravation thereof in respect of which the application for pension is made or the injury or disease or the aggravation thereof resulting in the death in respect of which the application for pension is made, was attributable to or was incurred during such military service.

This is a complete restoration of the insurance principle as it existed in 1919. It is in the opinion of the royal commission, I believe it is in the opinion of the veterans generally, and, as far as I can judge, it carries out the purpose absolutely. Now, the second subsection says:

In respect of military service rendered after the war.

That is in respect of service rendered by men who remained in the force after the declaration of peace. I think that "force" must mean the permanent force, or perhaps some other body of men in the militia still serving although the war was over. Now in respect of these men it is said that—

Pensions shall be awarded to or in respect of members of the forces who have suffered disability—

I will not read the whole clause—when the disability or death—

—was attributable to military service as such.

So, repeating myself and in order to make myself perfectly clear to hon. members, there are two classes of men: Men who served between the 4th August, 1914 and the 31st August, 1921, when the declaration of peace was made, for whom the insurance principle is restored, and a second class of men who served after the declaration of peace and who are still, I believe, in service but in regard to whom no pension shall be awarded unless the disability is attributable to military service as such. There are a number of subsections but these, of course, extend the principle.

Mr. MANION: I understand the minister to point out that there is really no change in the spirit of the act itself. This is simply clearing up the spirit of the act. Am I correct?

Mr. BELAND: That is right.

Mr. LADNER: May I ask the minister a question? He has given a very clear and concise statement—

Mr. BELAND: I am not through yet.

Mr. LADNER: I beg your pardon.

Mr. BELAND: I am sorry but my hon. friend will have an opportunity of speaking again. The hon. member for Cape Breton South and Richmond (Mr. Carroll) wants to know whether, as far as tubercular cases are concerned, this bill will place them in a better position than they occupied under the act as it was before. I say, yes by all means and in this manner: Under the act of 1920, if interpreted according to the letter and not the spirit, and under the act of 1921 which is still narrower, an ex-soldier suffering from tuberculosis could not receive a pension unless that tuberculosis was attributable to his service as such, whilst now if tuberculosis was incurred during his service whether it is due to the service or not he may receive a pension.

Mr. MacLAREN: May I ask the minister a question to clear up a point which I think is not quite evident? Will the minister please look at the last few lines of paragraph (a). It says:

—the application for pension is made or the injury or disease or the aggravation thereof resulting in the death in respect of which the application for pension is made, was attributable to or was incurred during such military service.

Would the minister make it quite clear what is involved in the term "military service?" Does that mean "in the actual field of warfare" or does it mean "service in Canada, or service in England?" How does he explain the term there "during such military service?"

Mr. BELAND: I shall be pleased to explain to my hon. friend. One must read the whole of clause 11.

(1) In respect of military service rendered during the war.

So that paragraphs (a), (b), (c), (d), (e) and (f) have reference to that first line in respect of military service rendered during the war. That means service rendered anywhere —in Canada, in England, in France, in Siberia or anywhere at all,—as long as the man was under the colours.

Mr. MANION: I understood the minister to answer me one way and I think he answered my hon. friend (Mr. Carroll) another way. In other words, I understood him to answer my hon. friend that according to the law as it was if a man took consumption or any form of tuberculosis, not attributable to service but during service, he would not have a pension in the past. That is what I understood him to say.

Mr. BELAND: I do not say it was in the pension law, but under the interpretation of the act as it existed in 1920 and 1921, and since then, he was not entitled to a pension.

Mr. MANION: I wanted to make that clear. I certainly do not agree with the minister, at least that was not my understanding. My understanding was that any disability a man incurred during service has been pensioned right along.

Mr. BELAND: Oh, no.

Mr. CARROLL: If it is attributable.

Mr. BELAND: Oh no. There are 500 cases I am informed by the Pension board to-day.

Mr. IRVINE: I wanted to ask the minister if the amendment moved by the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Ladner) would not bring out the spirit of the act even more clearly than the original form would?

Mr. BELAND: I do not believe it would: I think it is too involved. I would not advise loading up section 11 as it has been drafted. It has been drafted carefully. It has been submitted to the royal commission and to the veterans, and they agree that as far as legislation goes this will meet the purpose. I do not say that no amendment can be made at all. I have just accepted one which appeared to me to make the meaning absolutely clearer; but I feel that the amendment my hon. friend has moved is not going to make things any easier in any way. That is my impression.

Mr. LADNER: I would like to ask the minister a question just on the point of the subject matter of our discussion, that is in connection with the attributable feature of the bill. The last two lines say "attributable to military service." Now, the minister has given a very clear statement of the history of the law, and undoubtedly he is to be commended for reverting to the insurance principle. But all that the minister has said about the insurance principle, to which it is proposed to return to-day under this bill, does not at all relate to the point of my amendment or the subject matter of the discussion which followed it and in which I endeavoured to place the matter clearly before the committee. What I am getting at is this: Supposing a person has developed tuberculosis two years after the war. Before that person could claim a pension he must establish attributability to the war because he may have got his disability under peace conditions after his discharge. In endeavouring to establish that his tuberculosis was attributable to the war he must produce certain evidence, the difficulties of which must

be apparent to every member of the committee. The difficulty for the applicant in the past has been that when he has brought all the evidence possible before the Pension board it has then been of such a kind as not to conclusively establish his claim to the satisfaction of the board. The result has been that the board have in many cases misinterpreted the law in their own way. My idea is to change the law so as to prevent such an interpretation. The board has taken the stand "We are not satisfied that this is attributable to the war, because the statute makes the positive assertion that the claim cannot be considered until it is established that the ailment is attributable to the war." And the board says it is not attributable. The effect of my proposed amendment is that, if the applicant shows a case which could reasonably be attributed to war service, and a considerable doubt exists, then the board, with all their expert knowledge, must give the benefit of the doubt to the applicant, unless they can say, "We have evidence on our files, and have medical testimony, to show that, although you have established a reasonable case, we have gone one step further and we can show that your case is not sufficiently sound, and that the facts do not show that this tubercular affection was attributable to war service." I am not raising this point as a purely personal matter. Many people have spoken to me about it, and some associations are endeavouring to have this change made. What objection could there possibly be, if a person makes out a reasonable case before a commission, to give that person the benefit of the doubt, unless the board can show that it is not reasonable, and that the man is not entitled to have the pension? In that respect, the proposed amendments do not touch the case at all. They relate to a different subject matter, namely the insurance principle, to which the minister has addressed his remarks.

Mr. BELAND: Medically speaking, does my hon. friend contend that some diseases cannot be reasonably attributed to service?

Mr. LADNER: I understand that in a case of cancer or carcinoma, after about the three years' period, medical testimony shows that it cannot be reasonably attributed to military service. But if it arose within one year, then it could reasonably be attributed to such service. In such a case, if the applicant is afflicted with cancer within eight months or one year, and surrounding indications show that pains and so on existed prior to discharge, and while on military service, that would be a reasonable case, and should be allowed; unless the board can produce other testimony to show that, notwithstanding the reasonableness of the man's contention, there are stronger contentions to show that the cancer was not attributable to service.

Mr. BELAND: I am unable to see the difference which the hon. member refers to. First of all, during the first year, all men were treated by the department free of charge, and every case of disability that resulted during the first year, you might say after discharge from the service, has been treated and pensioned. Cancer may be attributed to service. I know of a case where cancer inside has been attributed to service, where a man has been kicked by a horse during his service and the cancer developed two years later. In that case the man was pensioned. Why? Because the traumatism that he had suffered at the time of his service might have been the cause of his present disability.

Mr. LADNER: I know of a case where, instead of being kicked by a horse, the person was injured in an aeroplane fall and developed a cancer, but the department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment considered the case was one of appendicitis and treated him for it, until they opened him up and found that he had cancer. Then they operated on him and he died. It was established on sworn affidavit that the man had the fall from an aeroplane, that he was injured, and that he complained of pains in the area where cancer subsequently developed. There were three affidavits to that effect. Subsequently he died, and in that case there was a reasonable presumption, as we say in this case, that the trouble could reasonably be attributed to war service, The commission held the opinion notwithstanding, that the cancer was not attributable to war service. My point is that that applicant should have received that pension, unless the commission could show, medically, or by something more than inference or medical theory, that he should have been denied the pension.

Mr. BELAND: How would it serve the hon. member's purpose if he had his amendment in this case? How would the case be met by the amendment?

Mr. LOVETT: And did the cancer develop after he was discharged?

Mr. LADNER: We do not know that, because the doctors of the board treated him for appendicitis.

Mr. LOVETT: How long was that after he returned from the war?

Mr. LADNER: Before he was discharged.

Mr. BELAND: What prevented his friend from getting the pension? Was it the medical opinion?

Mr. LADNER: Yes.

Mr. BELAND: If this amendment were to pass, how would he get the pension?

Mr. LADNER: Because there was medical opinion on the other side and the applicant, under this section—

Mr. BELAND: Medicine is not an exact science.

Mr. LADNER: The applicant under this section would have had a case which could reasonably be attributed to war service, and prima facie the applicant would have a right to the pension and the board would then be obliged to produce other evidence to rebut the presumption of the right of the applicant to a pension. The tubercular cases are really more in point.

Mr. BELAND: In all sincerity, if the hon. member had been sitting on the board, would he have awarded a pension in this case?

Mr. LADNER: Most decidedly so.

Mr. BELAND: That is the reason why we provided for appeals.

Mr. LADNER: But the parliamentary committee rendered a decision against the decision of the board.

Mr. BELAND: That is exactly why we provide for appeal. It does not matter how you surround the law with amendment after amendment, which makes it so involved that not even a lawyer can see through it, if you have no appeal board or no appeal court you cannot give entire satisfaction. Perhaps this is a case that should be allowed. I will conceive it to be a case that should be allowed; surely in this case, if my hon. friend's contention is right, that appeal will be sustained. We are going to provide for appeal. Do not try to involve the act, because by such an amendment you might destroy the purpose of the section as it is framed, and it has been framed with the greatest of care. I assure the hon. member there is no intention to deceive anybody there, and certainly no intention to deceive the returned man, because this is the carrying out of the recommendations of the commission.

[Mr. Ladner.]

Mr. MARLER: In making any remarks with respect to this amendment, I wish to recall to hon. members of this committee the remarks which I made last year when the report of the parliamentary committee on pensions and re-establishment was presented. I stated at that time, and I state again now, that in my opinion the country owes to every returned soldier the fullest and the best treatment which can possibly be given, compatible with the resources of the country; I think I used the words "the future welfare of the nation." I have not changed my mind in the very slightest degree since last year. I think that every returned man, and the dependent of every returned man who has died, should be given, not only a perfectly fair and equitable deal by this House and by the country, but in addition should be given the most generous treatment that can possibly be accorded him. On the other hand, I think you, Mr. Chairman, and all hon. members will admit that when any claim is made against the country, no matter from what source that claim may come, there should be a certain amount of substantiation, a certain amount of evidence adduced in support of that claim before the money of the people is paid out. That theory holds as regards returned men the same as regards any other citizens in Canada, excepting in this, that as regards returned men, any claim that they may have, direct or indirect, must and should be and, I am certain, is intended to be, treated with the utmost generosity in every particular.

The minister has explained to the committee to-night section 11 of the act. That section is the governing section of the whole act. He has explained the difference between the insurance principle and the "due to service" principle. He has told the committee that, under the act of 1919 the principle at that time was the insurance principle. Subsequently, in 1920, that principle was made the "due to service" principle. There was a very great distinction, and the distinction was this, that under the insurance principle any disability of any kind incurred on service, the slightest aggravation of any disability the soldier had was pensionable in full and his dependents also could have a pension. Under the "due to service" principle, the soldier had to show that the disability from which he was suffering was due to military service. That is now entirely wiped out and the insurance principle is returned to. Any disability from which a soldier may be suffering up to the 31st day of August, 1921, is pensionable, providing that it was incurred on service, or in any way attributable to

service, or in any way aggravated during military service. Those words are very significant, and they are premising the remarks which I intend to make on the amendment which my hon. friend (Mr. Ladner) has brought forward to-night. I want the committee to bear in mind the date whereof I speak, namely the 31st August, 1921. The war ended substantially on the 11th November, 1918. The Canadian Expeditionary Force was disbanded—I am speaking from memory now and I should like to be corrected if I am wrong—if I mistake not, on the 31st December, 1920. All the soldiers were disbanded at that time; but notwithstanding that disbanding, the "incurred on service" principle, or the insurance principle is brought along to the 31st August, 1921. Any returned man or the dependent of any returned man has to show up to that date, many months after he took off the King's uniform, that the disability, no matter how slight, the aggravation, no matter how slight, is pensionable, not only for himself, but for all his dependents.

Now let me come to the point which my hon. friend from Vancouver South (Mr. Ladner) brings up. I quite understand his point, which is this. He says that the onus of proof should not be on the returned man; that it should be entirely either on the country, the Pension board, or whoever acts for the country.

Mr. LADNER: After a prima facie case has been established.

Mr. MARLER: I will read the amendment just in a moment. According to this, what has any returned man making a claim for pension to prove? He has to prove any illness, not necessarily an illness caused by a gunshot wound, not necessarily an illness which he might have suffered while he was overseas, but any illness at all which was incurred on service. If he has been damaged by reason of that illness incurred on service, even an ordinary illness which he might have had at home, he is pensionable, and if he dies as a result of that illness, his dependents are pensionable also.

Every man in the army has a medical history sheet. It is true that when men joined up in the army, their medical history sheets were not made out in the most careful manner; but while they were in the army, their medical history sheets were kept in a fairly accurate manner, and everything that occurred while a man was on service was entered on that medical history sheet. That is reasonable and proper proof as to the state of the man's health during his service. Then he left the service. Some men were discharged on what is known as the short form. The short form simply discharged the man as fit. The long form gave a history of the man's condition at discharge. When a man reported on discharge that he was not physically fit, the long form was used, and that obviated many difficulties. But many men reported on the short form, and it is of those that I wish to speak at the present time. When a man was discharged out of the army on the short form as fit, he may have become sick one year, two years, three years after the 31st August, 1921, the date of the declaration of peace, and his record during the war, his medical history sheet may or may not have been clean. If he becomes sick years after the war, he is pensionable provided that there is the slightest connection between his illness and the illness which occurred while he was on service. Mark this; this is not a question of a military illness, not a question of a wound which he might have received; but if he had a natural, ordinary illness on service and later on after discharge, notwithstanding the fact that he was discharged with a clean record, if there is any connection set up in any way between the last illness I speak of and the first illness, he is pensionable. That has been the practice.

I quite admit—and I am sure the hon. member who moved this amendment is actuated by the best possible motives—that some mistakes have been made in the past. But what does this bill bring down in that respect? This bill brings down the question which we will have an opportunity of discussing in a few moments of the boards of appeal. Some of us may have feelings on that subject; some may not think the boards of appeal, as proposed to be constituted, are correct; others may think they are correct. But there they are in the bill at the present time. Let me revert now to the position in which I was a few moments ago. That is to say, if a man falls sick after being discharged as fit, and he goes before the Board of Pension Commissioners, he has one examination. The board say: "No, you had a clean medical history sheet during your service. It is true you were not sick; it is true you are sick now. We can see no connection between your present illness and the illness which you suffered on service. Therefore we cannot pension you." That man says: "I will appeal to the district appeal board," and he does so.

Mr. LADNER: Does the hon. gentleman suggest that the district review board can change the substance of law? My amendment

relates to the substance of law. It is a different proposition. An appeal would not affect that.

Mr. MARLER: The district review board, as the act is constituted at the present time, can adjudicate, not only on questions of fact, but on questions of law.

Mr. LADNER: But as it will be constituted.

Mr. MARLER: As it will be constituted, it can adjudicate even on the question of the extent of the man's disability. It can adjudicate on anything it likes.

Mr. LADNER: But it cannot change the law.

Mr. MARLER: No, it cannot change the law, but it can get at the very point which the hon. member has in mind. It can say that the man's illness is attributable to, or was incurred on service. There is not the slightest doubt that the board can adjudicate on that point. That is one of the main points for which these boards are constituted, and indeed when we come to discuss that part of the act some of us will probably question whether that is not, in fact, the main function of the board, to adjudicate on the question whether the illness is attributable to service or not.

Now let me come to my hon. friend's amendment. I repeat that so long as we understand what this amendment means, so long as hon. members desire to accept it, so long as parliament as now constituted desires to take upon its shoulders the burden that the amendment may entail, I have nothing to say. All I desire to do is to suggest to this committee what the effect of the amendment is; and I am not speaking from the point of view of dollars and cents, because dollars and cents are not the most important consideration in a matter of this description. But the question is, will the amendment unnecessarily, unfairly, and without sufficient opportunity of proof itself, involve the country and give to claimants an advantage to which they are not entitled? What does the amendment say? It was read rather hurriedly, but that was no fault of my hon. friend; I think the hon. gentleman introduced the amendment in perfect good faith. It says:

> For the purpose of the Pension Act and amendments thereto, and notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the provisions of the said act and amendments thereto, or any other act,—

Please note these words:

> —where a member of the force who has left the naval, military or air force service is, or at any time after the date of his leaving that service has been found to be suffering from tuberculosis, neurasthenia, cancer, or any other disease or incapacity—

In other words, notwithstanding the fact that the Canadian Expeditionary Force was discharged on the 31st December, 1920, notwithstanding the fact that the insurance principle in this act extends to August 31st, 1921, the amendment will make certain to any man at any time who has served in the war, whether he went overseas or not, or whether he got to a theatre of actual war or not, the absolute right to say that the illness from which he is now suffering is due to military service or was incurred while he was on service.

Mr. LADNER: Only if he can prove a reasonable case.

Mr. MARLER: That is not what the amendment says. If my hon. friend will allow me to read it I will discuss it with him later. I am only too glad to discuss the matter with him. The amendment continues:

> —which could reasonably be attributed to war service, such member shall be deemed to be suffering from a disease attributable to, or aggravated by naval, military or air force service, as the case may be, unless or until it is shown that the tuberculosis or neurasthenia or cancer or other disease or incapacity was neither attributable to, nor aggravated by, such service; and for the purpose of this provision, acceptance for such service shall be conclusive that at the time of joining such service the officer or man was not suffering from any such disease or incapacity.

Let hon. members fully understand, if they want to pass the amendment, that they will have to take the consequences of so doing. The last sentence of the amendment means that every man brought into the Canadian Expeditionary Force is eligible for a pension whether he got out of Canada or not, whether he reached England or not, or whether he reached any theatre of actual war or not. Such a man is eligible under this amendment, no matter at what time in his life he may contract the diseases mentioned therein, "or any other disease". An hon. gentleman mentions, and properly so, that a man might have been only a few weeks in the army, half an hour, perhaps, when he was discharged, and he would naturally be subject to this amendment. Let us take some cases that have actually happened, so that we shall not be talking mere theories. There were many men who enlisted in the army and who were very anxious to go overseas to serve their country. Thousands upon thousands of them did so and they deserve enormous credit. The fact is that they besought physicians who examined them to pass them for service and I know of

many such cases in Montreal, which is no exception. There were such cases all over the Dominion, and some of my military friends in the House will probably confirm that statement. These men were taken on and to all intents and purposes they were perfectly well. As soon as they left a high altitude, as soon as they got to sea and reached England they contracted various ailments of one kind or another, which were not very serious. They were pensionable. There were other men who were discharged and sent back to Canada, never having served in any theatre of actual war; they were never near a theatre of war, and many of them never got overseas. But the amendment will cover men of that description. Now, I claim, in all sincerity, that the amendment is inadvisable, and I have no desire whatever to deprive ex-service men of their rights. On the contrary, I think they should be given everything that the country can give them. I will stand by that, as I have done before. But I do claim that under the act as now drafted, under section 11 and under the other clauses providing for courts of review and a federal board of appeal, the ex-service men are given every possible opportunity to prove their cases. Some hon. members may say—I do not say it myself—that at the present time these men perhaps are not getting what they should get. I think myself that as a matter of fact the Board of Pension Commissioners, except in isolated cases, do pension men to the best of their ability. But even if the men do not always get a fair hearing, you have boards of appeal. The act is so drawn that every man has an opportunity to show any reasonable connection between the disability from which he is suffering and the fact of his having enlisted. Is not that fair enough? Or are we going to take an amendment of this description, not knowing what it will entail?

Mr. MEWBURN: Mr. Chairman, a year ago when the minister's estimates were up I recommended that a commission should be appointed to inquire into the hundreds of vexatious cases that had arisen in the last few years in regard to the treatment of our returned men by the pension commissioners. My suggestion perhaps went a little further than what the minister proposes to-night, but I congratulate him on having appointed a royal commission, I congratulate the commission on the very able report they have submitted to the minister, and I am very glad indeed that he has introduced this bill. I have read it over carefully, and while there are other sections in the act in which many of us could suggest changes, I believe, taking it on the whole, that this bill is most commendable and meets a long-felt need. I am sure all of us could detail many cases that have come to our personal knowledge in which we consider that grave injustice has been dealt out to our returned men. I might instance one case which is probably typical of dozens. The man went overseas, served his country, developed pneumonia, was in hospital, came out before he should—which was probably his own fault—insisted on going back to service, and remained at the front to the end of the war. During the demobilization, as we all know, the feeling on the part of every officer, non-commissioned officer and man in the Canadian Expeditionary Force was to get out of the army and back to civil life as quickly as possible, and to accomplish this they exercised their ingenuity to the fullest extent to secure their discharge papers and left the service as class A men, whereas if they had been medically examined they would not have been so classified. The particular man whose case I am dealing with got back to his job without delay. A year later he developed tubercular trouble and is now in the Hamilton sanitarium. His medical history sheet discloses that he had pneumonia overseas and that he passed out of the army Class A; but the doctor at the sanitarium, an expert on tuberculosis, says that the man's trouble was caused through service at the front. That man has not been paid one cent by the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment since he has been in hospital.

Mr. BELAND: That is a clear case for appeal.

Mr. MEWBURN: It is Captain Nicholson's case. I wrote three letters myself, but his case was turned down. As I understand it now, that man's case can be appealed and reviewed, and if he can substantiate by expert medical evidence that his tubercular trouble is attributable to service he will be entitled to compensation.

The only suggestion I would make is in regard to section 11, subsection (a). I think probably the word "reasonably" might go ahead of the word "attributable," so as to make the line read, "was reasonably attributable to or was incurred during such military service."

Probably I am the one principally responsible for the record office for the Department of National Defence. I took a great deal of trouble in connection with its establishment. I remember very distinctly bringing a recommendation before Council in the early stages of the war, for as minister I felt that nothing

should be omitted by the government, or the Militia department, to ensure a proper record being preserved of the service of every officer, non-commissioned officer and man belonging to the Canadian Expeditionary Force. I took this course advisedly, having some knowledge of the fictitious claims made against the American government after the Civil War. I felt it was incumbent upon the government or the minister in charge that the country should be protected against unreasonable claims, and although I am not taking any credit for it; the credit belongs to the departmental officials —I believe that our records are the most perfect of any preserved by the belligerent countries. Those records are so complete that to-day our doctors scrutinize them when tubercular and other troubles develop after returned men have gone back to civil life, although as a matter of fact I believe the trouble is reasonably attributable to service. I congratulate the minister and shall be glad to support his bill.

Mr. NEILL: I rise to ask a question, not of you, Mr. Chairman, nor of the minister, but of the members of this committee. Before doing so I must give the setting. For nearly a whole year we have had a commission of very able men dealing with the subject now under discussion, and they have submitted an elaborate and evidently carefully thought-out report—a report which singularly enough appears to have been received with satisfaction by everybody concerned, and more particularly by the returned men. We have the further fact of the hon. minister in charge of this bill coming before this House making this statement—and I have heard it at least half a dozen times—that it was his intention to bring down legislation carrying out the full intent of the report of this royal commission. He now tells us that he is doing so, that he has studied the act very carefully—and he has shown us to-night that he has a grasp of the subject which I am sure no one else possesses—and that he has had the very ablest draftsmen frame these amendments, and he tells us further that he has submitted these amendments to the people who after all are most vitally concerned—the soldiers themselves—and to the Ralston commission, all of whom have signified their approval.

The question I now ask the committee is this: Can we, sitting here to-night, expect to obtain such a grasp of the subject as would enable us to amend or improve the work of the royal commission, of the minister and of the draftsman? I think if we attempt to do anything of the kind we shall only add confusion, and that we had better accept the amendments in the form in which they have been submitted to us and see how they work out for a year. If this were the work of the Pension commission I would say: Let us scrutinize it down to the last syllable and the last comma, because I do not think we are satisfied with their interpretation of the act. But under the circumstances outlined I think we might do well to pass these amendments of the minister more or less in their entirety.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Mr. Chairman, I should like to draw the attention of the committee to a suggestion along the same lines as that indicated by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill). All members have received, I have no doubt, and certainly the members from Toronto, the statement issued the day before yesterday by the Great War Veterans' Association, and I would ask that it be made a part of the record of this debate, so that we can say that not only has the royal commission reported what they think is in the interest of the men, but that the men themselves, the members of the Great War Veterans' Association, endorse the report This is the communication, Mr. Chairman:

OTTAWA, June 13, 1923.

Re Pensions Appeal Procedure

Sir,—I am instructed by the Legislative Committee of the Dominion Veterans' Alliance to solicit your support of legislation designed to establish the form of pensions appeal procedure recommended by the Royal Commission on Pensions and Re-establishment. The principal features of the procedure so recommended are set forth in Sections 9-13 of the Bill proposing certain amendments to the Pension Act which is now before the House of Commons.

I may explain that in each province, evidence and suggestions, relative to this subject, were placed before the royal commission by a committee representative of all groups of ex-service men. Great care was exercised by these committees in weighing all ideas discussed and in advancing those most practicable under conditions prevailing in respective provinces. It is believed that the recommendation of the royal commission on this matter embodies the principles generally regarded by ex-service men as fundamental in any provision for appeal. It is also believed that the form of appeal procedure recommended will achieve the maximum of satisfaction with a minimum of expense.

Experience gained in dealing with the grievances of individual ex-service men before and during the inquiry of the royal commission has led this organization to the conclusion that thousands desire to appeal from decisions of the Pensions Board. This experience has also resulted in the conviction that the procedure outlined by the royal commission offers advantages vastly superior to any plan yet proposed. This procedure ensures justice with economy and invites confidence. It may not be amiss, therefore, at this juncture to point out some of these advantages.

The procedure recommended enables a discussion preliminary to appeal which will tend to eliminate appeals without legal ground or, of a frivolous character and those caused by obvious errors. In this way, without undue restraint upon the appellant, the work and expense of the appeal administration may be materially lightened.

The constitution of the appeal boards as recommended by the royal commission ensures a commonsense treatment of the appeal, free from professional bias and undue emphasis upon technicalities. Members with legal and medical experience can most readily deal with legal or medical aspects of the claim, and the presence of a member with industrial experience will provide a viewpoint most essential in estimating the degree of incapacity as gauged by the requirements of the labour market. It is also most essential that members of every board should have knowledge of conditions which prevailed on active service.

To avoid dissatisfaction, it is desirable that the large number of appeals awaiting consideration at the outset, should be reviewed with all possible speed. The hearing of each appeal will necessitate a careful examination of the appellant's service record a proceeding which, with the present system of records, requires a great deal of time, even by those with experience. The procedure recommended will provide a personnel available and competent to engage in a review of all appeals lodged, without undue delay and continuously while necessary.

The proposed district review boards are easily accessible to the prospective appellants either from the standpoint of location or time. If at the outset this work were entrusted to officials unable to engage therein without interruption, many men in certain occupations would find it difficult to appear during the appeal proceedings. Furthermore, it is presumed that the district review boards will arrange hearings in various centres in the district as may be convenient.

While the procedure recommended is designed to adequately cope with the initial deluge of appeals, nevertheless, it offers the most certain assurance of ultimate economy in administration. The administrative machinery may be telescoped as the volume of appeals may diminish. Provision is made for a gradual centralization based upon the federal appeal board which would not be possible under any other scheme proposed.

One of the foremost advantages of the proposed legislation is that uniformity with regard to decisions and procedure in the various districts is definitely safeguarded. The required reference to the Pensions Board and possibly at a later stage the Federal Appeal Board, provides a balancing and harmonizing influence. There is little danger, as the work progresses, of any variation of decision at different points upon appeals based upon similar evidence. Under any lack of the other schemes of district appeal procedure proposed lack of uniformity would be inevitable. Another advantageous feature of the appeal legislation in view is that federal supervision may be exercised over all decisions as regards expenditure of federal funds.

I trust that these views may receive your favourable consideration and support.

Yours faithfully,

C. G. MacNeil,
Secretary, Dominion Veterans' Alliance.

Here we have the Dominion Veterans' Alliance endorsing this scheme. I agree with the ex-Minister of Militia (Mr. Mewburn) that we ought to be very careful about disturbing this very well thought-out plan as so endorsed.

Mr. CALDWELL: Mr. Chairman, as a past member of the Pension committee of this House for three years I wish to corroborate some of the statements made by the minister to-night. I desire first, however, to congratulate him on the bill which he has introduced. So far as it is possible to remedy by legislation the disabilities under which the returned man has been suffering, I think his bill will achieve that end. However, I want to go just a little further than any hon. members have gone whom I have heard speak to-night. I did not have the advantage of being in the House when this matter was discussed on Monday evening. I am speaking now of the interpretation of the act. I think it will be practically impossible to pass a pension act that will be so administered by the present Pension board as to get justice for the returned man. Hon. members may not all agree with me in that, but I feel sure that a good many of them will. I want to cite a special case to prove my contention, a case which in my opinion is fully covered by the act, but in connection with which justice has not been done, and I doubt if it ever will be done while the present chairman of the Pension board holds that office. He has always taken the attitude that once he makes a decision he must not reverse it for fear he will be admitting he had done wrong.

Mr. POWER: Oh, I object to that.

Mr. MARLER: I take exception to my hon. friend's attitude in that respect.

Mr. CALDWELL: I have the floor.

Mr. MARLER: I simply want to register my objection.

Mr. CALDWELL: I want to cite this case so that the facts may be understood. This man enlisted within ten days after war broke out, went to France, and came back discharged as no longer fit for service. He was one of the men referred to by some hon. members here to-night as those who were anxious to get back to civil life. He was over military age when he enlisted; he served two years and then broke down under the strain. He had three sons of military age who enlisted and were in training while he was overseas; they went to England on the same vessel that brought the father home. He was therefore very anxious to get back to his family—a wife and three small children. As I say, he was discharged as no longer fit for military service, not even as A-1. He tried to carry on in civil life, but he broke down within a month and went under the doctor's care. He made the mistake of not going to a military hospital and undergoing examination by military doctors. He employed a civilian doctor, and by the way, the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment paid that doctor's bill afterwards—I presented it—to the extent of $100. After carrying on

for upwards of two years under conditions such as these, trying to work, breaking down and going under the doctor's care—not entering a military hospital but undergoing treatment by his own practitioner—his condition at last compelled him to go to a military hospital. He was sent to a sanitarium in St. John, New Brunswick, which is

10 p.m. under the direction of a very competent man, Dr. Farris by name. After being under Dr. Farris' care for a matter of three months he was granted full disability pension for tuberculosis; I hold in my hand a copy of the communication notifying the man that he had been granted that pension. But after that pension had been paid for two months it was discontinued. The case had been reviewed by a medical man here in Ottawa who had never been within five hundred miles of the pensioner, who had two months before been granted a full disability pension. His pension was cut down to $5.30 a month, which was supposed to be in respect to a gunshot wound in his knee—and that pension was for himself and his wife and three children. I at once got in touch with Dr. Farris, whom I know very well, and whose ability and honesty have never been questioned. I asked him what he knew of this man's case. I knew the man personally. I knew he was a hardy robust man before he enlisted; that he had returned from the front broken in health and that he has since been unable to do a day's work, or, if he has done it, should not have done it. I would like to read the following letter from Dr. Farris dated April 6, 1920:

Dear Sir,—Driver James B. Tompkins, No. 5216, 1st Field Co., C.E. C.E.F., was a patient in this institution for several months. I believe he had pulmonary tuberculosis. He went out of here in good condition with the disease quiescent. I examined him again in the fall of 1919 and thought he was not so well and recommended his return to this institution. I was surprised to learn that his pension had been cut off and the Pension board did not believe he had tuberculosis. He had had pleurisy and bronchitis before discharge and he had a hemorrhage about a year after his discharge. On March 10th, 1920 he was admitted here again, as his wife said he was in a very bad condition. I was unable however to find any definite tuberculosis this time. His lungs had cleared up and his general condition was fair. I found his heart weak and I believe he has arteriosclerosis. I feel confident that this man had tuberculosis at the time of his discharge, that he made splendid improvement while in here, and that he has taken pretty good care of himself since, but—

This is what I want hon. members to notice particularly:

—that he is unable to do but a small amount of work, apparently due to arteriosclerosis and also to tuberculosis. He certainly should get more than $5.30 per month for his pension.

[Mr. Caldwell.]

I also communicated with the doctor who attended him in his home after his discharge, and this is the letter I received from him.

WOODSTOCK, N.B., December 28, 1920.

May say for your information that I attended this man first on July 10, 1916. I believe he was discharged from the army in June, 1916. The man had at that time a slight hemorrhage from the lungs I have attended this man ever since, and there is no doubt that this trouble was induced by active service. He was a strong, robust man before going to the front, and since that time his health is such that he is unable to earn a livelihood. He has spent several months in a sanitarium, but the trouble is still present. This man without doubt should have been receiving a pension since this trouble started.

I have repeatedly taken this matter up with the Pension board, submitting these facts to them for their information. They did not have Dr. Farris' letter or either of Dr. Grant's letters at the time they discontinued the pension, and I was fully convinced that upon receiving this information they would reverse their decision and reinstate the pension. But they persisted until last year in refusing anything more than the pension for gunshot wound that I have mentioned. Here is a letter from Dr. Grant dated March 3, 1922—and I may say this letter was unsolicited; Dr. Grant wrote me knowing that I was interested in the case. He says:

WOODSTOCK, N.B., March 3, 1922.

Mr. J. B. Tompkins is ill again and has had another hemorrhage from the lungs, his condition is certainly unsatisfactory so far as any improvement is concerned.

Dr. Grant at that time took the matter up with the Camp Hill hospital at Halifax with a view of having this man admitted for treatment, because he was in very poor financial circumstances and was unable to pay a doctor. The Pension board was unwilling to admit that he had a claim for pension. This was the reply Dr. Grant got from the Camp Hill Hospital in Halifax, dated March 16, 1922:

Dr. N. P. GRANT,
Woodstock, N.B.

Your communication of the 10th inst. relative to the marginally noted man has been passed to this office.

You are advised, please, that B.P.C. Ottawa, have definitely ruled that this man's pulmonary condition is not to be regarded as due to service. No steps can therefore be taken to have him admitted to any S.C.R. institution.

They refused to admit him to a sanitarium even for treatment, although he and his three sons had given splendid service. The three sons went over in 1916 and served during all the remainder of the war.

Mr. BELAND: He was ultimately admitted, was he not?

Mr. CALDWELL: Yes. I will come to that later. Dr. Grant forwarded a copy of this letter to me and I at once took the matter up with the D.S.C.R. here. After my insisting very strongly that action be taken they did admit him to a sanitarium for treatment, and upon my taking the matter up quite strenuously with the Pension board they granted him an increase in pension. Here is the letter from the Pension board dated July 28, 1922.

The CHAIRMAN: I am afraid the hon. gentleman is going beyond relevancy to the matter under consideration when he reads extensively from these letters.

Mr. CALDWELL: I was not present when the principle of the bill was before the House the other night. However, I should like to be permitted to refer to these communications.

The CHAIRMAN: I question whether that record can be read. A good deal of what has already been read has been irrelevant.

Mr. CALDWELL: I will bow to your ruling, but I would like to refer to it if I may not read it. On July 28, a communication was received from the Pension board saying that they had granted him a pension of $21 a month for himself, his wife, and three children. I think it is a 15 per cent disability that gives a pension of $21 a month, and they made this retroactive for the whole period from his discharge, after, for three years, refusing to give him anything but $5.30 a month and stating that his condition was not due to service. Then in July, 1922, they yielded a little and they admit that his condition is possibly due to service and they grant him a pension that I consider an insult to a man who has given the service that he has and who is not able to work as he is not. But due to the fact that he must live, he has gone out and worked repeatedly for a short time. Each time he breaks down and comes back on the doctor's hands. His wife, who is not a trained nurse at all, leaves the children with him when he is not able to work and she goes out and endeavours to get nursing in order to try and keep the wolf from the door. Their home is mortgaged, their taxes are not paid, they are in a very critical financial condition. The three sons who have returned have married and have had as hard a time as most returned men to re-establish themselves, and should not have to support the father and mother and the smaller children. However they have had to contribute from their very meagre earnings, after maintaining themselves, to the upkeep of the family. One of the sons bought a farm from the Soldier Settlement board, made his 10 per cent payment down, but owing to adverse conditions has lost that. So that this family that have given such great war services do not feel, nor do their friends feel, that they have at all had justice at the hands of the Pension board.

An hon. MEMBER: What pension does the man get now?

Mr. CALDWELL: He is receiving a pension of $21 a month for himself, his wife and three small children Every doctor that examines him tells him that he should not work but he finds that he must do so. When he works a little he breaks down and comes back again on the doctor's hands. When he gets on his feet he endeavours to work again, but without success. These facts have repeatedly been brought to the attention of the Pension board. The letters I have quoted from have been referred to the board. I have taken the case up repeatedly with them. Their last stunt was to call in a tubercular expert to go over this man's file of papers. That was on May 29th, 1923. I have a letter from the board stating that the medical expert, after reviewing the man's file—here in Ottawa whereas the man lives in Woodstock, N.B.—had decided he was not entitled to a pension.

Now to substantiate the statement which has already been made by some members, and which may still be repeated by others, I may state that I think the present Pension board have made their position untenable by the attitude they have taken towards the Pension Act and towards pensioners. For instance in the case of the amendments of 1920, and 1921, questions were asked by various members of the parliamentary pension committee who wished to assure themselves that those amendments would not affect the men of the Canadian Expeditionary Force. Had the members of that committee—I think I can speak for myself anyway and I believe the same remark applies to other members of the committee—believed that those amendments would have been applied to the men who served in France, or in any other theatre of war, they would not have been passed. But the Pension board, or their representatives, said those amendments did not apply to the Canadian Expeditionary Force, but simply to the men in the permanent force, and applied to conditions after the war was over. It was stated without hesitation that the amendments would not apply to any man who had served in the overseas forces. Ac-

cordingly the amendments were allowed to go through. For that I think we are all to blame. I think a separate clause should have been framed to deal with the permanent force leaving section 11 as it was. However, I am pleased that the minister has brought down section 11 in its amended form.

I now wish to quote from the report of the Ralston commission to substantiate the claim that the Pension board have not given the pensioner the benefit of the doubt in a great many cases. On page 114 the report of the commission reads as follows:

> Sufficient has been shown, in the evidence before the commission, to quite justify the conclusion that the statement that the applicant is given the benefit of any reasonable doubt cannot be taken as expressing by any means an invariable principle of pensions administration. Numerous cases were presented in which, in the opinion of the commission, there was clearly a reasonable doubt established in favour of the applicant, but pension was refused; and in many of these the applicant showed not only a reasonable doubt but a preponderance of evidence in his favour.

This is the finding of the royal commission after having had submitted to them, I think I am safe in saying, hundreds of cases in which the pensioner was not given the benefit of reasonable doubt. I do not wish to weary the House by quoting copiously from the report but in many places it is stated that statements derogatory to the pensioner were taken at their face value while facts established in his favour were not considered. That is to say, that facts operating adversely against the pensioner were given very great prominence in the matter of deciding on pensions. I can personally vouch that I have found this to be the case. Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to weary the House but I must say I feel very strongly on this matter. As a member of the Pension committee of this House for three years I have had as good an opportunity to know the attitude of the Board of Pension Commissioners towards the pensioners and towards any change in the Pension Act that would be for the benefit of the pensioners as any hon. member in this House.

Mr. RYCKMAN: I rise to speak only because I wish to emphasize and make a little more clear, if I can, the necessity, as I believe it, of giving in a case of doubt, the decision in favour of an applicant for pension. I think the minister did not quite understand the purport of the amendment when it was proposed. No one desires to lay violent hands on this section 3—a long section with many subsections and, if I may be permitted to say it, well drafted—but I want to put this case to the minister: Suppose there is an applicant who is suffering from a disease which if attributable to or incurred during military service would entitle him to a pension. Suppose we have one suffering from such a disease who goes before the Board of Pension Commissioners. There are two doctors who say, "Your disease is attributable to the war or to your military service." There are two doctors on the other side who say flatly "Your disease is not attributable to your military service." In other words, suppose, as very often happens, it is a case of fifty-fifty, that there is no preponderance of testimony in favour of the plaintiff, that the verdict can only be the Scotch verdict, "not proven." Now, what is the position of the Pension commissioners? I do not know whether they are sworn to administer their duties faithfully or whether they take an oath of office. No doubt they do do that whether they take such an oath or not. They are in this position then, "We cannot award a pension. The case is evenly balanced. We cannot say this is attributable to the war, nor can we say it is attributable to military service. Therefore it is impossible for us, under this admirably drawn act, to award a pension." What I desire is that when the case is on an even balance the onus of proof shall favour the applicant, and that the even balance shall be immediately disturbed by saying that the applicant is entitled to his pension. The British House of Commons has done that; the government introduced an act. I believe it was in 1922 or 1923. We are told we have the best Pension Act of any country that went through the war but we do not have it in this respect. We may have been liberal with those entitled to pensions, but that is not the only consideration. I would like the minister to tell this House if it is possible under this admirably drawn act, for the Board of Pension Commissioners, discharging their duties faithfully according to the oath of office, if they take it, where the evidence is evenly balanced, to decide in favour of the applicant and grant a pension. I submit it is not.

Mr. BELAND: Of course the Pension board may decide in favour of any applicant, if there is a difference of opinion between two medical boards. There is nothing at all in the act that would preclude a decision in favour of an applicant, if two medical men pronounce against the attributability and two pronounce in favour of it.

Mr. RYCKMAN: I am afraid I have not made myself clear. The members of the Board of Pension Commissioners must discharge their duties honestly. Instead of tak-

ing two doctors for and two doctors against, I will take one doctor for and one against. The applicant comes before the board and makes his claim under section 3, subsection 11 (a), and one surgeon says "Your disease is not attributable to nor was it incurred during military service." The other surgeon, equally credible, comes forward and says "Your disease is attributable to or was incurred during military service." What is the board to do? The board may say that either of these two distinguished surgeons is entitled to credibility, but that "We cannot believe A any more than we can believe B; it is an even balance, the onus of proof is upon the applicant, and therefore we have to deny the pension". Of course, as the minister says, there is nothing to prevent the board from granting a pension, but if the board is discharging its obligations as men sitting in judgment, it is impossible under the law to give a pension to the applicant.

Mr. BELAND: I beg to differ with my hon. friend. There is nothing whatever in the act that precludes the board from awarding a pension in the case he has cited. My hon. friend is speaking of attributability, but we go further than that in this act. We say that if it is attributable to service the man may be pensioned and shall be pensioned—not "may" but "shall"—also if the disease was incurred during service. It is absolutely impossible to go further, and if you attempt to go further you confuse matters entirely. I admit that very often one medical opinion is set against another medical opinion. Medicine is not a science of geometry nor of mathematics, and doctors disagree. How can we expect that they will not disagree, when lawyers disagree on a given statute? When the Pension board refuses a pension in a case such as my hon. friend mentioned, the remedy would be to appeal. I do not know whether my hon. friend is a lawyer by profession or not.

Mr. RYCKMAN: Yes.

Mr. BELAND: Then, as a lawyer he knows that contradictory evidence is submitted in the court in almost every case. It is a matter for the judge to estimate the evidence of one party as against the evidence of the other party. In numberless cases the evidence is contradictory, and if the litigant loses his case before one court it is open to him to appeal to a higher court; if he is not satisfied with the second court, he may go to a third court, or he may go as far as the Privy Council.

Mr. RYCKMAN: Although it appears to me that I have laboured hard I have not made myself plain to the minister.

Mr. BELAND: Yes, the hon. member has made himself very clear.

Mr. RYCKMAN: The minister must admit there are many cases where the evidence is evenly balanced. The applicant has just as much in his favour as the defendant has in his favour; in other words, there are cases where there is no preponderance of evidence, you are in a dilemma as to where the right may be, and you would seek to have some additional evidence in order to decide the case. But it is not forthcoming. In that case the board has no option and no alternative but to refuse the pension.

Mr. BELAND: On what does the hon. member base that assertion? Will he quote me one single line in the act that precludes the awarding the pension?

Mr. RYCKMAN: I will read the section. Such a provision does exist in the English Act. I am sorry now to take up the time of the House, but I must do it. The section of the act reads:

> In respect of military service rendered during the war—
>
> (a) Pensions shall be awarded to or in respect of members of the forces who have suffered disability resulting from injury or disease—

Let me skip a few words here.

> When the disability resulting from injury or disease or the aggravation thereof in respect of which the application for pension is made or the injury or disease or the aggravation thereof resulting in the death in respect of which the application for pension is made—

Then what?

> —was attributable to or was incurred during such military service.

Suppose a man qualifies under the first part of the section I have read, and comes as an applicant for a pension, what must he show? He must show that this disability, disease or the aggravation thereof was attributable to or was incurred during such military service. Suppose he produces evidence, as I have said before, and that ranks fifty in authority, and there is evidence against that which amounts to fifty; there is an even balance, and that man, under the act of the hon. minister, must be denied his pension, if the Pension board does its duty.

Mr. BELAND: All I can say is that I beg to disagree with my hon. friend. I ask him to quote one single sentence in this act that would preclude the awarding of a pension in such a case under this act. He cannot show one single sentence. Of course, there is no

such preclusion in the act, and my hon. friend, who is a lawyer, knows it. It is a question I understand of appreciation of medical evidence as presented. It is not a question of one doctor as against another. I would not set my medical opinion against the opinion of a professor of pathology in McGill University or Queen's University, though it might be one medical opinion as against another medical opinion. It is for a competent board to judge the situation, to appreciate the evidence as presented, and to award or refuse a pension according to their judgment and their conscience. There is in the act nothing that precludes them from awarding a pension, even if the evidence is not adduced.

Mr. RYCKMAN: Does the applicant have to prove that his disease was attributable to his military service?

Mr. BELAND: No.

Mr. FIELDING: Or incurred during military service?

Mr. RYCKMAN: Or incurred during military service?

Mr. BELAND: That is different.

Mr. RYCKMAN: I was stating just one case. It is very plain that if you can prove that your disease was attributable to military service, you get a pension. I will put the matter in this way. Does the minister admit that an applicant must prove that his disease was attributable to or was incurred during such military service?

Mr. BELAND: I do not say that he has to, and there is in the act nothing that says that.

Mr. RYCKMAN: What does the language mean?

Mr. BELAND: The language means that he may make application for a pension for a disability which is attributable to or incurred during service.

Mr. RYCKMAN: He must show that.

Mr. BELAND: He may and, no doubt, he does show all possible evidence that is in his possession. It is for the Pension board then —and they do this in every case—to resort to securing medical opinion from their advisers in this regard, from the medical sheet, from whatever is produced by the man, and to base their judgment thereupon.

Mr. MANION: I think possibly I may offer just one suggestion that may help to clear up the point. Probably the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Ryckman) is correct as to the legal letter of the law, but at the same time it would be an absolute impossibility in many cases for men applying for pensions to prove that their disease or disability was due to or was incurred during service. Take the case, for example, of a man who became ill a year after his discharge. He was discharged as fit. His case is laid before the medical board who finally say: "Well, the evidence looks as if this might have occurred at that time." Unless there is some medical record, it would be impossible for that man to prove in a legal sense, that his case was due to or was incurred during service.

Mr. RYCKMAN: He has to do that now.

Mr. MANION: I do not think so. The argument I was making the other day was that you cannot live up to the letter of the law, as the Pension board has been inclined in the past to do.

Mr. BELAND: That is my impression also.

Mr. MANION: I hope this amended act will put an end to this living up to the letter of the law.

Mr. LUCAS: The last few lines of paragraph (b) of clause 3 read:

> Provided that no pension shall be paid for a disability or disabling condition which at such time was wilfully concealed, was obvious, was not of a nature to cause rejection from service, or was a congenital defect.

As regards a man who had a congenital eye condition, if it was proven that his condition was aggravated by service, would he be denied a pension?

Mr. BELAND: No. He would not be pensioned for the pre-existing disability, but he would be pensioned for the aggravation in this case. If that was not a congenital defect, or if it was not wilfully concealed, or if it was not obvious, then he would receive a pension, not only for the aggravation, but for the pre-existing disability if he reached an actual theatre of war. That is the purpose of paragraph (b).

Mr. MacLAREN: In reference to this discussion about proving a case, I would suggest that there is practically no such thing as a man proving his case. A man may prove his case, in the event of an application on account of some obvious disability, by the evidence of his comrades who saw it occur. But that happens only in a certain number of cases. As regards many diseases, such as medical diseases, these things are not proved. I do not suppose the minister would suggest for a moment that these cases are subject to proof.

What then is the question? It is a matter of a man submitting his case to the Pension board. If a man submits a reasonable amount of evidence, then his case is established; but one does not mention that in the same breath as proof. The case is not proved to a mathematical demonstration, but it is accepted on the establishment of a reasonable case. I think we are a little liable to confuse these terms in that sense.

As far as I can gather from reading the amendment, it conflicts with the latter portion of paragraph (b). That may not be the case, but I consider this amendment is of such a length that it should be printed and circulated amongst the members. Personally I do not feel able to discuss it until I have had a fair opportunity of reading it over very carefully. Many very serious difficulties have arisen in connection with pensions over the fact of obscurity and difficulty in interpretation. I fear we have expected too much of the Pension board in that respect, because they have had great difficulty from the act just as have returned men and others who are interested. We should be most careful to see that we make this act now as amended as perfect as possible. Especially we should gain from the experience we have had in the last few years of difficulties that have arisen through imperfectly and obscurely drafted acts. This amendment is too lengthy to be read over in this way unless we have an opportunity of reading it carefully as we have had of reading the bill. I, therefore, would suggest that if the amendment is to be proceeded with, it be allowed to stand for this evening until printed copies can be distributed amongst the members.

Mr. BELAND: The four last lines of paragraph (b) to which my hon. friend (Mr. MacLaren) has referred are a repetition of the act of 1919 and have remained in the act ever since. They are not new.

Mr. MacLAREN: The minister misunderstood me. I am referring to the amendment proposed to the bill.

Mr. BELAND: The amendment now before the committee?

Mr. MacLAREN: My remarks are not on the amendment, but on the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. CLARK: As I understand the matter, the insurance principle was contained in the 1919 act. Is that correct?

Mr. BELAND: We called it so.

Mr. CLARK: Then in the 1920 amendment, that was wiped out?

Mr. BELAND: Yes.

Mr. CLARK: Is it not a fact that since the act was amended in 1920, pensions have actually been awarded to ex-members of the Canadian Expeditionary Force on the insurance principle?

Mr. BELAND: If that is a question, I shall answer it.

Mr. CLARK: I was going to give, perhaps, a concrete illustration of that. For instance, if a man who had suffered during service from a light form of tuberculosis, let us say, had been cured and had gone back to service, and subsequently to his discharge, say in 1921, he again developed tuberculosis and applied for a pension, is it not a fact that a pension would be granted in such a case where the medical history of the man showed that he had suffered from the trouble on service.

Mr. BELAND: I think so.

Mr. CLARK: In other words, although the act was amended in 1920, the insurance principle has been carried out during subsequent years?

Mr. BELAND: I pointed out a minute ago that the due to service principle did not appear to have been applied until 1921. My hon. friend perhaps has not in mind that the declaration of peace took place only on the 31st of August, 1921, although the act had been amended more than a year previously.

Mr. CLARK: I was not thinking of that, but of cases that arise to-day, cases of tuberculosis, or any other disease, the origin of which can be found in a man's medical history sheet. What I am suggesting is that a pension will be granted even to-day as the law now stands. Is not that correct?

Mr. BELAND: I think it happens, yes.

Mr. CLARK: Well, as I understand the matter, these amendments which are now before the committee are simply for the purpose of crystallizing the practice which is now in existence.

Mr. BELAND: No.

Mr. CLARK: I cannot get any meaning from the minister's answer, then.

Mr. BELAND: Though in some cases pensions might have been awarded on the insurance principle, in at least 500 cases, I am informed by the Pension board, pension has been refused on that very account, because

under the act as it stands to-day, the disability in respect of which the application is made may not be attributable to service, even though it might have been incurred on service.

Mr. CLARK: I agree with the amendment to that extent, in so far as it corrects that feature. I want to emphasize what the member for East Toronto (Mr. Ryckman) said. I agree with his interpretation of this amended bill. True, we may be looking at it from a legal standpoint; we must take that into consideration. But suppose you have a case in which there are say, two doctors, on either side. The case comes before the Pension board and we find that after a perusal of the opinion given by the doctors in the first instance, the two medical men on the Pension board absolutely agree with two of them against the man, so that there is an adverse decision. It is very dangerous for the man's case if there is equal evidence on both sides, and even if the two doctors on the Pension board disagree, the situation is serious. So long as it is necessary for the man to show that his disability is attributable to service or was incurred on service there is going to be dissatisfaction, and there are going to be difficulties. It is my desire to see this dissatisfaction obviated and these difficulties overcome as far as possible this present year. I believe that this section will be of service to some extent, but you cannot get away from the fact that evidence must be produced that the disability is attributable to service. After a period of two or three years there will be considerable difficulty in satisfactorily proving this, and there must be differences of opinion where there are medical men. Furthermore, I can quite understand that applicants for pensions will be firmly convinced that their disabilities are attributable to service, or were incurred on service, and these men will be able to obtain independent medical opinion supporting their view, though you may find medical opinion produced by the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment unanimously opposed to it. There will always be differences of opinion among medical men, and that is going to give rise to difficulties and dissatisfaction. The minister says that this is where the appeal board comes in. That may help to some extent, but even the appeal board will be faced with the problems presented by the member for East Toronto, and I am not satisfied that this section is going to meet a very large number of cases which are bound to be appealed as soon as the appeal boards are constituted if the subsequent sections are adopted. In my experience, these sections simply crystallize what has been the practice of the Pension board. I have had no particular difficulty in cases which I have presented to them where I could show that disability was attributable to service. Where I could do that I have had no particular difficulty in having the insurance principle applied. Yet I quite understand that there have been cases all over Canada, some 500 in number, which have arisen where that principle has not been applied. In that regard I agree with the amendment, because that principle, I think, should be applied. I submit, however, that we are not getting over the whole dissatisfaction, which is bound to result when the bulk of these appeals come before the board.

Mr. POWER: Whilst I agree to a large extent with my hon. friend from Toronto and the hon. gentleman who has just spoken (Mr. Clark) that something should be done to take the onus of proof as to the attributability of the disease off the applicant, I think the amendment offered by the member for Vancouver South (Mr. Ladner) opens the door altogether too wide. Let me give an extreme hypothetical case. A man, let us suppose, was called to the colours and drafted in 1918. He reported to the barracks and was given harvest furlough. He was probably ten minutes at the barracks when he was given furlough, and he went home to his farm. Before he reported back again the armistice was declared. Thirty or forty years afterwards he develops tuberculosis. Under the amendment, the fact that he reported to the barracks, was medically examined and passed as fit, is conclusive evidence that he must have contracted tuberculosis on service and he would be entitled to a pension. I think hon. members of the committee will agree that that is opening the door a little too wide and would certainly lead to a considerable abuse. As I have already stated, I agree with the other legal lights that at present the onus of proof is on the applicant, and something should be done to open the door a little wider in this respect, but I think we are going a little too far under the amendment offered by the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Ladner).

Mr. MANION: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that as we have been discussing this amendment for a little over two hours, and as probably all opinions in regard to it have been elicited, we might as well decide one way or the other and get on with this bill.

Mr. MARLER: The amendment moved by the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Ladner) deals with the definition of the word "attributability", which I think he desires to incorporate in the act. The amendment now before the committee goes a great deal further. I do not think it is advisable to define the word "attributability", I think any definition will only tend to narrow its meaning. But if it is desired to define "attributability" in such a way that the onus will not be entirely on the soldier, let us make an amendment along that line.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): A year ago, Mr. Chairman, I might not have supported this amendment, but to-day, after my experience in the interval, I am inclined to support it. The onus of proof at the present is too difficult for the applicant to sustain. Let me remind the minister of one case which illustrates this very strongly and will convince him that something must be done to alleviate the applicant's burden. I brought to the notice of the department the case of a man who after having a pension for four years finds himself suddenly deprived of it because the Pension board discover they made a mistake. What mistake did they make? Referring to their records, they find it reported that there is a scar on the left side of this man's neck which was there before the war. The man denies this and states that after he was discharged he went over to Glasgow and there had a slight operation performed, of which this scar is the mark. The board refuses to accept his statement or to take any steps to prove or disprove it. As a result the man has to go to the trouble of sending over to Glasgow to get some person there, who is not interested in his case, to go through the hospital records. What are the facts? This man had a slight operation performed in Scotland in 1910—he worked from 1910 to 1914 in the shipyards there—then became a fireman on a convoy, worked right up to 1914 in perfect health—served a year or more on the convoy—jumped his job at Montreal—went to Belleville and enlisted—and a month later showed signs of tuberculosis. That is a very unfortunate case, but it is not the only one I have brought to the department's notice. I find it is very difficult for the applicant to bear all the burden of proof, and yet there is nothing in these amendments to relieve him of that burden in any way.

Last year I supported the amendment that time should not count with a tubercular case. The man perhaps had been under a gas attack with no immediate bad effects. I think tubercular cases should be in a class by themselves. Neurasthenic cases should also be sympathetically considered if the men can prove they suffered shell shock while actually at the front. There are one or two of these amendments that appeal strongly to me, and if the minister is prepared to relieve an applicant of the full burden of proof I shall support them.

Mr. LADNER: Mr. Chairman, may I change the amendment in the fifth line? I should have put after the word "who" these words: "having served in a theatre of actual war."

The error arose owing to the English act being differently worded.

Mr. MARLER: Mr. Chairman, I protest vigorously against an amendment like this being read into one of the most complicated acts on our statute books. I believe that not half a dozen men in the House can read the amendment correctly into the act, and for myself I decline to take the responsibility of dealing with an amendment of this description without having it put before the law officers of the Crown for their consideration.

Mr. LeSUEUR: From the discussion so far it appears that a number of members feel that this section puts upon the applicant the onus of proof. That, of course, is the ordinary legal principle in all courts, and one would naturally expect it to be the case here. I understand that the minister's interpretation of this section is that the matter is entirely in the discretion of the Pension board.

Mr. BELAND: Hear, hear.

Mr. LeSUEUR: To make it absolutely clear I have been wondering if it would be satisfactory to him to insert before the word "attributable" the words "was in the opinion of the board reasonably attributable." That might possibly cover any question of doubt in regard to the onus of proof.

Mr. BELAND: I have no objection to the words being inserted.

The CHAIRMAN: The question is on the amendment. Is it the pleasure of the committee that the hon. member introducing the amendment (Mr. Ladner) shall have leave to add in the fifth line thereof after the word "who" the words "having served in a theatre of actual war"?

Mr. BELAND: No.

The CHAIRMAN: Then the question is upon the amendment moved by the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Ladner).

Amendment (Mr. Ladner) negatived.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Before the clause carries, I would ask for a definition of the words "wilfully concealed" in the fifteenth line in subsection (b). There was a period of enlistment when the greatest care was not exercised by the medical examiners in passing volunteers, and many men were accepted without being thoroughly examined. A large number of men were so anxious to enlist that although they may have suffered from such a disability as flat feet or poor eyesight, which afterwards developed into a serious condition, they did not disclose it at the time for fear they would be rejected. Who is to determine when a man wilfully concealed any disability?

Mr. BELAND: In this connection, Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that the board has experienced any difficulty at all, certainly since I have been minister I have not heard of a single complaint in this regard. "Wilfully concealed" I think would mean, for example, the case of a man who on enlistment failed to mention that three of his toes were missing, and after discharge, because of having served in a theatre of actual war, claimed a pension for the loss of those toes. Well then, the board would say, "You lost them before the war?" and if the answer was in the affirmative, the board would say, "You wilfully concealed that when you enlisted." I do not think this restriction has caused any difficulty. The words "wilfully concealed" were in the original act of 1919: they were in section 25 (3) of the act of 1920; they were in the legislation of 1921 and 1922. If there has been wilful concealment and a man is confronted with that provision of the act, he admits it immediately and there is no further difficulty.

Mr. LeSUEUR: Before the committee proceeds with clause 4 I would like to crave the indulgence of the minister and of the committee to propose an amendment to the interpretation clause, subsection (b) of section 2, in which the words "widowed mother" are, to some extent, defined.

Mr. BELAND: Is my hon. friend referring to the Pension Act?

Mr. LeSUEUR: Yes. Under section 47 of the Pension Act, supplementary pension is given to the widowed mother, wife or children of persons domiciled and resident in Canada at the outbreak of war who enlisted in the military forces and who died in service or as the result of service. Last year the House in its wisdom defined the words "widowed mother" as extending to and including a mother deserted by her husband. I wish to propose an amendment to the interpretation clause, comprising the addition of the following words:

And also a mother whose husband is in a helpless and dependent condition.

Possibly I can best explain what I believe to be the justice of that amendment by citing a case. A boy who had been the support to a certain extent of his mother and a rather sickly father—the father was unable to work continuously—enlisted in the Royal Air Force. He went to the front, fell within the German lines and was killed. The father later became paralyzed; today he is a helpless paralytic, who has to be fed by the mother of this boy and given close attention. The result is that simply because her husband is living, though in a helpless condition, she is unable to collect any supplementary pension in respect of her son's death. From a monetary standpoint she is in a much worse position than if the husband had died; if her husband were dead she would be clearly entitled under the act to collect pension. As it is, she has to give her time to the nursing of her husband; it is a drag on her resources to maintain him, and solely on account of the peculiar wording of the act she is prevented from obtaining a pension. My amendment is to cover cases of that kind.

Mr. POWER: I rise to a point of order. I submit that the amendment just proposed is out of order in that it involves additional expenditure on the part of the Crown.

The CHAIRMAN: I may say that the resolution which preceded this bill provided in part as follows:

That enactments be made respecting pensions for military servics rendered during the war and after the war, which shall be made retroactive to the first day of September, 1919, and all cases in which pension has been refused, reduced, discontinued or underrated by reason of the fact that the proposed legislation was not included in the Pension Act shall be subject to review by the Board of Pension Commissioners—

And so on. There is no limitation in the resolution which prefaced this legislation as to the amount of public expenditure that is to be involved. As to the question of a private member not having the right to move an amendment in committee which would increase the public expenditure I may quote the following from May, page 461:

This principle, however, is apparently disregarded when the recommendation of the Crown is given to a resolution empowering the expenditure of public money which, framed in general terms, places no limitation on

11 p.m.

the amount of expenditure to be authorized by the resolution. As the resolution sanctions, without any specific limitation, the application of money to be provided by parliament to certain purposes, when the clauses in a bill founded upon such a resolution are before the committee, the freedom of action sanctioned by that resolution can be exercised.

So I must rule that the hon. member's point of order is not well taken.

Mr. POWER: Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to discuss the matter at length but I would call your attention to decisions rendered on a similar matter four years in succession when amendments to the Pension Act were brought down. On those occasions I proposed that a certain extension be applied to the words "widowed mother" in the act, and that widowed mothers be granted additional pensions. On every occasion my amendment was ruled out of order by the then chairman of committees, the present member for Shefford (Mr. Boivin). I think these decisions should form some kind of jurisprudence; at least, they ought to be looked into before the Chairman gives a definite decision on the point of order raised now.

The CHAIRMAN: I have made some inquiry into that, and I am informed that in those instances the resolutions in each case dealt specifically with each particular part of the subject matter of the bill; they were not only very definite in that respect but they were very explicit as to the exact extent to which the bill and the powers and rights created by it went. I understand that the resolution which prefaced the introduction of this money bill was prepared in the widest terms so that the minister would be in a position to consider any amendment that might be offered.

Mr. FIELDING: What is the amendment, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN: The amendment is that there be added to the interpretation clause the words:

And also a mother whose husband is in a helpless and dependent condition.

The question is upon the amendment.

Mr. BELAND: The purpose of the amendment is to consider as a widowed mother a mother who is not a widow but whose husband is in a helpless condition and utterly unable not only to earn his own living but also to care for himself. There is in the Pension Act as it exists to-day, in clause 34, subsection 3, the following provisions:

When a parent or person in the place of a parent who was not wholly or to a substantial extent maintained by the member of the forces at the time of his death subsequently falls into a dependent condition such parent or person may be awarded a pension provided he or she is incapacitated by mental or physical infirmity from earning a livelihood, and provided also that in the opinion of the commission such member of the forces would have wholly or to a substantial extent maintained such parent or person had he not died.

I believe the case referred to by my hon. friend would be covered by section 34, subsection 3 of the existing law. I do not think his case would be improved by adding as he proposes to the interpretation the expresison "widowed mother." I have no serious objection to accepting the amendment of my hon. friend. It will have very little consequence financially and I realize the force of the point my hon. friend has made, as to the position of the widowed mother under the circumstances he has mentioned. As far as I am concerned I do not see anything that would be unjust in the proposition of my hon. friend. I even believe it would be fair and generous. I would suggest, however, that my hon. friend read clause 34, subsection 3, carefully and see if he does not think that the case in question is covered by that particular subsection.

Mr. LE SUEUR: I appreciate the remarks of the minister as to the fairness of the proposal but section 34-3, as I read it, refers to a member of the Canadian forces. This amendment is proposed to cover the case of a member of the royal forces and refers to the supplementary pension to a widowed mother, and would come under section 47 of the Pension Act.

Mr. BELAND: I am afraid in that case the point of order raised should be seriously considered. At any rate we might perhaps wait for a few seconds until my hon. friend has thoroughly considered the effect of the subsection which I quoted.

Mr. LE SUEUR: I am satisfied on that point.

Mr. MANION: I have read the clause to which the minister refers and it does not seem to me that it would cover the case represented by my hon. friend. Anyhow since the minister admits that the amendment would meet the case and would only involve a very small expenditure, why not accept it and let us pass on?

Mr. BELAND: I will accept it.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall clause 3 as amended carry?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Before you pass to the next clause there is a matter I would like to bring up but I do not know whether it would be appropriate to do so at this stage or not. I should like to ask the

minister a question with reference to the time of the appearance of disability. In the case of a widow an amendment was passed by this House last year to the following effect:

(1) Pensions shall, in all cases, be paid to the widow of a member of the forces without reference to the time of appearance of the disability, which resulted in his death, unless and until it is substantiated that the marriage of such member was contracted with the intention of procuring pension for such widow, and not a bona fide carrying out of the agreement, provided that such disability shall not have been caused by the act of such member or through vice, and that pension be only payable while such widow remains unmarried.

I believe that amendment was rejected by the Senate. What I should like to ask the minister is, whether it is at all possible for him to see his way clear to reintroducing some clause that would cover that particular point. There was a case in the city of Winnipeg, perhaps the minister may recall it, of Lieutenant Phinney, that very well illustrates the unjustness of the present arrangement if I might just mention that case in a few words. Lieutenant Phinney died as the result of a disability incurred upon active service, and within the meaning of the Pension Act, incurred prior to the time of his marriage. He enlisted with the Fort Garry Horse in August 1914, but in an effort to reach France he transferred to the Imperial Forces. He was taken sick and returned to Canada and discharged in March 1916. His health recovered and he again volunteered in the Canadian Expeditionary Force, and was given a commission in the Canadian Field Artillery. He proceeded overseas and went to France in October, 1917. In February 1918, he was gassed and evacuated to England where he remained in hospital for some time. He made a complete recovery and was discharged A1 for active service in May 1918. Prior to returning to France he was married in England. He served with distinction until the conclusion of the war, winning the Military Cross for his splendid daring and skill in bringing his battery into action in front of the infantry lines at the battle of Cambrai. Upon discharge he was in receipt of a pension, but upon his demise the widow was refused pension on the grounds that the marriage had taken place subsequent to the appearance of the disability. His marriage was contracted at least six months prior to the armistice. The Board of Pension Commissioners admit that death was attributable to service. There has never been any question of "fortune hunting" in this case but because of the inclusion of this unjust provision in the act pension is denied the widow of this splendid soldier.

[Mr. Woodsworth.]

I have no amendment to offer but it seems to me that the amendment of last year probably covers the ground. If not is there any other way in which the minister could meet the situation.

Mr. MARLER: Where can we find the text of that amendment?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: This is an amendment, I believe, which was introduced last year.

Mr. MARLER: I cannot find it any place.

Mr. CALDWELL: It is possible I have the amendment here that is referred to. I could not follow the wording as given by the hon. member (Mr. Woodsworth) but it appears as section 5 of the amendments of last year. By the way, this is one that had been suggested by myself before the Pension committee during three successive years; it was defeated by a very small majority for two years but last year it carried in committee, was recommended to the House in the report of the committee, was passed by the House, but was rejected by the Senate. The amendment reads as follows:

Subsection one of section thirty-three of the said act, as amended by chapter sixty-two of the statutes of 1920, is further amended by inserting after the words "married to him" in the second line thereof the words "within one year after date of discharge from the forces or".

That covers, I believe, a very limited number of cases. I agree with the hon. member (Mr. Woodsworth) when he says there is very great hardship in some of these cases. For instance, a member of the forces who enlisted and went overseas but was not married, contracted a disability due to his service and came back and married afterwards and his widow gets no pension if he dies of his war disability. There is another clause in the Pension Act—and I am sorry I have not got a copy of the act before me—which provides that a pension may be granted to a wife if a man lived with her before he went overseas even if not married to her. I think the comparison is odious, and I do not like to make it, but I think, in the case of the man who married even within one year of his discharge or of the appearance of his disability, that his widow should be entitled to the same pension as if he had been married before going overseas. There was an objection raised to it in the first year, and the first amendment I moved two years ago was that if he was married within five years of his discharge, or after the appearance of his disability, the widow would get a pension. The next year

I cut it down to two years after his discharge, and last year I think I went the whole limit and made it one year after his discharge. That made it impossible for any one to take any advantage of this provision because that one year had expired, and there would be no possibility of any woman marrying any returned soldier for the sake of the pension she might get. I would hate to attribute such a motive to any one. But that possibility was obviated by making it one year from his discharge or the appearance of his disability because that time had already expired.

I strongly urge the minister to make this amendment to this bill. I think the number of cases was quite limited. I do not remember the exact number, but it was given to us. I think the chairman of the Pension committee, who is here tonight, would remember what the number was. The Pension board gave us an estimate—of course it was only an estimate—of the number that would be affected by this amendment, and if my memory serves me it was a limited number.

Mr. POWER: The Pension board could not know what would be the number of claimants under the proposed amendment, because a large number of people, knowing that the Pension Act precluded them from obtaining a pension, would not make any claim.

Mr. CALDWELL: I think they gave us an estimate of the possible number.

Mr. POWER: How could they?

Mr. CALDWELL: The estimate would not be based on actual mathematics, but I believe they gave us their opinion. I know of one or two particular cases—

The CHAIRMAN: We are on section 4. I understood the hon. member for Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth) desired to ask a question and I thought the hon. member for Victoria and Carleton (Mr. Caldwell) was seeking to do the same. We are on section 4, but, of course, if the minister desires to answer the question—

Mr. CALDWELL: I will wind up by asking the minister if he proposes bringing in an amendment to cover this feature in the Pension Act.

Mr. BELAND: It is not covered at all by the present amendment. The Pension Act deals with this case, and no widow can be awarded a pension if she marries a man after the appearance of the disability. I would suggest that we deal with all the sections of the present bill, and, when we are through, perhaps the amendment may be suggested as a clause that could be added to the bill.

Mr. CALDWELL: Thanks.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 4—Pensions in accord with extent of disability.

Mr. BELAND: This is a repetition of the clause in the Pension Act.

On subsection 2—How extent of disability estimated.

Mr. BELAND: This is a repetition of the clause in the act.

On subsection 3—When no deduction of pension.

Mr. BELAND: This is the clause in the present act repeated verbatim.

Mr. MANION: I had a suggestion to make as to a brief amendment. It would come under clause 26 of the original bill. Should it be added here or later on?

Mr. BELAND: I think we should wait till we get through these clauses.

Section agreed to.

On section 5—Date of coming into force.

Mr. CLARK: I understood the minister to raise a point of order in regard to an amendment to the previous section which we were dealing with. I have an amendment to offer to section 33. Do I understand the minister to desire that any such amendments shall be postponed?

Mr. BELAND: Yes, postponed until we have gone through the sections, unless they come directly under any of them.

The CHAIRMAN: Unless it is to amend the bill as presented to the committee, the minister has requested that the amendments be postponed until the bill has passed the committee.

Mr. CHURCH: I would ask the minister to consider certain cases of soldiers who are Canadians who served in the Fenian raid and in the South African war. They were very old soldiers, and in their desire to get over to England, they joined the British Expeditionary Force, left Canada, and went over. I understand they do not get any pension under the Pension Act or under these amendments. Could the minister not include those cases? Colonel Ralston thinks they should be considered. As I say many of them are very old soldiers and they are entitled to something. They do not get anything under existing legislation. They were in a hurry to get over, and qualified and went over in the British Expeditionary Force.

Mr. BELAND: This question has been dealt with by parliamentary committees and they have always refused to carry out the

suggestion. There are very few such cases. In fact, I think there are only two Fenian raid pensioners.

Mr. CLARK: Following up the remarks of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Church) I wish to refer to a case which was presented to the Pension board, I know it is not provided for by the act, and perhaps the minister would consider it in framing these amendments. It is the case of a man who joined the Canadian forces and found there would be some delay in getting over. He, therefore, took his discharge in Canada, paid his own way to England, and was drowned on the Lusitania. It can be proved conclusively that the man was a member of the forces here in Canada, I think a member of the Canadian Expeditionary Force, and took his discharge from that force in order to joint the British Expeditionary Force so that he could get to France more quickly. As a matter of fact in that particular case the man's discharge from the Canadian Expeditionary Force is of the same date as the sinking of the Lusitania. Is there any provision for such a case as that?

Mr. BELAND: No, there is no provision, but I am a little surprised to hear that the date of his discharge would coincide with the date of his drowning.

Mr. CLARK: That is a fact. I have investigated it.

Mr. BELAND: There is nothing in the act that would cover such a case. This man was, as we would say in French, sitting between two chairs. He was between two armies. He was discharged from the Canadian army, proceeded to England, being no longer a member of the Canadian force, and was drowned before he joined the Imperial forces. That case is unfortunate.

Mr. CLARK: Has the Privy Council power to pass an order in council dealing with such cases where the facts prove conclusively that the case is a just one? Has the Privy Council power to pass an order in council bringing such a case within the Pension Act so that the board can award the pension laid down in the schedules to the act?

Mr. BELAND: There is no power conferred in the act on the Governor in Council to pass such an order. I am very reluctant to receive that power from the committee to award a pension, when we think it should be reasonably awarded. I realize, though, that this is an extraordinary case, perhaps one of its kind, but the man was a member of neither force at the time he perished. I do not know where the remedy would be.

[Mr. Beland.]

Mr. CLARK: I understand last year on the recommendation of the parliamentary committee, an order in council was passed for payment of a pension to a nursing sister.

Mr. BELAND: I am not aware of that.

Mr. CHURCH: I agree with what the hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Clark) has said. I think there are many of these cases throughout Canada. I know of a case similar to that mentioned by the hon. member, the case of a colonel, one of Canada's oldest soldiers. He served at the time of the Fenian raid, the Northwest rebellion; he was one of the principal officers in the Canadian contingent in the South African war. He received no pension on account of all those wars. He left the soil of Canada because he was qualified and the British were after our qualified men. He paid his passage to England; he served for three or four years over there and he returned. Because he signed up with the British Expeditionary Force and not with the Canadian Expeditionary Force, he is not, under existing legislation, entitled to a pension. This case was brought to the attention of Colonel Ralston, and I received a letter from Colonel Ralston stating that there was nothing in the present Pension Act; that it was a matter for the government to consider an amendment to cover a case like this. There are many cases like this. Four or five of the oldest soldiers we have are cut out altogether. They are disabled and they cannot get civilian positions. Many of these men are poor, and I think the minister might very well look into the matter and see that it is considered at the end of this amending bill.

Section agreed to.

On section 9—District review boards.

Mr. MARLER: This brings up the whole question of the review boards. I do not know whether the minister desires to discuss this clause to-night or not. I have some remarks of considerable length to make on this clause.

Mr. BELAND: Make them as short as possible.

Mr. MARLER: I will certainly do that. I know I have seen this bill before; but when a complicated bill like this is brought down and put through second and third readings the same evening, it is pretty hard to grasp the whole situation. I have no objection to clauses 9 and 10. I should like to speak on clause 11.

Mr. BELAND: The hon. member has no objection to clauses 9 and 10?

Mr. MARLER: Not as they stand.

Mr. BELAND: That is some progress.

Mr. MARLER: I want to speak on clause 11.

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): I move that sub-clause (3) of clause 9 be amended by adding these words "provided that no staff officer or ex-staff officer be eligible for appointment to such board."

Mr. CLARK: What is the hon. member's reason for that?

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): My reason is, that the attitude of staff officers in the army is too much the attitude of the Pension board. I have never seen on active service a staff officer, or a brass hat, or an officer wearing a fur collar on his military coat, that was human.

Mr. BELAND: This is a direct reflection upon the hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Clark). I resent it very strongly, and for that reason I shall vote against the amendment.

Mr. MARLER: I should like to know from some of the military gentlemen in this chamber what the effect of this amendment will be. Will it mean that we can get the best class of men for these appeal boards or not?

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): We can get men without number who are not and never have been staff officers and who will be better men for these boards than those who have been staff officers.

Mr. MARLER: How does my hon. friend define a staff officer? What is the exact meaning of a staff officer?

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): It is defined in the King's regulations. If my hon. friend had ever been in the army, he would know that.

Mr. MARLER: I have been in the army, but I have never been a staff officer and neither has my hon. friend.

Amendment negatived.

Section agreed to.

On section 10—Federal appeal board.

Mr. CLARK: I want to know something about sub-clause (4) of clause 10. Does that mean that the chairman of each district appeal board is to be paid $7,000 a year and each member $6,000 a year? Are there nine appeal boards throughout the country and nine chairmen receiving $7,000 a year?

Mr. BELAND: This clause has reference only to the federal appeal board. Clause 9 dealt with the district review boards.

Section agreed to.

On section 11—Appeals to district review board:

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): I move that the following words be added at the end of sub-clause (1):

Which recommendation, if favourable to the application for pension, shall be final and shall be adopted by the Board of Pension Commissioners.

In support of that, I may say that I see no reason for sending this application for pensions from pillar to post. The Pension board deals with it. Its decision is adverse. Then you have the district review board, and I submit that the opinion of the district review board, if favourable to the applicant, should end the matter. There is no reason why the government and the public should desire to set aside the decision of the district board, if that decision is favourable to the applicant. Such a decision, I think, should be regarded as final.

Mr. BELAND: I am unable to accept the amendment. The royal commission has set out very clearly what the procedure should be in the matter of appeals, and I believe it is only proper that when a decision has been rendered by the district appeal board more favourable to the applicant such recommendation from the district appeal board should be forwarded to the Board of Pension Commissioners that they may carry it into effect; and in case they refuse to carry it out, automatically that decision of the district board will go to the federal appeal board for confirmation or alteration. My hon. friend will see later, as we proceed, that no alteration of the district board's decision can be made by the federal appeal board unless the appellant who received the favourable decision is given an opportunity of appearing personally before the federal board. I think that is a guarantee that the whole scheme will work with some uniformity.

Mr. MARLER: Has the minister considered how many appeals are likely to come to the federal appeal board under subsection 3? The federal appeal board must review substantially every case that goes before the district board.

Mr. BELAND: They will have as many cases as are decided upon by the district appeal boards, with the exception of those appeals, decided by the district boards, which

are carried into effect by the Board of Pension Commissioners.

Mr. MARLER: There is an appeal from the decision of the district appeal boards. In other words, if a soldier appeals to the district appeal board and that board says his case was not properly treated by the Board of Pension Commissioners, the commissioners can appeal to the federal appeal board, if they want to.

Mr. BELAND: They may refuse to carry out the recommendation of the district appeal board, and if they do so, automatically the appellant's case goes to the federal appeal board.

Mr. MARLER: That is not the way the bill reads.

Mr. BELAND: It is. Let me read the provisions for my hon. friend. They are as follows:

(4) In cases where the recommendation of the district review board is more favourable to the applicant than the decision appealed against, the federal appeal board may not disapprove the recommendation without giving the applicant an opportunity to appear personally, or be represented before it, at a hearing in the district in which the applicant resides, or at the seat of the federal appeal board as may be deemed more convenient. On this hearing, the federal appeal board shall make such final decision as may appear just.

The section my hon. friend refers to is this:

(2) In case a recommendation more favourable to the applicant than the decision appealed against is not carried into effect within a time specified by regulations made under the powers hereinafter conferred, or in case of a recommendation not more favourable to the applicant than the decision appealed against, the recommendation and fyle containing all papers in regard to the case shall be forthwith transmitted by the Board of Pension Commisioners to the federal appeal board, and the Board of Pension Commissioners may at the same time submit for the information of the federal appeal board a statement of their reasons for not carrying into effect the recommendations of the district review board.

So that if the Board of Pension Commissioners should refuse to carry out the decision of the district appeal board in, say, Halifax, they will have to transmit the decision of the district board in Halifax to the federal appeal board, with a statement of their reason for not carrying it into effect, and the decision of the federal board shall be final.

Mr. MARLER: It is my opinion, which I offer for what it is worth, that section 11 constitutes exceedingly cumbersome and expensive machinery for the country to carry out. It means that every single decision, good, bad or indifferent, can be appealed from. I do not believe that the federal board will be able to function owing to the enormous number of cases which are likely to come before it, and in addition to that it is my opinion that the soldiers themselves will find the procedure unsatisfactory. I do not want to go into the matter in any great detail, because one could say very much about it; but this is not the system which has been adopted after a great deal of experience in England. There the practice is that the soldier may appeal on a question of entitlement, that is to say, as to whether or not his injury or aggravation is attributable to war service, which immediately brings him under the act. But on a question of assessment, unless it is the final assessment—and there are final assessments there that is where a soldier is given a certain pension for a definite period—the soldier has an appeal to the boards constituted under the department. In my opinion, I repeat, this is expensive and cumbersome machinery, and I doubt whether the federal board will be able to function. The district review boards will be encumbered with an enormous amount of work, and I do not think that the federal appeal board will be able to deal with all the cases that will be submitted to it, nor do I think that the soldiers will be any more satisfied than they are to-day.

Mr. CARROLL: I think we are all committed, first, to the unit appeal boards, and also to the federal appeal board. My hon. friend (Mr. Marler) has made a deep study of the question and he is sincere in the views he advances. But I am not concerned at present as to whether this procedure is either cumbersome or expensive. I hold the view that if it is in the interests of the returned soldiers of Canada it should be made effective. As the minister has pointed out, if the district appeal board's decision is not carried out by the commissioners, there is a further appeal to the federal board; automatically, on the refusal of the board of commisioners to carry out the district board's finding, the matter is taken to the federal board. That is only in keeping with the principle that underlies our courts of law. We have various courts of law that are both cumbersome and costly; nevertheless, they are very effective. I believe that the gentleman who framed the report of the Ralston commission, and who is a sound lawyer, saw the point of view of the British people in affording every opportunity of appeal to the returned soldiers.

Mr. MARLER: This is not the British system of appeal in these cases.

Mr. CARROLL: I am not saying that it is the British system in regard to pensions, but it is undoubtedly the British principle of juris-

prudence. The principle embodied in the provisions of this bill follow that principle as closely as possible.

Mr. MARLER: Follow what?

Mr. CARROLL: The system of British and Canadian jurisprudence.

Mr. MARLER: It does not follow the British system of pensions.

Mr. CARROLL: I have already stated that the system proposed in connection with these appeals is not the British system in regard to pensions. What I am pointing out is that it is consistent with British principles of jurisprudence. It provides an appeal step by step to a tribunal which will be ultimately binding. With regard to the amendment of my hon. friend from Yukon (Mr. Black), I know that that hon. gentleman is absolutely sincere in his regard for the welfare of the returned soldiers of Canada. The hon. gentleman's amendment, however, might work very disastrously to the cause of the returned soldiers.

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): No.

Mr. CARROLL: Well, let us consider the matter. Does the hon. member desire to make the district appeal board's decision final?

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): If favourable to the applicant.

Mr. CARROLL: Then I do not think that is quite fair. The applicant, of course, is a returned soldier, and while I desire to see everything given the returned man that we can possibly give him, at the same time we must administer British law impartially both to the applicant and to the other party interested in the matter. There must not be one law for the applicant and another law for the Board of Pension Commissioners. If you have a court of appeal it must be open to all who are interested in the questions it has to decide; and if you have a district appeal board and you declare that a decision which it makes that is unfavourable to the returned soldier shall be appealed against, but that any decision in the returned man's favour shall be final and be subject to no appeal, then you are obviously creating class legislation in this country, which personally I do not like. I emphasize once again the fact that I am as favourable towards giving to the returned soldiers all that we can possibly give them as is any other member in this House, but I do say that we must treat all alike. I agree with my hon. friend from St. Lawrence (Mr. Marler) that the section will be rather cumbersome and perhaps somewhat expensive. But I do not regard this as any insuperable objection to it, for I certainly think it will safeguard the rights, both of the returned soldiers, whom we all want to see protected, and of the exchequer of Canada. I am therefore thoroughly in favour of the provision.

Mr. MANION: I want to say just a few words in regard to subsection 2 of section 10 with reference to tenure of office. It has been pointed out that the commissioners shall be appointed for a period of five years. There are three of them, two at $6,000, and one at $7,000, or, in all, $19,000; and over the period of five years this will mean a total expenditure of $95,000. We are therefore tying ourselves up for this amount for salaries alone, and the minister knows very well that in addition to this there will be secretariats of various kinds, besides travelling and other expenses. Instead of making these appointments for five years, I would suggest that we make them for two. For this reason. Supposing at the end of a couple of years that this system was not found satisfactory, or that under it practically all appeals had been dealt with, and that consequently it was desired by any government then in power to do away with this expensive civil service, under the present legislation they could do nothing, whereas if we made the appointments for two years they could be renewed from time to time while the necessity for the board continued. I know the argument will be advanced that it would be difficult to get men to serve for two years, but I do not think so. I fear that we are building up not only in this branch but in all other branches a civil service which is an appalling expense to the country, and I think the time has come when we should take seriously into account the large salaries of these executives. I think, without interfering with the efficiency of the proposed board, we might very well cut down the tenure of office to two years.

Mr. BELAND: Mr. Chairman, it was also my desire to have this federal appeal board appointed for as short a period as possible. I may point out that the Board of Pension Commissioners is appointed for ten years, and the salaries are exactly the same, $7,000 for the chairman and $6,000 for each of the commissioners. It is of course impossible to fix lower salaries for the federal appeal board commissioners than those we have granted to the Board of Pension Commissioners. Now, if we should reduce the appointment to two years I am afraid it would not be possible to find three outstanding men willing to give up their vocations and devote the whole of

their time to this work, because it is provided in one of the subsections of section 10 that these commissioners shall devote the whole of their time to the performance of their duties and shall not engage in any other occupation. That is my reason for thinking they should be appointed for five years. I asked the opinion of the members of the royal commission on this very question, and at first they suggested ten years, but on further consideration they thought five years would be more satisfactory. The members of the district review boards will be appointed for one year only and will be part time men, in view of the fact that after a year we expect there will be a great contraction of their work. It may be that by that time the number of appeals will have decreased so considerably that two or three district boards will be sufficient to deal with them. But I believe it will be the sentiment of parliament in the years to come that there should always be in Ottawa a federal appeal board above the Board of Pension Commissioners. To-day we are the only belligerent country in the world without an appeal board. I grant the expenditure will be large, but what we have to do is in discharge of what we consider to be a national duty to our returned men. I remember when the Land Settlement Act was introduced in this House by the previous government the measure contained so many provisions that appeared cumbersome and difficult of application that we doubted whether it would be a success. During the first year there is no question but what we will experience many difficulties under this measure, and whether we shall be able to overcome them entirely or not remains to be seen, but I hope we shall be able to rise superior to all of such difficulties.

Mr. LOGAN: In reference to the point raised by the hon. member for St. Lawrence-St. George (Mr. Marler), while there may be some question as to this measure being cumbersome, I was very much impressed to-night by the speech of the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill). He pointed out that for one year an able commission, presided over by a very capable soldier-lawyer in the person of Lieutenant-Colonel Ralston, had been travelling all over the Dominion investigating soldiers' grievances, and as a result of the evidence submitted to them they had made certain recommendations. They have made certain recommendations, and I agree with the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill) that we might fairly accept those recommendations. They come as the well-matured suggestions of those who have had to do with questions of this kind, and I hardly think that we here to-night, who may not, perhaps, have had much experience in the matter, should suggest changes in the proposals made by the commission. In reference to the appointment of a district board the Ralston commission says:

> After considering all the suggestions received from representatives of ex-service men and the systems in vogue in both Great Britain and the United States the commission has come to the conclusion that an appeal procedure which would meet conditions in Canada and fairly protect the interests of both the ex-service man and his dependents, and the country, would be the following which is hereby recommended:
>
> (a) The establishment, under the Department of Justice, of a district review board for each of the nine D.S.C.R. districts, and of a federal appeal board for the Dominion of Canada, the personnel of each of these tribunals to consist of a medical man, a lawyer and a layman, at least two of whom shall be ex-service men.

Mr. CARROLL: Is the hon. gentleman not aware that every Great War Veterans' organization in this country recommended that before the Ralston commission?

Mr. LOGAN: That makes their recommendation all the stronger. I think we may very well declare that part of the section carried. I suggest also that the recommendation of the Ralston commission in reference to subsection (c) be adopted, namely, that the time within which the entering of appeal may be made be one year instead of three months. On page 17 of their first interim report the Ralston commission say:

> The right of appeal to be open for one year from the coming into force of the regulations, or for one year after the decision complained of, whichever may be last.

But in the bill the one year is changed to three months. I think that three months is entirely too short a time within which appeal may be entered, particularly having regard to the fact that our soldiers are scattered all over the face of the globe. I do not know why we should not adopt the recommendation of the Ralston commission and make the time one year. I beg to move that—

The CHAIRMAN: There is already an amendment before the committee, moved by the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Black). Is it the pleasure of the committee to adopt this amendment?

Mr. SHAW: I think the minister's attitude in connection with this amendment is a correct one. He has very properly referred to the question of uniformity. You cannot have a final decision by one district board which may be entirely out of harmony with the final decision of a board somewhere else. An automatic appeal to the federal appeal

board secures uniformity throughout the whole Dominion. If you do not have uniformity you will have continual complaints from soldiers, because many of them will find out that in one part of Canada the soldiers get one sort of treatment, and in another part, another. So that an appeal to the federal appeal board is absolutely necessary.

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): The remarks of the hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Shaw) would seem to indicate that the district appeal board is of no use whatever. Why have a district board at all if you are going to go on to a federal appeal board? Why not make your appeal direct from the Pension board to the federal appeal board? The district review board is of no use; it cannot give a decision that will be acted upon in any event. It is only an additional expense and an additional worry to the returned soldier. He will make application to the Pension board for pension; if the board rules against it the appeal goes to the district review board, and no matter what decision they give, there must be an appeal to the federal appeal board.

Mr. CARROLL: Not necessarily.

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): If the decision of the district review board is in favour of the applicant, why not make it final? The hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Carroll) undertook to show how the amendment could be embarrassing to the returned soldier; there is nothing more impossible in the world. It would be most satisfactory to the returned soldier—in fact, too satisfactory. How anything could be too satisfactory to the returned soldier to suit this House I am at a loss to understand. Why keep him dangling between one board and another? If the Pension board says no and the district review board says yes, why not let it go at that; why worry the soldier by asking him to go to the federal appeal board? Is not the country satisfied, is not the returned soldier satisfied, if the district review board decides in his favour?

Mr. CARROLL: Then the hon. member is in favour of doing away altogether with the federal appeal board?

12 m.

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): Not if the decision is against the returned soldier. Give him another chance; let him go to the federal appeal board if the decision is against him. But if the decision is in his favour the public should not want to combat the decision. I do not think the minister wants to do it; I do not think the taxpayer wants to do it. It is an imposition on the returned soldier to force him to go from that district board to the federal board if the decision of the district board is in his favour.

Mr. CALDWELL: Is it not a fact that if the district review board decides against the pensioner he does not then go before the federal appeal board?

Mr. BELAND: He does.

Mr. CARROLL: The point taken by the hon. member for Calgary West (Mr. Shaw) is very much stronger than anything I could have said. Suppose, for example, that in the district of Halifax, which comprises quite a large area, a man suffering from tubercular disease gets a decision from the unit appeal board which gives him a pension, and out in Calgary a man under exactly similar conditions gets a decision against him. There is no doubt that there would be dissension if that condition existed. The man in Calgary would say, "Well, the eastern man has got the best of us; he has a decision from his board that we are unable to get from ours." The method proposed is based on the same principle as that which applies in the case of our courts: we have a trial judge, we have the Supreme Courts of the various provinces, then we have appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada. That is what I was trying to point out to my hon. friend from Montreal a few moments ago. There is one question, however, I would like to ask the minister: I think I heard him say a little while ago that these amendments as drafted had been presented to the federal command of the Great War Veterans' Association, who had expressed themselves as being in favour of them. Is that correct?

Mr. BELAND: As soon as the bill was printed I sent a copy of it to the office to which my hon. friend refers. The only suggestion I received from them was that the time within which appeal should be made might be extended to one year. That is the suggestion the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) made. They also suggested something along the line referred to by my hon. friend from Winnipeg, with regard to marriage after the appearance of disability.

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): I do not think it could be suggested for a moment that if the Great War Veterans' Association or any soldiers' organization were asked whether a decision of the district board favourable to the soldier should be final, they would not say yes.

Mr. BELAND: Of course they would say yes.

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): Sub-section 2 says:

In case a recommendation more favourable to the applicant—

And so on. Who is to say whether the decision is more favourable or not to the applicant, who is going to be the judge of that?

Mr. BELAND: My hon. friend asks who is going to say that?

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): Yes.

Mr. BELAND: Any child could say it. If you have a 20 per cent disability and you appeal to have more and 30 per cent is granted, I think anybody can say it is more favourable. If you have no pension, and you appeal, and you are awarded a pension, I think it is more favourable, but if your appeal is not granted then the recommendation is not more favourable. My hon. friend has not given any thought to that.

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): I have given some thought to the matter. The hypothetical cases which the minister has cited are easy of discernment. If a man's disability is fixed at 20 per cent and it is increased to 30 per cent it is easy enough to see that it is more favourable. But if the district board gives a decision in the ambiguous way in which the Pension board has time and again given it, and which no one not even a lawyer can interpret, it is going to be very difficult to say whether it is more favourable or unfavourable.

Mr. BELAND: No such decision can be rendered.

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): They may have given a decision which in the end does not grant a pension but still it may be argued that it is more favourable than the decision rendered by the Pension board, and who is to say whether it is more favourable or unfavourable? I want the wording to be such as will make the decision of the district board final and let it go at that, that is if we desire to ameliorate the condition of the returned soldier.

Mr. MANION: I think a very strong argument has been advanced by the hon. member for Yukon. I know that very often in the past there has been a complaint among the soldiers that in case of an examination by a local board as to pension the result was told to the applicant and then the report was sent into the Pension commissioners at Ottawa, and there was some cutting down of the decision. I think the minister will admit that on many occasions under this clause there has been a great deal of dissatisfaction. Certainly it has appeared to me many times to be rather a strange thing that when a local board of whatever number of doctors, three I think usually, examine a case and, we will say, award a 40 per cent pension, that after they have sent in their report to the Pension board it has been cut down to 20 or 30 per cent. It has always appeared to me very strange that the Pension board should presume—because that is the proper word to use—to alter the decision of the three men who have examined the man. In the same way in the cases mentioned by my hon. friend (Mr. Black) there would be some questions asked. It is true that the law makes provision that the applicant may appear before an appeal board but if unsuccessful he would have to pay his own expense.

Mr. BELAND: Not before the federal appeal board.

Mr. MANION: He would if he was unsuccessful.

Mr. BELAND: Not if he was unsuccessful.

Mr. MANION: Then I have read the clause wrongly.

Mr. BELAND: I will read the clause if my hon. friend will listen to me:

The expenses of the successful applicant in appearing before the district review board shall be paid on the scale now allowed applicants brought in for periodical medical examination, and the expenses of applicant or his representative in appearing before the federal appeal board shall, if the attendance of either be required by that board, also be paid on the same scale.

Mr. MANION: Yes. But there is the provision "if the attendance be required by that board." He may not be required by the board. They may decide without requiring the attendance.

Mr. BELAND: Will my hon. friend bear with me for one more second?

Mr. MANION: Yes. Will the minister tell us what clause he is reading?

Mr. BELAND: I am now going to read sub-section 4 of section 11:

In cases where the recommendation of the district review board is more favourable to the applicant than the decision appealed against, the federal appeal board may not disapprove the recommendation without giving the applicant an opportunity to appear personally, or be represented before it, at a hearing in the district in which the applicant resides, or at the seat of the federal appeal board as may be deemed more convenient. On this hearing the federal appeal board shall make such final decision as may appear just.

The CHAIRMAN: We are considering subsection 1 of clause 11 to which an amendment has been moved by Mr. Black (Yukon). Is it the pleasure of the committee that the amendment be adopted?

Amendment negatived.

Mr. MANION: I just wish to go a little further in order to get the point cleared up. I do not think that the two clauses the minister has read are necessarily to be interpreted as he interprets them. I think they may be interpreted that way or they may be interpreted otherwise. To repeat what the minister read:

> The expenses of the applicant or his representative in appearing before the federal appeal board shall, if the attendance of either be required by that board, also be paid on the same scale.

The other clause quoted by the minister says, they shall give him the opportunity of appearing. Suppose they do not require him to appear but he takes the opportunity of appearing? I think the clauses conflict.

Mr. BELAND: They cannot reach a more favourable recommendation without giving him the opportunity to appear.

Mr. MANION: I would not say that the interpretation is absolutely as the minister makes it.

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): I should like to ask the minister who is to decide when the recommendation is more favourable or otherwise under section 2?

Mr. BELAND: Well the decision itself expresses the fact in plain language.

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): Who is to interpret it, the minister, the board, or the returned soldier?

Mr. BELAND: No; the decision itself. If the appeal of the man for an increased pension is not sustained he does not get a more favourable decision. If he gets an increase of pension he has a more favourable decision. Nothing could be clearer.

Subsection 2 agreed to.

On subsection 5—Time for appeals.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Logan has moved an amendment to subsection 5 to strike out the words "three months" and substitute the words "one year" in lieu thereof.

Mr. RYCKMAN: Is that in accordance with the recommendation of the commission, and is it satisfactory to the organizations of ex-service men?

Mr. BELAND: The royal commission recommended one year. I consulted the Department of Justice and asked them what was the procedure in the law courts. They intimated to me that a month or thirty days was usually the time allowed for an appeal. I concluded that perhaps three months would be a reasonable delay, that is how that period came to appear in this clause. The recommendation of the conclusion was for one year. I realize that three months is too short and I am willing to accept it.

Amendment agreed to.

Subsection as amended agreed to.

On subsection 10—Payment of expenses.

Mr. MARLER: There should be another section here in order to tie up the appeals with the Pension Act. I bring that to the attention of the minister, as section 11—

> All appeals under this section shall be tried and decided under the provisions of the Pension Act and amendments thereto.

It is in order to tie up the appeal board with the Pension Act itself.

An hon. MEMBER: It is tied up now.

Mr. MARLER: No, I do not think so.

Mr. BELAND: We should have a little more explanation. I did not catch the purport of the amendment.

Mr. MARLER: The purport of that amendment is that when these boards of appeal are established they shall look to the Pension Act and amendments thereto as the basis of their appeal in law.

Mr. BELAND: Is that not implied?

Mr. MARLER: No.

Mr. POWER: When we constituted the Supreme Court I do not think we said, "All decisions shall be made according to the law."

Mr. BELAND: I would think it was implied.

Mr. MARLER: The House can take it or leave it as it thinks proper, but I have gone through the section with the greatest care with those who understand the subject, and they tell me that they approve of my suggestion.

Mr. CARROLL: This is an amendment to the Pension Act, and all appeals and all trials under the amendment must be in conformity with the Pension Act.

Mr. CALDWELL: If any amendment is to be made to the Pension Act no such clause as

this should be added. If it is necessary, of course I have no objection to it, but I do not think it is necessary.

Mr. LOGAN: In my humble opinion this amendment of my hon. friend, with all due respect, is ridiculous. You might as well put at the end of every act we pass a provision that the court shall adjudicate according to this act. It is the law, and they have to adjudicate according to it.

Mr. HUMPHREY: I am inclined to think the amendment is going to destroy all the good this present bill would accomplish, and that it will tie up the Pension Act in such a way that it will not function. I take it that it is nothing more than an amendment put forward by the sympathizers of the Board of Pension Commissioners.

Mr. MARLER: The hon. member has no right to make that allegation, and I ask him very kindly to withdraw it. I can give him my word there is no such suggestion. I have studied the matter with great care, and I am just as much in favour of the returned man as he is. Perhaps he has not the discernment to see it. This is a fair and open amendment. I do not force my opinion on the hon. member. I suggest that he withdraw the allegation he made.

Mr. HUMPHREY: I do not see that there is anything in the allegation to take exception to. The amendment presented is absolutely unnecessary. Many hon. members of this House and people outside of this House have studied this particular act. We had a commission that sat for a year for the purpose of suggesting legislation which would have no restrictions to prevent it from functioning. Each member of this committee sitting here to-night is just as eager to have legislation brought in that will function properly as are those members who are submitting the different amendments. As far as the allegations go, I cannot see that there has been any reflection, but it is a well known fact—and the opinion has been expressed in this House—that the Board of Pension Commissioners have not functioned as the people of Canada think they should function; and that is why this particular legislation is introduced. Therefore, I cannot see how I can support the amendment.

Amendment negatived.

Section agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the title carry?

Mr. CALDWELL: Before the bill is reported, I have an amendment which the minister asked me to withhold until the other provisions of the bill were passed. It will be an amendment to section 33 of the Pension Act.

Mr. BELAND: Section 15 of the bill.

Mr. CALDWELL: The amendment is—

> Subsection 1 of section 33 of the said act as amended by chapter 62 of the statutes of 1920 is further amended by inserting after the words "married to him" in the second line thereof the words "within one year from the date of discharge from the forces".

Mr. POWER: I rise to pretty nearly the same point of order as the last one. This amendment involves additional expense to the Crown. It is true in your decision, Mr. Chairman, you stated the minister had given notice and had brought down a resolution which was in very wide and general terms and could cover all possible amendments, but I will call your attention to the resolution. It says:

> Resolved that it is expedient to amend the Pension Act, chapter 43 of the statutes of 1919 and the amending acts, and to provide—
>
> 1. That enactments be made respecting pensions for military services—

The amendment proposed by my hon. friend for Victoria and Carleton is not respecting pensions for military service. It is respecting pensions granted in respect of military service.

Mr. CALDWELL: I am surprised at the hon. member.

Mr. POWER: The widow of the soldier does not get any pension for her military service; so that under the strict interpretation of the wording of the resolution the amendment of my hon. friend is out of order. The widow gets a pension on account of the military service of her late husband, but she does not get any pension for military service.

Mr. CALDWELL: Is that not true of all soldiers' widows who do get pensions?

Mr. POWER: Yes, it is true.

Mr. CALDWELL: I think nobody but a lawyer would think of such a technical interpretation.

Mr. POWER: When a man has been caught up on these technical points so often, he does not see why somebody else should not suffer, particularly when he is pleading a bad case.

Mr. CALDWELL: I am glad he admits the bad case.

Mr. POWER: I submit under the terms of the resolution the amendment is not in order.

The CHAIRMAN: I fear I must rule against the hon. member. The resolution preliminary to the bill, section 1, says:

That enactment be made respecting pensions for military services rendered during the war and after the war.

It does not say to whom these pensions shall be paid for the services rendered by those who did render such services, and pensions are payable to either dependents of those who might be classed as dependents. I think, in view of the discussion which has taken place, and in view of what the hon. member knows as to whom pensions are payable, that it must mean any person the House may decide is entitled to a pension.

Mr. POWER: All through the Pension Act we find these words, "pensions shall be awarded to or in respect of members of the force." When they say "in respect of members of the force" they mean to dependents on account of the services of members of the force. So that if the minister, when he brought down his resolution, wished to allow the field to be open for amendments which would grant pensions to other than those who actually earned the pensions on the field of battle, he would have said "for military service" or "in respect of military service." I submit that is the wording of the act; it is carried all through the act, and it has been carried through the act since 1919.

The CHAIRMAN: I feel I must find that the wording is more general and wider in the act than in the amendment moved by the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Caldwell).

Mr. CARROLL: What is the effect of the amendment?

Mr. CALDWELL: The effect will be to grant a pension to the widow of a soldier who marries after his disability has appeared, if he was married within one year after his discharge.

Mr. HUMPHREY: Is this the same amendment that was passed by this House a year ago?

Mr. CALDWELL: Yes. After due investigation by the Pension committee last year, it was recommended in the report of the Pension committee that this should be embodied in the act, and it was passed by this House, I think without any dissent.

Mr. POWER: Yes, there was.

Mr. CALDWELL: Possibly by the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power); but I do not think we took his suggestion seriously, even at that time, because he is very sympathetic to the soldier and his dependents. We all know that. When the bill went to the Senate, the bill was amended by cutting out this clause.

Mr. POWER: Whatever the hon. member for Victoria and Carleton (Mr. Caldwell) may say, I have serious objection to this amendment, and I have objected to it even since I have been a member of the Pension committee, that is, since the session of 1918. I seriously and conscientiously believe there should be some finality about these pensions. The woman who marries an ex-soldier after the appearance of a disability, enters into this bond with her eyes open. She knows he is suffering from a disability, and she should not be pensionable at his death. If we now allow this widow to obtain a pension, I am morally certain that at the next election, —or if not at the next election, the election after that, because at the next election there will be a good government in power, but at the next election after that there might not be—we shall have this placed before the party which is in power: "You have already granted a pension to the woman who marries one year after the appearance of a disability. Why not extend that to five years?" The hon. member for Carleton told us at one time that he wished to extend it to five years. They might be asked: "Why not extend it to ten years? Why not extend it to the very moment before the death of the ex-soldier?" We shall have an ex-soldier at the age of seventy-five or eighty marrying a young woman and have pensions continuing in aeternum. We shall be paying more than they do in the United States, where they are paying more for pensions to-day than they were at the end of the Civil War. I am afraid to open the door. There are many cases which deserve sympathetic consideration; but if we once open the door, election after election we shall have to extend this and extend it until such time as we shall have a pension bill that the country will not be able to stand.

Mr. MANION: All kinds of promises were made at the last election.

Mr. POWER: Yes. The hon. member made some, and so did I.

Mr. CALDWELL: The pre-election promises of the hon. member for Quebec South seem to be haunting him somewhat.

Mr. POWER: No, they are not.

Mr. CALDWELL: I have no fear of pre-election promises because I made none. I do not feel that this is a radical thing to do at all. It was passed by this House last year without any serious dissent. It is a matter of justice due to the widow of a soldier, who married him within one year after his discharge. There is no danger of opening the door. Three years ago I moved this amendment in committee that it would be applicable to anyone married within five years of the discharge. At that time the five years had not elapsed, and there was an objection that this might be taken advantage of by some women wishing to marry a soldier for his pension. I did not feel there was danger of that then; but due to the fact that the year has expired some time ago, I do not think there is trouble to be feared in passing this amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY: I feel that the door should be open to some extent to provide for a certain number of cases, and to provide for that certain number of cases, the door must be open for at least a year. There are a number of cases particularly of men who went overseas in the early stages of the war and who came back to the Old Country and got married. In that respect I fail to see how these particular widows can be provided for unless we open the door for at least a year. Although I am not in favour of going to any great extent, I should like to ask the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power) in just what way he would provide for those that enlisted in the early stages of the war, went to France, returned to England and married, again returned to France and afterwards met with casualties, if we do not open the door for at least a year. Because those men enlisted in all good faith, went to France and back and were married, this all taking place before the Pension Act was drafted, before we had a Pension Act or any pension regulations. In that way I feel that this amendment is only meeting a situation that the country believes is fair and right.

Mr. POWER: I would simply not give a pension to a woman who married after the appearance of a disability.

Mr. HUMPHREY: Does the hon. member not think such women are entitled to pensions?

Mr. POWER: No.

Amendment (Mr. Caldwell) agreed to: yeas 21; nays 17.

[Mr. Power.]

Mr. CLARK: I beg to move:

That section 33, subsection (2) chapter 43, 1919, be amended by striking out the words:

"Provided that the death occurs within five years after the date of retirement or discharge of the date of commencement of pension."

I will explain this in a few words. I brought the matter to the attention of the minister the other evening and, while he did not express himself, I understood him to be unfavourable to the proposition. It is this. Suppose a man was wounded overseas and was 100 per cent disabled. He came back to Canada and his wife cared for him for a period of five years. He dies in the sixth year, and in order that his widow shall receive a pension she must prove that the man's death was strictly attributable to service. If she cannot prove this, the pension is not awarded. On the other hand, if the man dies within the five year limit, the widow is entitled to the pension. My contention is that if the man was so severely wounded as to come within any of the classes 1 to 5 the circumstances of his family are practically as bad as they would be had he been killed. In fact, viewing the matter apart from the question of his wife's affections, and considering, for the purposes of argument, merely the material aspect of the case, it would have been probably better had he been killed outright, because his wife must necessarily suffer considerably in supporting him. I think, therefore, that the time limit should be wiped out. I have in mind a particular case which I brought to the minister's attention and with which the leader of the Progressive party (Mr. Forke) is familiar. The case recently arose in that hon. gentleman's constituency of one Private MacPhail.

Mr. FORKE: This man was absolutely blinded and was gassed, so that he was utterly unable to earn a cent in any way. He was a burden to his wife and died recently. Yet she cannot get a pension.

Mr. BELAND: The Pension Act provides that if a pensioner, who comes within the classes 1 to 5, that is to say, who receives a pension of 80 to 100 per cent, dies from any cause other than service before the expiration of five years, the widow will be pensionable just as though he had died from disabilities due to service. The provision was inserted in the Pension Act originally for the purpose of meeting the cases in the first few years of high disability pensioners. For instance, a man may have lost an arm or a leg or an eye. He would receive a disability pension which would entitle his widow, if he died within five years, to a pension, whatever

might be the cause of his death. That provision was made, I take it, for the purpose of affording the pensioner sufficient opportunity the more easily to support his disability. Since then the Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act was passed by this parliament giving the privilege to any man in any physical condition whatever to secure insurance just for the asking and without medical examination. Such cases as my hon. friend from Brandon (Mr. Forke) and my hon. friend from Burrard (Mr. Clark) have mentioned would therefore come under the Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act. Any high disability pensioner could insure his life for $5,000 or less in favour of his wife and if any accident happened to him and he died of any other cause than disability due to war service his wife would receive the insurance. But in this case to which my hon. friend has referred, we must fix a time limit, and five years was considered reasonable. We hear of it now because the five years are up in some cases. Still it is the privilege at the present time of all those high disability pensioners to insure for $5,000 as a maximum. I submit that to the committee and am willing to abide by their decision.

The CHAIRMAN: The question is on the amendment.

Mr. BELAND: What is the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN: It is moved by the hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Clark):

That section 33, subsection (2) chap. 43, 1919, be amended by striking out the words: "Provided that the death occurs within five years after the date of retirement or discharge or the date of commencement of pension."

Mr. BELAND: Do I understand it is the intention that for all time to come these men shall receive a pension, no matter what the cause of their disability is?

Mr. CLARK: Not at all. Where a man is so severely wounded in the field that he becomes 100 per cent disabled, I want his case to be treated in the same way as if he had been killed. Because he is a 100 per cent disability case, therefore he is of no more value to his wife than the dead man would be to the widow.

Mr. FORKE: It may seem almost amusing to talk in this way, but in the particular case referred to the man was 100 per cent incapacitated. He was blind, he had been gassed, and was absolutely a burden upon his wife.

Mr. CLARK: There are many such cases.

Mr. MANION: It is apparent that in the case explained by the hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Clark) the wife might be placed in a worse position than if her husband was killed, because if later he dies her pension is cut off, whereas if he had died at the front she would receive a pension. I think it is a very reasonable request and should be accepted.

Mr. BELAND: I do not think we are at present in a position to decide this definitely. I would propose to my hon. friend that instead of five years we say six, which will cover all the cases now pending.

Mr. CLARK: It will not cover the very case cited by the leader of the Progressive party.

Mr. BELAND: When did this man die?

Mr. CLARK: Just a few days ago.

Mr. BELAND: He will be covered.

Mr. CLARK: No, he was discharged early in 1917.

Mr. FORKE: This happened in the first year of the war when the man had only been overseas for a short time. He was taken prisoner by the Germans and through maltreatment he lost his sight. He came back in the early years of the war, and his case did more to enliven enlistment in the Brandon district than anything else that happened. It created that war spirit which proved such a stimulus to enlistment everywhere. But I can see the difficulty the minister has in mind.

Mr. MARLER: Is this the case the hon. member brought up before the parliamentary committee last year?

Mr. CLARK: No.

Amendment (Mr. Clark) agreed to. Yeas 25, nays 21.

Mr. CHURCH: Has the minister made any provision in the new legislation to take care of those Canadians who belonged to the British Expeditionary Force and do not get any pension at all?

Mr. BELAND: No.

Mr. CHURCH: I understand that some of those men get a small pension of $17, and are total disability cases. The pension is too small for their support. I think we might take care of such cases and make up the deficiency under our act.

Mr. BELAND: They have the option of taking the Canadian or the British rates.

The CHAIRMAN: It is moved by the hon. member for Fort William and Rainy River (Mr. Manion):

That there be added to subsection 2 of section 26 of the Pension Act 1919, and amendments thereto, the

following: "Provided however, that the Board of Pension Commissioners shall have discretion to pay the pension to any person who was being, or was entitled to be, supported by the pensioner at the time of his last examination."

Mr. MANION: This amendment is to cover such cases as I cited a couple of days ago. Suppose a man is being paid a 70 per cent pension, it is a temporary pension and he has to be examined every six months. Perhaps he gets into trouble or deserts his wife and children, goes across to the States and fails to reappear for examination. According to my understanding his pension is cut off. This amendment is to give the commission discretion to continue the pension to his wife and children as if the man had complied with the conditions. I think it is only just to the wife and children that this amendment should be accepted. There are not many such cases, but when they do occur great hardship results to the man's dependents. I do not think the minister could have any objection to this proposal, for discretion is left entirely to the commission.

Mr. BELAND: It is a new principle entirely. A man may have died from any cause other than a war cause, and a pension would be awarded to the wife and children for three or four years after he died when in the ordinary course they would not be entitled to anything.

Mr. MANION: If after looking into the case the commission feel the man would have been allowed a pension, it would be entirely at their discretion to award a pension to his dependents. I do not think there are many cases which are left to the commission's discretion under this legislation.

Mr. BELAND: There are a great many cases of desertion.

Mr. MANION: It would be up to the commission to decide whether the wife and children should be given a pension. However, I am in the hands of the committee.

Amendment (Mr. Manion) agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall I report the bill?

Mr. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, before the bill is reported I wish to again refer to a type of case which I mentioned the other evening and which I think should be provided for in this amended bill. The case is that of a man with a wife in Canada going overseas and contracting a bigamous marriage, although there were no suspicious circumstances and the second wife thought the marriage was bona fide. Subsequently the man was killed at the front and the widow in Canada claimed a pension. The act as it now stands requires that a pension shall be paid to one wife only. I made the proposal that under the circumstances I have outlined the pension should be payable to both women or at least that there should be a discretion in the Board of Pension Commissioners to so order. I put the facts of a particular case before the minister, and he stated that it could be dealt with without amendment. I wrote him to find out how, but I have not yet had a reply. Possibly he has not yet received my letter.

[The Chairman.]

Mr. POWER: Did my hon. friend say that the man left two widows?

Mr. CLARK: Yes.

Mr. POWER: Then one of them could not have been his widow.

Mr. CLARK: Technically, that is so. But these are the facts: The man had a wife in Canada, went overseas, committed bigamy, but so far as the second woman was concerned she knew nothing about his previous marriage until after his death. She came to Canada, claimed a pension and was refused because the first wife made a similar claim, which was allowed.

Mr. POWER: But under the present act the commission may, in its discretion, give a pension to the unmarried wife. So I do not know what my hon. friend has to complain of. I think I remember two or three years ago a case similar to that cited by my hon. friend from Burrard (Mr. Clark). A man had been separated from his wife for seven or eight years, proceeded overseas, committed bigamy and later was killed in action. Both widows put in claims. The Board of Pension Commissioners, if my memory serves me right granted a pension to the unmarried wife on the ground that the first one had deserted him and was not entitled to any consideration. She had not written to him or had not lived with him for seven or eight years, therefore they thought the second wife was more attached to him, though she was not married to him—she could not have been, because he had already contracted marriage with another. For these reasons they gave her the pension. So that the Pension board has discretion to do the same thing in the case my hon. friend mentions.

Mr. CLARK: The board has discretion, it is true, but here is a case where the wife who was left in Canada had a family and there had been no separation. The deceased, however, after going to France, had

married this other woman on the 29th of January, 1916, and he was killed on September 29th, 1916. A daughter was born of that bigamous marriage on January 4th, 1917. Both of these women are absolutely above suspicion, and consequently it was perfectly natural that the Pension board should award the real widow the pension. But it cannot be said that the woman who went through the form of marriage on the second occasion is not entitled to consideration. She contracted the marriage in good faith; her marriage certificate is produced and is above suspicion.

Mr. POWER: After reflecting on the various phases of the Pension Act regarding the unmarried wife and cases such as the one mentioned by my hon. friend. I make this observation: that the boys are going to have a very good time in the next war.

Section agreed to, bill reported, read the third time and passed.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, the House adjourned at 12.55 a.m. (Thursday).

Thursday, June 14, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

REPORTS

First and final report of the Joint Committee of both Houses of parliament appointed to consider the forms of bills, the better distribution of the work of legislation between the two Houses, and the practical operation of the provisions of the Senate and House of Commons Act.—Mr. Boivin.

Seventh report of the Select Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce.—Hon. Mr. Maclean (Halifax).

Eighth report of the Select Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills.—Mr. McGiverin.

Annual report of the Civil Service Commission for the year 1922.—Hon. Mr. Copp.

THE BANK ACT

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax) moved:

That the minutes, proceedings and evidence had on Bill No. 83, respecting banks and banking be printed in blue book form, as an appendix to the journals of the House, in accordance with the recommendation contained in the seventh report of the Select Standing Committee on Banks and Banking.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

PUBLIC WORKS—EXPENDITURES

Mr. COOTE:

During each of the last ten years, what was the total amount spent in each Province on (a) Public Buildings; (b) Harbours and rivers; (c) Dredging; (d) Canals?

Hon. Mr. COPP:

DEPARTMENT OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS

STATEMENT showing expenditure on canals (by provinces) by the Department of Railways and Canals. Fiscal Years 1913-14 to 1922-23

PROVINCE

New Brunswick	Quebec	Ontario	Year	Total
$ 56,299 64	$986,848 16	$3,496,582 28	1913-14	$4,539,730 08
90,373 60	891,223 80	6,320,143 84	1914-15	7,301,741 24
209,494 85	709,255 80	7,012,845 85	1915-16	7,931,596 50
130,524 91	713,353 66	5,171,960 28	1916-17	6,015.838 85
52,882 49	523,738 83	2,784,537 36	1917-18	3,361,158 68
28,973 55	650,212 90	3,273,833 26	1918-19	3,953,019 71
15,953 11	717,619 38	6,228,404 40	1919-20	6,961,976 89
9,449 13	950,655 16	5,154,082 14	1920-21	6,114,186 43
5,706 90	983,164 99	7,763,902 21	1921-22	8,752,774 10
13,349 38	869,351 98	8,285,779 90	1922-23	9,168,481 26
$613,007 56	$7,995,424 66	$55,492,071 52		

New Brunswick, Total.....	$613,007 56
Quebec, Total.....	7,995,424 66
Ontario, Total.....	55,492,071 52
Total.....	$64,100,503 74

DEPARTMENT OF MARINE AND FISHERIES

Dredging in St. Lawrence Ship Channel, P.Q.

1913–14	$1,004,145 22
1914–15	999,762 43
1915–16	981,761 64
1916–17	1,084,769 81
1917–18	656,421 63
1918–19	425,332 57
1919–20	484,186 19
1920–21	507,211 94
1921–22	567,370 88
1922–23	595,845 12

Nova Scotia

Fiscal year	(a) Public buildings	(b) Harbours and rivers	(c) Dredging	Total
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
1913–14	211,538 88	588,749 89	356,785 75	1,157,074 52
1914–15	282,154 90	578,257 63	223,982 32	1,084,394 85
1915–16	136,053 99	248,701 73	166,423 96	551,179 68
1916–17	94,817 40	249,726 62	183,507 58	528,051 60
1917–18	129,178 84	258,982 58	95,170 45	483,331 87
1918–19	117,118 48	165,345 29	48,191 17	330,654 94
1919–20	143,289 68	206,141 49	206,999 53	556,430 70
1920–21	190,266 97	1,813,592 22	246,198 66	2,250,057 85
1921–22	233,106 93	246,171 39	177,710 63	656,988 95
1922–23	170,783 43	318,443 17	220,555 00	709,781 60
	1,708,309 50	4,674,112 01	1,925,525 05	8,307,946 56

All figures for 1922-23 are approximate.

Prince Edward Island

1913–14	23,777 44	93,797 66	93,014 37	210,589 47
1914–15	42,521 13	209,956 60	85,850 17	338,327 90
1915–16	21,375 20	57,063 47	72,297 98	150,736 65
1916–17	19,394 79	12,634 54	46,672 23	78,701 56
1917–18	22,198 64	10,097 47	42,254 55	74,550 66
1918–19	22,750 64	10,946 81	9,177 92	42,875 37
1919–20	29,942 65	36,825 81	55,877 00	122,645 46
1920–21	29,886 34	74,347 61	65,312 45	169,546 90
1921–22	26,991 90	34,979 89	43,146 47	105,118 26
1922–23	26,179 36	26,801 15	55,120 00	108,100 51
	265,018 59	567,451 01	568,723 14	1,401,192 74

New Brunswick

1913–14	413,604 08	1,538,036 54	1,822,697 76	3,774,338 38
1914–15	417,463 12	1,754,524 75	1,881,778 16	4,053,766 03
1915–16	198,394 37	602,031 72	1,050,284 49	1,850,710 58
1916–17	170,488 44	881,436 17	354,473 21	1,406,397 82
1917–18	87,500 99	298,161 59	378,093 48	763,759 06
1918–19	93,623 65	308,295 95	59,142 76	461,062 36
1919–20	137,739 53	1,075,564 72	118,225 52	1,331,529 77
1920–21	158,725 53	1,384,719 30	129,566 63	1,673,011 46
1921–22	253,829 46	1,402,498 82	181,730 16	1,838,058 44
1922–23	157,556 71	1,003,840 93	220,556 00	1,381,953 64
	2,088,925 88	10,249,110 49	6,196,551 17	18,534,587 54

QUEBEC

Fiscal year	(a) Public buildings	(b) Harbours and rivers	(c) Dredging	Total
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
1913-14	2,348,449 53	1,159,001 61	353,297 04	3,860,748 18
1914-15	2,591,691 40	1,479,133 91	303,509 90	4,374,335 21
1915-16	1,361,710 51	1,572,012 34	250,638 49	3,184,361 34
1916-17	680,412 01	2,129,121 87	151,827 17	2,961,361 05
1917-18	689,941 68	1,587,653 62	181,714 37	2,459,309 67
1918-19	537,660 23	1,219,575 29	63,286 50	1,820,522 02
1919-20	693,570 73	768,698 03	207,892 58	1,670,161 34
1920-21	703,109 38	707,428 95	189,486 31	1,600,024 64
1921-22	796,291 97	686,111 65	145,967 66	1,628,371 28
1922-23	799,520 00	751,186 12	188,741 99	1,739,448 11
	11,202,357 44	12,059,923 39	2,036,362 01	25,298,642 84

ONTARIO

1913-14	6,281,701 57	2,275,013 20	1,991,541 12	10,548,255 89
1914-15	5,232,269 06	2,907,041 66	1,458,129 38	9,597,440 10
1915-16	3,423,555 46	1,732,894 77	1,061,504 62	6,217,954 85
1916-17	3,960,711 63	1,098,860 09	738,016 60	5,797,588 32
1917-18	3,906,351 38	1,275,398 75	339,502 40	5,521,252 53
1918-19	5,706,438 61	607,454 41	244,017 11	6,557,910 13
1919-20	6,415,521 54	1,275,498 87	165,136 06	7,856,156 47
1920-21	6,284,662 94	2,513,169 69	242,909 17	9,040,741 80
1921-22	5,017,262 85	1,629,073 63	186,688 17	6,833,024 65
1922-23	3,935,250 01	1,461,291 00	249,920 33	5,646,461 34
	50,163,725 05	16,775,696 07	6,677,364 96	73,616,786 08

MANITOBA

1913-14	471,089 26	169,660 90	68,665 74	709,415 90
1914-15	793,405 26	264,403 91	60,147 59	1,117,956 76
1915-16	413,936 74	92,416 09	57,881 49	564,234 32
1916-17	142,931 06	44,177 79	47,522 90	234,631 75
1917-18	209,848 71	33,994 32	47,461 36	291,304 39
1918-19	174,646 85	25,089 02	7,333 23	207,069 10
1919-20	170,629 18	57,887 99	29,016 58	257,533 75
1920-21	269,686 34	73,282 05	72,707 16	415,675 55
1921-22	223,003 07	53,777 07	46,396 87	323,177 01
1922-23	211,281 11	38,094 77	84,321 89	333,697 77
	3,080,457 58	852,783 91	521,454 81	4,454,696 30

SASKATCHEWAN

(including Harbours and Rivers and Dredging in Alberta)

1913-14	750,065 25	89,232 86	9,872 82	849,170 93
1914-15	325,685 57	66,114 95	14,909 23	406,709 75
1915-16	186,792 81	38,164 26	14,151 65	239,108 72
1916-17	125,807 25	3,634 88	.....	129,442 13
1917-18	118,231 34	2,041 27	822 50	121,095 11
1918-19	113,007 10	876 13	10,386 03	124,269 26
1919-20	151,787 92	735 96	6,281 48	158,805 36
1920-21	145,260 07	1,421 20	.....	146,681 27
1921-22	155,333 62	2,298 80	.....	157,632 42
1922-23	175,077 06	459 65	16,585 88	192,122 59
	2,247,047 99	204,979 96	73,009 59	2,525,037 54

ALBERTA

(Harbours and Rivers and Dredging included in Alberta)

Fiscal year	(a) Public buildings	(b) Harbours and rivers	(c) Dredging	Total
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
1913-14	771,606 39	.....	.....	.....
1914-15	762,135 86	.....	.....	.....
1915-16	355,163 38	.....	.....	.....
1916-17	126,361 29	.....	.....	.....
1917-18	356,678 88	.....	.....	.....
1918-19	232,838 55	.....	.....	.....
1919-20	207,121 69	.....	.....	.....
1920-21	184,964 11	.....	.....	.....
1921-22	215,676 04	.....	.....	.....
1922-23	273,559 00	.....	.....	.....
	3,486,105 19	.....	.....	.....

BRITISH COLUMBIA

1913-14	927,085 41	1,447,567 90	623,576 72	2,998,230 03
1914-15	1,053,207 41	2,686,237 08	1,008,444 04	4,747,888 53
1915-16	615,464 99	2,618,371 05	1,089,356 80	4,323,192 84
1916-17	261,645 91	1,734,118 18	763,081 13	2,758,845 22
1917-18	196,329 23	1,490,197 95	455,466 92	2,141,994 10
1918-19	334,030 91	450,972 16	152,342 34	937,345 43
1919-20	351,095 52	476,955 12	373,007 72	1,201,058 36
1920-21	326,927 48	454,201 18	361,582 07	1,142,710 73
1921-22	309,956 51	1,551,390 44	305,982 91	2,167,329 86
1922-23	292,565 06	983,721 44	259,145 97	1,535,435 47
	4,668,308 43	13,893,732 52	5,391,989 62	23,954,030 57

YUKON TERRITORY

1913-14	89,400,26	.....	.....	89,400 26
1914-15	62,771 17	5,012 85	.....	67,784 02
1915-16	62,536 69	4,876 91	.....	67,413 60
1916-17	49,467 62	3,394 82	.....	52,862 44
1917-18	40,006 17	4,272 45	.....	44,278 62
1918-19	38,005 94	.....	.....	38,005 94
1919-20	37,382 04	.....	.....	37,382 04
1920-21	39,432 35	.....	.....	39,432 35
1921-22	36,886 78	5,843 78	.....	42,730 56
1922-23	40,719 43	2,568 10	.....	43,287 53
	496,608 41	25,968 91	.....	522,577 36

(d) No information.

NATIONAL DEFENCE DEPARTMENT

Naval Services

Amounts paid on Public Buildings (Naval) for 10 years, from April 1st, 1913, to March 31st, 1923.

Fiscal Year	British Columbia	Nova Scotia
	$ cts.	$ cts.
1913-14	18,561 41	27,416 38
1914-15	15,787 71	76,029 00
1915-16	19,397 54	106,756 92
1916-17	13,878 41	50,779 59
1917-18	19,202 92	279,522 45
1918-19	63,600 93	673,925 19
1919-20	33,085 26	370,146 04
1920-21	8,554 30	33,723 57
1921-22	2,857 82	35,927 02
1922-23	43,198 86	25,980 95
Totals	238,125 16	1,680,207 11

Note:—No expenditure has been incurred outside of British Columbia and Nova Scotia as there are no Naval establishments in other provinces.

Militia Services

Amounts paid on Public Buildings (Military) for 10 years, from April 1, 1913 to March 31, 1923

Year	Ontario	Quebec	Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island	New Brunswick
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
1913-14	514,882 91	241,449 64	67,004 75	.....
1914-15	329,717 43	346,400 83	82,983 47	.....
1915-16	1,077,611 48	276,717 25	437,033 80	.....
1916-17	3,521,657 91	207,031 08	314,236 67	.....
1917-18	405,596 62	202,346 48	115,342 98	15,667 38
1918-19	512,288 14	224,879 06	171,661 26	83,707 81
1919-20	595,777 08	222,086 37	111,647 51	85,552 13
1920-21	448,065 63	236,843 75	78,836 13	30,495 65
1921-22	182,422 82	90,120 70	58,760 77	19,843 63
1922-23	190,542 07	138,392 38	39,221 08	26,132 88
	7,778,562 09	2,186,267 54	1,476,728 42	261,399 48

Year	Manitoba	Alberta	Saskatchewan	British Columbia
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
1913-14	117,826 11	29,553 87	.....	70,915 27
1914-15	80,323 32	20,049 23	.....	37,903 38
1915-16	136,981 59	67,881 41	.....	37,515 60
1916-17	122,480 73	80,241 74	28,850 01	61,747 48
1917-18	56,756 66	53,774 39	51,038 96	46,028 81
1918-19	47,842 74	57,720 50	30,865 70	58,810 95
1919-20	43,517 41	84,939 34	34,639 69	41,942 64
1920-21	137,333 80	17,715 06	35,018 54	43,378 08
1921-22	87,261 17	16,029 93	14,815 35	22,207 22
1922-23	74,558 02	20,323 29	22,985 50	27,870 66
	904,891 55	448,228 76	218,213 75	448,220 09

INLAND REVENUE OFFICERS

Mr. KELLNER:

1. What is the salary of an inland revenue officer in the province of Alberta?
2. Does he receive any percentage of the fines imposed? If so, what?
3. Do the officials pay their own travelling expenses?
4. What is the total amount of government money paid to these officials since the 1st January, 1920, to the corresponding date of this year?

Hon. Mr. BUREAU:

1. There are no inland revenue officers since the consolidation of the customs and excise services.
2. Officers of customs and exise making seizures for infractions of the inland revenue laws receive the balance of the fine paid after deducting the informer's share and other expenses,—except in cases where the amount is unusually large.
3. No.
4. It is impossible to give the amount paid officers in connection with inland revenue work, as all officers perform both customs and excise work.

RETURNED SOLDIERS' INSURANCE

Hon. H. S. BELAND (Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment) moved the second reading of Bill No. 203, in respect of the Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

On section 1—Where applicant died prior to delivery of policy, the insurance is payable if application approved and premium paid:

Mr. MANION: Is this bill just carrying out exactly the recommendations of the Ralston commission?

Mr. BELAND: Yes.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

DEPARTMENT OF SOLDIERS' CIVIL RE-ESTABLISHMENT ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. H. S. BELAND (Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment) moved the second reading of Bill No. 204, to amend the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment Act.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is this bill printed?

Mr. BELAND: Yes, and copies were in the Distribution office the day before yesterday.

[Mr. Copp.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is not on my file.

Mr. FIELDING: It is on mine.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

On section 1—Regulations respecting medical and appeal boards:

Mr. MEIGHEN: These bills are not on the files. They are not on mine, and I have not been able to get a copy yet. We cannot follow the discussion without the bill.

Mr. FIELDING: I will hand my copy to my right hon. friend.

Section agreed to.

On section 2—Appeals, and review and appeal tribunals:

Mr. MEIGHEN: Would the minister explain the effect of these clauses one by one. I do not know what clause 1 means. There are certain words struck out. What is the effect of that?

Mr. BELAND: Last year the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment Act was amended by adding the words that we propose to strike out to-day. The words were inserted in the act last year in order to provide for a medical appeal board, the powers of which were limited to treatment and, in the case of pension, only when a divergence of opinion existed as between the recommendation from a unit and the decision of headquarters. By the provisions of the Pension bill as it was passed last night, appeal tribunals in each district are going to be created. The present amendment means that the provision which was made last year for the creation of a medical appeal board in Ottawa is done away with, and provision is being made under clause 2 that ex-service men who apply for treatment with pay and allowances and are denied such treatment by the department, may come before the district appeal board and submit their case in appeal.

Mr. MANION: This is just implementing the Pension bill passed last night?

Mr. BELAND: Exactly.

Mr. GUTHRIE: As I understand the matter, there will be appeal boards in the various districts, instead of in the city of Ottawa?

Mr. BELAND: Yes.

Mr. GUTHRIE: One thing that has been brought to my attention in regard to the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, I think, I might bring to the attention

of the committee, as the constitution of new appeal boards will certainly increase the number of officers in that department and the amount of salaries which is now payable by that department. What strikes one at the present moment in regard to the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, is that, out of the large amount which is annually paid out by the department, a very small amount of the money ever reaches the soldier or is ever used for the purposes of the soldier. As we are drawing into the fifth or sixth year since the conclusion of actual hostilities, the time is coming for a consolidation of some of the departments of government, and the one which is due first for consolidation is, I think, the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment My suggestion to the minister and to the committee would be that before this House meets again, arrangements should be made whereby this department, the Pension board attached to it, and various other sub-organizations should be consolidated in the Department of National Defence. The figures in regard to the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment are startling. They have been prepared and handed to me, having been taken from the Auditor General's report of last year. The total expenditure for the year 1921-22 was $17,818,646.70. The most striking thing about it is that $6,922,432.62 has been expended in salaries; in other words, 38.84 per cent of the total vote for the year 1922 was paid out in salaries. Then, for administration of the department, the sum of $3,957,045.26 was disbursed, or 22.7 per cent of the total vote. Now we come to payments and allowances to the soldiers themselves, and we find that the total for that year was $6,940,168.82, or 38.89 per cent of the vote. That is to say, 38.89 per cent represents the total amount which the soldiers received out of that large expenditure of $17,900,000 odd. It strikes me that the cost of administration is exceedingly high; the amount spent in salaries is something enormous. The idea of spending nearly $7,000,000 in salaries for the administration of $17,000,000 seems entirely out of proportion. It may be that these figures, representing as they do the year ending 1922, will not be fully applicable to the year just closed. The year just closed may indicate some saving in this respect, and therefore a somewhat better showing. But my information leads me to believe that the same proportion will be maintained this year. I have not the figures for the year just ended; the auditor's report for that year has not been brought down.

Now, I would be the last man to object to any increased expenditure for the relief of soldiers who might need that expenditure, but I would point out that the soldiers themselves are getting very little of the amount expended; aproximately 39 per cent only is going to the soldiers, while 38 per cent is spent in salaries, and 22 per cent for purposes of administration. Does not the minister think that the time has come when he might consider the question of closing up all the outside institutions? In the city of Ottawa, I am told, an arrangement is made with the hospitals whereby they take soldier patients at a rate of $3.50 a day. They give them excellent care and attention at an annual rate of less than $1,200, which is far below the amount spent by the department in connection with patients who are not in civic hospitals. I am also informed that the various hospitals throughout the country are glad to get such patients. There may be a few branches of the department in connection with which special institutions will have to be maintained for a number of years yet to come, but in the majority of instances, I am satisfied, the patients can receive equally good, if not better, treatment at a great decreased cost by adopting the method which has been followed in the city of Ottawa and in some other cities, of utilizing the civic hospitals and arranging a fair basis of payment for these institutions. If this were done, a very large part of the salary list would disappear, and more money could actually be expended on the soldiers themselves. At all events, I am satisfied from the figures before me that the salary list is entirely disproportionate to the work done by the department. I bring the matter up now because the present clause of the bill seeks to increase the number of those persons in the department who will receive salaries. I think it is very proper that these boards should be appointed and the salaries paid, but, at the same time, there is great room for improvement in the old salary list, and the minister would do well to look it over before parliament meets again, and reconsider the matter to the end that a better showing may be made next session.

Mr. BELAND: On the very day I took charge of the department I myself was amazed by the size of the figures representing the amount that was being paid out in salaries in the department. However, after some days' study of the question I realized that this was a department in which naturally a large proportion of the expenditure would have to go out in salaries. Just one moment's consideration of the circumstances will lead my hon. friend (Mr. Guthrie) to

agree with me in this regard. All ex-service men who are seeking treatment must first of all be examined by a physician or medical man. That, in itself, requires a very large medical staff, to say nothing about the men who require treatment in the hospitals of the department. So much for the question as to the treatment of the men. Let us look at another feature of the work of the department,—the pensioners. A very large proportion of the pensioners are not permanent; they are subject to periodical re-examination. For the proper discharge of this work it is obvious that 43,000 pensioners would of necessity require a very large medical staff. This does not take into consideration the men who are seeking pensions and who must also be medically examined.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I think the pension costs are in addition to the figures I have given. I have a note here from which I gather that the cost of administration has been deducted from the figures I gave a moment ago.

Mr. BELAND: Does the hon. member refer to the amount paid in the way of pensions?

Mr. GUTHRIE: No, I am referring to the cost of administration of the pensions; the sum of $58,373 for this purpose has been deducted from the figures I gave.

Mr. BELAND: That sum of $53,000 covers clerical assistance to the Board of Pension Commissioners in Ottawa. The board do not pay salaries to any of the medical men who are examining soldiers all over the country. This will immediately convey to the mind of the hon. gentleman and to the House generally that quite naturally in this department a very large percentage of the money must be spent in salaries. Now I come to the figures themselves, which have been taken as a basis for observation by my hon. friend,—the $17,000,000. That was for the year 1921-22. The expenditure was large during that year, but I do not think it was too large. In the following year, 1922-23 this amount was reduced by $3,000,000 if I remember rightly. For the next fiscal year 1923-24 we are asking about $2,500,000 less. This is a substantial reduction. Whether it is as large as my hon. friend would like to see effected I do not know, but it is an honest effort in that direction.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I understand that through 1922-23 the expenditure chargeable to administration was maintained in proportion to the money actually received by the soldiers?

Mr. BELAND: I am not in a position to state whether the proportion has been maintained or not. We have enormously reduced the number of employees of the department. My impression is that this is not a permanent department, and I hope the time will shortly be reached when cases which have become chronic in their nature will be dealt with in homes rather than in hospitals. This policy, of course, is a subject of study for myself and the officials of the department at the present time. How soon it will be possible to disband the department remains to be seen.

My hon. friend has stated that the hospitals of the department should be closed as far as possible. I agree with him. A number of our hospitals have been closed and we have been contracting our operations. My hon. friend may be aware that we have made preparations to close the branch hospital at Burlington, near Hamilton, where we have about 130 patients. A delegation waited upon me some days ago to stress the advisability, if not the necessity, of keeping this hospital open. This request is typical of what we may expect when we begin to close any of these hospitals. But the intention is to contract the service as much as we can and within a few years to confine the care of ex-service men mostly to homes in two or three places in the Dominion. I realize that if we confide the care of our soldiers to the civic hospitals it may be less costly. We are doing that in Ottawa, in Regina and in Winnipeg, with the exception of a small hospital, and I think also in Victoria. I take these suggestions made by my hon. friend in the best possible spirit, and I can assure him that it is the object of the government to contract the service and to disband the department entirely without undue delay. How soon that can be accomplished I cannot say.

Section agreed to.

On section 3—Clause 8: Official Soldiers' Adviser.

Mr. SHAW: How does the minister propose to appoint these advisers? I rather gathered from his statement the other evening that he intended to invite recommendations from the soldier bodies and would act upon those recommendations. Am I correct?

Mr. BELAND: Yes. Of course, I am open to conviction in this regard, but my own view is that as these representatives will have to act solely in the interests of the soldiers they should be recommended by the men themselves. For instance, would not the Do-

minion Veterans' Alliance be the proper quarter from which to seek recommendations? I do not want to make these appointments at all I would rather leave them to the men themselves.

Mr. CHURCH: As these advisers should be in sympathy with the soldiers, would the minister be willing to accept recommendations regarding appointments from the returned soldiers' organizations?

Mr. BELAND: With pleasure. That is the intention.

Clause agreed to.

On section 3—Clause 9: Power to take evidence on oath.

Mr. MANION: What is the purpose of this? I do not remember the explanation which the minister gave a day or two ago.

Mr. BELAND: Under the Pension Act the Pension board has power to clothe a person with authority to administer oaths for the purpose of discharging certain duties in connection with the act. As a department we have not that power, and, as my hon. friend is aware, the department is discharging most of the work in connection with pensions. The reception of evidence in the case of dependents, for instance, necessitates the administering of oaths, and we find it absolutely necessary to have this power. Besides, I may point out that we are the agents of the Imperial Ministry of Pensions. There are a large number of Imperial pensioners in Canada, and the ministry requires from us sworn declarations as to the bona fides of any claims made by these pensioners. This power to administer oaths would apply only to officials of the department.

Mr. MANION: This will not require the creation of any new positions?

Mr. BELAND: No.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

WAYS AND MEANS

CUSTOMS TARIFF

This House again in Committee of Ways and Means, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

Mr. FIELDING: I desire to invite the attention of the committee to several items of the customs tariff which were under consideration before and concerning which some suggestions were offered. These suggestions we have given some attention. It will be remembered that I stated that representations had been made, supported here by the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens), that the wording of our clause with respect to the application of the British preference did not adapt itself to the manner in which the trade was conducted on the Pacific coast. We provide for a discount of 10 per cent as applied to goods which are imported by direct shipment. It is pointed out that there is not very much direct trade of that kind between Pacific ports and England; that British imports at Vancouver, for example, are largely brought by way of Hong Kong and transshipped. The wording of our clause, therefore, would not, it is felt, admit these goods to the benefit of the preference. After some consideration we have come to the conclusion to propose an amendment which will cover that case. I therefore propose to insert the following words in the resolution respecting the British preference, after the word "Canada" in the first paragraph thereof:

> Provided that goods entitled to the benefits of the British preferential tariff shall be entitled to the discount authorized by this section when such goods are shipped on a through bill of lading consigned to a consignee in a specified port in Canada, when such goods are transferred at a port of a British colony or possession not enjoying the benefits of the British Preferential tariff and conveyed without further transhipment into a sea or river port in Canada.

That is, if the goods are consigned to Canada and are transshipped at Hong Kong, that will be deemed a direct shipment.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. FIELDING: In respect to the two items 208b and 208c, bisulphate of soda and nitre cake, and dehydrated sulphate of copper for agricultural or spraying purposes, I think it was the hon. member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton) who thought that they were already free and that these items were unnecessary. The Customs department say, however, that it is not clear that they are already free, and that these two items are necessary. I think that is the point my hon. friend had in mind.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Perhaps my hon. friend can tell me under what item they are now taxable?

Mr. FIELDING: There was some question about it in the Customs department but they were rated under 711, unenumerated. That is the advice I get from the Customs department, and my hon. friend will probably agree that that is probably the only way we can deal with it. I beg to move that these two items, 208b and 208c, be now adopted.

Items agreed to.

Mr. FIELDING: There was some discussion also on item 281, which deals with fire brick. We were desirous of making a certain class of fire brick free, but the wording we have used, and which we thought would effect that purpose, is not, we are told, quite adequate. I propose to rewrite the item as follows:

281. Fire brick containing not less than 90 per cent of silicat; magnesite fire brick or chrome fire brick; other fire brick valued at not less than $100 per thousand; rectangular shaped, the dimensions of each not exceeding 125 cubic inches, for use exclusively in the construction or repair of a furnace, kiln or other equipment of manufacturing establishment. British preferential tariff free; intermediate tariff, free; general tariff, free.

It is substantially as it was before, but the wording has been improved.

The CHAIRMAN: There was a previous amendment to 281; the amended item is now proposed to be further amended as suggested by the minister. Shall the amendment carry?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I just wish to understand it. Item 281 in the budget resolutions of 11th May is subject to a duty of 5, 7½ and 10 per cent.

Mr. FIELDING: Yes, it was changed later.

Mr. MEIGHEN: To free?

Mr. FIELDING: Yes, on the 5th of June. It was the subject of some discussion; my hon. friend will see in Hansard what took place. There is now a slight change in the wording; otherwise it is as then agreed upon.

Mr. CLARK: If this amendment is adopted, will all fire brick come into Canada free of duty?

Mr. FIELDING: No; there is a division—certain fire brick will come in free and certain other fire brick will be dutiable.

Mr. CLARK: Will the minister give the reason for taking the duty off certain classes of fire brick?

Mr. FIELDING: This class that we make free is a brick not made in Canada. There was some question whether certain bricks were or were not made in Canada, and the item gave us some trouble. I have reason to believe that it is now fairly satisfactory.

Mr. CLARK: There is a fire brick plant in Clayburn, British Columbia; has the minister investigated whether this particular class of fire brick is made there?

Mr. FIELDING: Yes; it is not included in this free item. That class of brick would be subject to a duty.

Amendment agreed to.

[Mr. Fielding.]

Mr. FIELDING: There is one other item I wish to deal with just here. I propose to provide for a drawback in connection with items 583a and 583aa, as follows:

1031. Artificial sik tops and waste or artificial fibre silk, artificial silk yarns or filaments, enumerated in tariff items 583a and 583aa, when imported by manufacturers to be further manufactured in their own factories before the first day of July, 1924; portion of duty, (not including special duty or dumping duty) payable as drawback, 60 per cent.

That is the time at which we expect the new operations in connection with the manufacture of artificial silk to take place. This is to provide in the meantime that the manufacturer using these articles may be entitled to drawback. I think my hon. friend from West York (Sir Henry Drayton) suggested it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That is quite true; I did raise that question. I do not know whether my hon. friend is going quite far enough. Of course, if he did not go this distance it would mean that we could not have spinning done in this country because the outside spinner would have a direct advantage. As I explained before, the botany yarns are made of a combination of wool with an artificial silk top. The artificial silk top itself is of practically no value. It is broken artificial silk stuff and is merely a finish that gives a lustre to the wool. I would like my hon. friend to consider this point again though it may be that we can put it over now in view of what he says that the sections will not come into effect until after he has had a chance of considering it next session. But in view of the fact that the wool top is worth twice as much as the artificial top, and in view of the further fact that our tariff unfortunately provides for a 99 per cent drawback in connection with these yarns, the present position is that the spinner of wool yarn in Canada for hosiery purposes—jerseys and the like, and that is the only thing these yarns are used for—has absolutely no protection. Further, that section, coupled with my hon. friend's changes in the law this year looking towards the installation of a new industry here, has the further effect of putting the Canadian spinner at an absolute disadvantage as against his competitor overseas. Because in these botany yarns you have the composite article, you have the product of two articles. And the imported yarn base, which is of wool, and has twice the value of the artificial silk, will be entitled to the 99 per cent drawback notwithstanding the fact that artificial silk is used in it, while our own producers will be obliged to pay the duties provided by my hon. friend's budget in the production of

the botanies, and so they are put by this parliament at an absolute disadvantage. What my hon. friend is doing to-day, while not removing that disadvantage, postpones it and I would ask him for how long a time it is postponed. Is it postponed for a year, or what?

Mr. FIELDING: This takes place on the 1st of July, 1924.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then it would be postponed long enough to enable some rational, reasonable treatment to be given the older industry to prevent it from being put out of business just to help the new.

Mr. GUTHRIE: While we are on the question of spinning yarns, I want to draw the attention of the minister to the question of linen yarns. There never has been in this country any duty on linen yarns. For three years we gave them a bounty. The industry had never been established in Canada. It took its start from the demand which arose during the war for aeroplane cloth. We were making aeroplanes here and we could not get the cloth. There was an embargo on foreign yarns coming in. Two industries were started in Canada for the manufacture of linen yarns from the home-grown flax. A bounty limited to $25,000 was granted for a period of three years, and these two industries were established and were making some headway. Last year the bounty ran out, and the minister announced in his budget speech that it would not be renewed. Now the position is this. The manufacturers of linen yarn have absolutely no protection at all, and negotiations are going on to-day to remove the factory at Guelph, and I think the other factory, to Massachusetts where the United States government gives them a duty on linen yarns of 35 per cent. They find that they cannot compete in this country against Belgium, France and Ireland in the manufacture of linen yarns. If we are going to protect the silk and wool industry, as I presume we are to some extent, why not the linen yarn industry, a yarn made from home-grown flax for the purpose of using it in Canadian linen mills? Why should that industry not receive some consideration? My information, received this week, is that negotiations are going on now for removal of this business, employing two hundred men, from Guelph to Massachusetts.

Mr. FIELDING: My hon. friend is largely correct, but not exactly so. Linen yarns for certain purposes are free where they enter into other manufactures, but for other purposes there is a duty now. There was both duty and bounty, but the bounty has expired. My recollection is that it was not used to any large extent, that only a small amount of the bounty was claimed. The duty in part remains.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The people who gave me my information are the manufacturers, and they said they did not have any protection on their yarns. I did not look the matter up in the tariff, but I would rather assume that they knew what they were speaking about.

Mr. FORRESTER: They were quite right.

Mr. FIELDING: It is free for certain purposes but not free entirely. I have no doubt the manufacturers intended to give my hon. friend a correct statement, but I think he must have misunderstood them on that point.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is not the real trouble—I am speaking from my recollection of the tariff inquiry—that in so far as these linen yarns are concerned, while we start out with a duty on linen yarn the rebating sections of the tariff are such as to bring about practically the situation that the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Gutherie) points out? The minister says it is only for certain purposes that rebate is given. That is true, but these are practically all the purposes for which the yarns are used. They are not used for anything else, and you might just as well take away the protection altogether in most of these cases. It is just like the botany yarn; I am more familiar with the botany yarn situation, and I know that one mill has already closed down, and if it had not been for the partial relief now given would have been moved out of this country. I do not think my hon. friend can give the hon. member for South Wellington any real demand for these yarns except the demand which is covered by the drawback provision.

4 p.m.

Mr. FIELDING: It is one of those cases where one man's raw material is the other man's finished article. I might point out that there is no change in this respect. The bounty has expired, but we are making no tariff change as respects linen yarn. Item 543 in the tariff covers:

> Linen yarn, when imported by manufacturers of towels, damask, or seamless linen fire hose duck, for use exclusively in the manufacture of such articles in their own factories.

This comes in free. It is the raw material of the manufacturer and if you put the duty on there I suppose it would make trouble

for the other. The only change that has taken place here is that the bounty has not been renewed.

Mr. GUTHRIE: These linen yarns have been produced by two or three mills in this country, but the industry has never been a great success here, chiefly, I think, because it has never received reasonable protection. The supply of linen yarns became critical during the war, when we could not get the yarns at all. There was nothing left to do but to go ahead and make it in Canada, and in order to encourage them the government of that day gave them a bounty for three years. It takes some time to establish an industry and only a small part of that bounty was paid to them. It is not an industry entirely by itself. It is on the same plane as the woollen industry or other industries in Canada, and if the principle of protection is fair—and I submit it is fair in this country and has been in force for many years—why should linen yarns be singled out for no protection? Why should a concern employing a couple of hundred men, just now getting well under way, using their own yarn in their own business, making towels and sheeting and table cloths and the like, be put in the position in which they are now, with no bounty and no protection, having to import their linen yarns from Europe for the purpose of manufacturing them into goods in their own factories, when they could do all that work at home? The result now is that they are just pulling up stakes, and I think within the next thirty days they will be located in Massachusetts, manufacturing there, employing American labour, paying American labour, and sending the yarns back to Guelph which should have been made in Guelph. I think the case calls for immediate action on the part of the minister and the government. If this budget is not a protective budget I do not know what it is; and if it is, then it should take care of the flax business and the linen business, just as well as any other industry. I believe my hon. friend from South Perth (Mr. Forrester) probably knows as much about this question as I do, and can throw more light on it than I can. I am satisfied the matter is one of great interest to a large proportion of the people of Ontario. They want to grow flax and to have it manufactured in Canada, but under the circumstances the industry is bound to die in Canada and be transferred to the States.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It is not a matter of a drawback, as I thought. It has been carried right into the tariff, in the provisions as to manufacture. I do not think my hon. friend can point out any use to which linen yarn is put—that is any quantity of it—which is not covered by other tariffs. I refer to item 543, which is a free item, and 543A which is another free item. I think in the result it may fairly be said that, so far as linen yarns are concerned, there is no tariff at all.

Mr. FIELDING: The hon. member is wrong in stating that this industry has been singled out. We are not touching this industry at all in this tariff, and, not having made any changes, I have not studied the figures closely.

Mr. MEIGHEN: You touched it last year. Last year's touch was the last straw.

Mr. FIELDING: At all events, it is one of the cases which illustrates the difficulty where one man's raw material is the other man's finished article. Here is the item:

> Linen yarn, when imported by manufacturers of towels, damask, or seamless linen fire hose duck, for use exclusively in the manufacture of such articles in their own factories.

They are free. If we put a duty on these things, then the manufacturers who use them now and get them free will feel that they are entitled to compensation, and it is a difficult problem to handle. It cannot be settled by saying you will put a duty on these things, because when you do it you are disturbing other things. However, previously the bounty was a war measure, but it did not appear to be used to any considerable extent. It died a natural death, and we are making no change in that. Any criticism my hon. friends can offer—and there may be something in the criticism—should have been offered in the past, because we are not making any change.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The minister announced in the budget, "We do not propose to renew the bounty on linen yarns."

Mr. FIELDING: Surely.

Mr. GUTHRIE: If he had renewed it, as he gave it to copper and the like, I do not think there would have been much complaint, but to lower the bounty will result in the industry leaving us. Thoroughout the whole tariff they bracket together cotton and linen goods, that is, we find the same rate of duty in respect of them, treating them practically as the same article. But when it comes down to the yarns, the one has a duty and the other has not. We do not grow cotton in this country, but we do grow flax, and I submit if cotton yarns get a duty linen yarns should have it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: One of these industries is in the county I have the honour to repre-

sent. There are only two, as I understand it, in Canada. The other, and larger one, is in the county represented by my hon. friend to my right (Mr. Guthrie). The complaint made to me is that last year there was a small tariff, a very low tariff, one that had obtained against the real competitor, and that is always the tariff that counts; what there may be against some country that really is not a competitor does not matter at all. The complaint was that the actual duty against the real competitor was cut down on linen cloth to so small a percentage that there was no possibility of it reaching the consumer. It was small to begin with, and was among the lowest of our schedules. The amount taken off has made it impossible to continue in any scale at all. I think about forty of the looms are idle now, and my information comes from the head of the firm, who has been a linen man all his life. He came originally from northern Ireland and established both the industry that my hon. friend speaks of in Guelph as well as this one. My information from him is that there is no possibility of continuing at all—not in the least. I venture to say that, after we have this establishment here, and they become competitors with the foreign linenmaker for the trade of the country, and have become established, and have the homes of the workmen established, if they go away and the industry dies, then it is not a matter of waiting three or four years, but it is probably a matter of waiting thirty years before there will be any commencement made again. This is an indigenous industry. It is not like the illustration the Minister of Finance gave some two years ago of an industry that he said was indigenous and was entitled to support merely because it was based on the brain and inventive genius of one man. I refer to the illustration as to marmalade produced in Dundee. This is an industry built upon raw material, produceable and actually produced in large degree in Canada. A very serious responsibility is taken by the Minister of Finance when he so allows things to remain, leaving the bounty to go, leaving his reduction of a year ago to go. This is not for the good of the country. Does he imagine that after the Guelph industry gets down to Massachusetts, and after the industry of the hon. member for Victoria and Carleton (Mr. Caldwell) goes to the south of us, we are going to get any cheaper linen than before? Not a chance in the world. Why, the minister is going to lose more revenue because of the loss of the hands of that factory at Guelph than the bounty he pays. I do not favour the bounty. It may be all right for a short time, but the proper thing is when we have a system to have it complete and fair. The minister says, "oh, but this is the raw material for some other manufacture." So is everything; you can apply that argument to anything at all. These things are adjusted in the tariff by having a lower duty on what is the raw material for the purpose of manufacture and having it a little higher for the goods that do not become the raw material at all. He has done that himself in this tariff in introducing the new protection for artificial silk. He has so arranged it to cover the very objection he is raising now. Why does he not do the same in this case of an article that is, at least, as indigenous as silk, I think more so, and that certainly is far more indigenous to this country than many articles upon which he is maintaining a protection as against the real competitor. I refer to cotton, which is where he found it when he came into power? The real competitor is in the United States. The minister amended the duty on linen cloth a year ago, and it is now only 15 per cent, 2½ per cent off. The small bounty that was paid is gone; there is no protection for the yarn whatever, that is on the yarn as used for the purposes for which it is made here; and we are facing the consequences to-day.

Mr. FIELDING: My right hon. friend states that there is an import duty except for the purposes for which it is made here. It is not classified in the tariff separately; it is classified under twine and cordage. How much would be linen it would be difficult to say. Let me repeat this point again. We are not by this tariff dealing with that at all. There are many cases where an argument could be put forward in regard to a particular industry and we have no desire to do an injustice to any particular industry. As I say we are not making any change in the tariff to-day with respect to linen and that is why I have not the figures at hand. The matter might be worthy of consideration at another session.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The parties interested in the manufacture have waited on the minister?

Mr. FIELDING: I think so.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The matter has all been laid before him?

Mr. FIELDING: I think so.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The minister says that he is not making any change on the duty on linen. He overlooks the British preference.

Mr. FIELDING: Not on linen yarns.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Linen yarn is one item; the manufacture of linen is an entirely different item. Linen yarn goes into shoemakers' supplies, threads, fishing nets, certain kinds of cloth and of course into linen. This industry that I speak of in Guelph has had a hard time for the last fifteen years; but finally it is in a pretty fair way; it has become a very large industry employing five or six hundred men two hundred being engaged in the production of the yarn which is then manufactured in the mill. They have reached the point where the Canadian Pacific and the Canadian National Railways in their dining cars use their make of table napkins and table cloths which are very excellent. The leading hotels of the country buy their linen made in Canada from Canadian flax. The United States have undertaken to protect that industry in that country very handsomely. They give a duty of 60 per cent on linen towels, we give 15 per cent and, I believe the result of the recent cut, if the reduction applies to linen towels, is to cut it down to 12½ per cent.

Mr. FIELDING: Not if it is 15 per cent.

Mr. GUTHRIE: If it is 15 per cent, I understand, there will be no reduction. On sheets and the like, I am told, the United States impose a duty of 45 to 50 per cent; we impose a duty of anywhere from 15 to 17½ per cent. The difficulty is simply this. The linen workers in France to-day are earning 80 francs a week—that is the average wage of girls making these linen fabrics in the factories of France. That means $8 in our money.

Mr. FIELDING: I think it is nearer $5.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It is $5.60.

Mr. GUTHRIE: We are paying $15 to $18 a week to the girls making linen goods in the Guelph mill. I think this mill was started in 1903, and after 15 or 20 years' experience in Canada, we think we are in a position to make a very high class of linen from Canadian-grown flax. It has been a slow process to reach the goal which we have now reached. The situation is so disastrous as regards the tariff, that I doubt very much if the industry can survive. In the United States they realize the situation, and they have so adjusted their tariff as to make the linen industry there a far more marked success than it is in Canada. The question all comes back to this: Is it worth while to make your home-grown flax into your own linen, or is it better to buy linen in another country? For my part, I want to see it made in Canada.

Mr. GOULD: I wonder whether the thought has occurred to hon. gentlemen that the protection they quote in the United States and again in Canada is one of the reasons why the despicable wages are paid to those girls in the factories in France. The matter cannot be interpreted in any other way. The higher the protection goes either in the United States or in this country, in order that French manufacturers may compete, the lower will be the wages paid in those French factories. The hon. member brings in this humanitarian question again.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Supposing we have no factories in Canada and they are in Massachusetts where the protection remains the same, does the hon. member think the addition of the Canadian market to the output of the Massachusetts factories in addition to the United States market will lower wages in the Massachusetts factories?

Mr. GOULD: If we as a nation presume to become competitors in a financial way with the United States, there is nothing to prevent the United States from using her tariff weapon and raising the tariff by 50 per cent, bringing about the same conditions to-day complained of by the hon. member for South Wellington. This is only a vicious circle. I am very much interested in the manner in which the three hon. gentlemen are presenting their case to the Minister of Finance to bring this about. The more concessions are given to these industries, the worse conditions obtain both here and in the Old Country. What is the matter, in my humble opinion, as regards conditions in Canada, is that the purchasing public has not the means to purchase the article. This is only an artificial standard we create by giving this protection to that industry.

Mr. GOOD: I should like to ask the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) what were the tariff conditions which surrounded, from 1903 on, the industry which he spoke of as starting in 1903.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I think in the manufacture of linens the duty was 20 to 22½ per cent. You can take it as 5 per cent higher all along the line. There was in this country no industry for the manufacture of linen yarn until 1919, and in order to induce manufacturers to go into that and to use Canadian hemp, a bounty was given for three years. The bounty has run out.

Mr. GOOD: Do I understand that this particular industry which has been manufacturing linen cloth has recently started to manufacture the threads for which a bounty was given for the three years which have expired now?

Mr. GUTHRIE: That is right.

Mr. GOOD: The contention is that the bounty should be restored?

Mr. GUTHRIE: I would press for a reasonable duty on linen thread or for a bounty, one or the other, but I have had no communication from my people asking for a bounty. They ask for the same reasonable protection for their manufacture as others in the same list are getting, just as the new silk industry is getting, just as the Minister of Finance is giving to the artificial silk people. This is more important than artificial silk. If the principle is right as regards artificial silk—and I agree with it—it is right in this also. The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Gould) must bear this in mind, the great competition in linens is not from the United States, but from Ireland first where probably the finest linens in the world are made, then from Belgium, then from France, and now there is a very heavy competition from Japan. In all these cases the wages are nothing as compared with wages which have to be paid in Canadian mills. It is to meet that competition that we ask for some reasonable tariff protection. If we get it, we can hold the industry here. If we do not get it, I do not think we can.

Item agreed to.

Mr. FIELDING: The only items remaining, I think, in the customs tariff are the two resolutions touching the question of reciprocity with the United States. These have not yet been adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: There is one item on the last page of the resolutions, item 1032, with reference to oil which apparently has not yet been passed.

Mr. FIELDING: I thought it had been passed.

The CHAIRMAN: No. It refers to oil used in the manufacture of manila rope.

Mr. FIELDING: I had been under the impression that it had already been passed. However, if there is any doubt I move it now.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It refers simply to oil?

Mr. FIELDING: Yes, oil used in the manufacture of an article which itself is free.

Item agreed to.

TRADE AGREEMENT WITH UNITED STATES

Customs tariff:

8B. The Governor in Council may authorize any Minister of the Crown to enter into negotiations with any authorized representative of the government of the United States with a view to the making of a commercial agreement between the two countries on terms that may be deemed mutually beneficial. Any agreement so made shall be subject to the approval of the Parliament of Canada.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not suppose this resolution and the one following will be received by the committee with the same attention and earnestness that would be accorded them if they were considered to mean very much. I can assure the minister that those who are opposed to the idea underlying the resolutions would be in much greater evidence if it were believed for a moment that they were anything more than a mere gesture at this time; and I venture to say that the minister might be surprised at the variety of sources from which that opposition would come. I want to comment, first of all, on the first section. This, of course, while there is precedent for it, yet as a piece of legislation is of no effect whatever. It is merely words; it is merely surplusage in a statute It does not mean anything, because the minister or anybody else in the world could negotiate on behalf of a government without authority to do so; the only thing that he cannot do is to effect something. And this, of course, does not give him power to effect anything. I suppose it is harmless; if I did not regard it in that light I certainly would oppose it in this House at all consequences The second one is somewhat different, however. It provides—

Mr. FIELDING: Is the hon. member treating them together?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I fancy it would be just as well to do so; at least one cannot discuss the general subject unless he takes the two sections together. The second one provides:

If the President of the United States, under authority of the United States Tariff of 1922, determines to reduce by 50 per cent—

Those words are struck out, I understand.

—determines to reduce the duties imposed by such act on the following articles, that is to say:

Cattle; wheat; wheat flour; oats, barley, potatoes, onions; turnips; hay; fish as enumerated in paragraphs 717, 718, 719, 720 of the said Tariff Act of 1922, the Governor in Council may by Order in Council make such reductions of duties on similar

articles imported into Canada from the United States as may be deemed reasonable by way of compensation for such reductions on Canadian products imported into the United States.

This provides for more order in council government. But even this, I think, is harmless. Nevertheless, it has a meaning; it enables the government to do something finally without recourse to parliament, in the event of the United States President acting, as the section states, under the provisions of the United States Tariff Act of 1922. My first comment is this. I do not think the minister has carefully studied that Tariff Act if he really attaches any importance to this section. A reading of that Tariff Act would indicate that there was no possibility at all of anything being done with respect to these articles in relation to Canada. I read the act pretty carefully myself, and while there are two or three sections that cover contingencies, the result in effect is this. If the president becomes convinced that owing to differences in the cost of manufacture in other countries, owing to a disparity of cost of production elsewhere as compared with the United States, the duties imposed by the Fordney-McCumber Tariff are not representative of that difference, he may vary them up or down with a certain limitation in either direction upon his power of variation, that limitation being fifty per cent. But he must have not only the fact established that the duty itself is not representative of the variations in the cost of production, but also a certificate of his tariff commission. Well now, really, does anyone imagine that this is ever going to apply to wheat, barley, wheat flour, and so forth? Does anyone think that any tariff commission is going to go into the cost of production of these articles in Canada and in other countries, and suggest to the President of the United States that the duty they have in that country to-day is not representative of, does not correspond with, these variations, this disparity in the cost of production? Why, if hon. gentlemen, particularly those from the West, are right about our cost of production, as I think they are, then how in the world can any tariff commission ever find that the duty now levied in the United States is not representative of the difference in cost of production? I do not see how any recommendation is ever to be made. For the matter of that—I give the opinion for what it is worth—all the variations downward which the President of the United States will ever make under the authority of the United States Tariff Act will not amount to anything at all. If he made any variations they would be more likely to be upwards. Even supposing, however, that there is any remote possibility that he would make variations downward, then I venture to suggest that they would not apply to these particular things that the minister has selected for the purposes of this resolution. Consequently the minister is playing pretty safe in respect of his proposal for reciprocity. But he takes other precautions. On this subject he has very frequently dilated on what he conceives, or rather on what he says he conceives, to have been a very grave injustice done to this country by the rejection at the hands of the people of his treaty of 1911. I have lately thought that his lamentation was more apparent than real, that his courage as to a new treaty along these lines was not quite as great as he would have us believe. I wonder why he limits this section to ten articles. He had hundreds in his treaty of 1911. Why are these few selected out of those hundreds? Why are all the others left out? Articles of the greatest possible importance, a list of which I had before me a short time ago, are not included here at all. For example, let us consider fruits for a moment. Why are not fruits in this list? Why does the minister ask for power with respect to wheat but not with respect to fruits? If his courage is really as great as he would have us believe, why does he not ask parliament to give him authority, in case the United States is ready to admit fruits free into Canada, as well as wheat, wheat flour, barley, oats and potatoes? No single case could better illustrate the weakness of the minister's position. But I might go on—meats of all kinds, for example they were within his treaty of 1911. Why are they not here? Why does not the minister ask for power now to do again what he wanted to do in 1911 with respect to meats in case we are met by the United States? There is perhaps no single article of greater consequence. Going on, I find tomatoes, oatmeal, cornmeal, peas, bran, macaroni, biscuits, maple sugar, pickles, cherry juice, mineral waters, essential oils—and then a whole long list of manufactured or semi-manufactured articles, they are here by the pages, all of which he had in his treaty of 1911, but none of which he has in his request for power to-day.

Now, if the minister has the faith that this country is anxious for his 1911 treaty, why does he not ask for power to make it again as respects these articles? In a word, what puts the special nine he has selected in a class by themselves? In fact as to the main commodities, that is, wheat, wheat flour, products of wheat, potatoes, we had reciprocity within the last five years and we

have already seen the treatment the United States accord to reciprocity agreements in respect to those articles. Why does the minister want to put us on our knees before the United States for another agreement? They only allowed about six months' operation of our reciprocity arrangement on wheat, wheat flour and potatoes, when they got tired and cancelled the whole thing. But in case they change their mind again the minister wants to go down and offer to them reciprocity on these articles once more in order that they may cancel the arrangement once more. Does he think that a good tariff policy for this country? In fact outside of those and two or three other articles, he mentions no other in this resolution.

Now, if his courage was equal to his protestations he would put every other important article covered by the reciprocity offer in 1911 into this resolution. But he knows just as well as he knows public opinion—and he is not always a bad judge—that if to-day he brought into this parliament a resolution for power to do what he wanted to do in 1911 he would never carry the country with him. So he goes very cautiously about it, and includes nine articles selected from this list of several hundred, and says "I am willing to take that step," and he knows when he says it that the chance of the contingency arising which he mentions here is so remote that the stoutest Canadian who fears any renewal of a reciprocity agreement need have no misgivings. The first clause is merely words. The second clause is a request for power to act. It is applicable to only a tithe of the long series of articles he included in his treaty of 1911, and the inevitable condition attached, of course, is such that the possibility of the event ever materializing is remote in the extreme. Consequently, I do not see that the insertion of this clause in the bill need give rise to any very serious apprehensions. But I warn the minister again that there are evidences not a few, and some that might surprise him, that if he came forward at this time with his proposal of 1911 he would confront just as strong a current of opinion as he confronted then, and with the same result.

Mr. FIELDING: My hon. friend has been kind enough to say that I am sometimes not a bad judge of public opinion. After all, we can only offer our own opinions, and I offer this simply as my own opinion for what it may be worth, little or much—that if we had an opportunity to-day of getting from the United States the Reciprocity Agreement of 1911 three-fourths of the country would demand and would be rejoiced to get it.

I am glad to have the assurance of my hon. friend that these resolutions are harmless. Well, that is a great thing; if we cannot do any good in this wicked world, let us not do any harm. Now, are they no good? How much vaue should be attached to them? I have not said that I attach very great value to them myself as to accomplishing anything. I have explained that I thought it was right and proper that the undoubted intention of this government to seek reciprocity should be proclaimed in a formal way in the resolutions of this parliament. I think there are good reasons for that view.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Why is not fruit in?

Mr. FIELDING: We will come to that. We do not get fruit at the beginning of dinner.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Sometimes.

Mr. FIELDING: May I suggest to my hon. friend that I will follow him, if I can, in the order of his speech. He says that these resolutions are no good, that they accomplish nothing. Well, he ought to have a little more reverence for the historic policy of the Conservative party, for the glorious days of Macdonald, Tupper, Tilley and other illustrious men. In the great National Policy—which we sometimes refer to yet—we find there was a standing offer to the United States just as we have here, not in the same words but the same in principle, a declaration in the Customs Act of that day that Canada was ready to reciprocate with the United States on a large list of articles.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It proved no good then, either.

Mr. FIELDING: Exactly, it did not prove any good. But that does not prove that the offer was not honestly made; I am willing to believe that it was honestly made. In saying that it was not any good, my hon. friend is casting a reflection on the honesty of that clause of the National Policy and of the great men of the Conservative party who have passed away.

But why do we embody the offer in this resolution? To accomplish something. And I say it has accomplished more to-day than I expected it would. It has aroused a state of opinion in the United States which is of the utmost value. We declare our wish for reciprocity. There is nothing new in this, but by putting it in the solemn form of an act of parliament we are bringing it before the American people in a manner that they could not have noticed before. It has had that effect. I say the attention these resolutions have received to-day in the public

press of the United States and from their public men is vastly greater than I ever expected. I did not expect to accomplish everything at once.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the minister mean a friendly or an unfriendly reception?

Mr. FIELDING: Certainly, some of the greatest newspapers in the United States have given the offer a friendly reception, and have warned the Republican party that if they do not pay attention to it they will have to bear the penalty by and by. Undoubtedly the offer has had a good effect in that way.

Our friend asks: Why do we not include fruits and many other commodities? Are we bound to put every item that appeared in the agreement of 1911 in our offer to-day? I expect the Clerks of the House would object to such a long list, if nobody else did. We say we are prepared to make a general offer to negotiate with the United States, and we do not limit it to anything, we do not bind ourselves. We say we are willing to open the door for a fair discussion of the whole question without any limit. Fruit and everything else is in the first clause if the Americans see fit to come forward and so propose. But that would require an act of congress. We knew that, we knew that if anything was done under that section at all it would have to be done later by act of congress, and congress will not meet for some months. But there is something the President of the United States can do now. Our friend says that he will not do anything; I do not venture to predict what he will do. The President has power under the American tariff of to-day to decrease or increase duties to the extent of 50 per cent. He can do that without going to congress. We do not care anything about the methods by which he will do this. But if the President desires to act he can get all the necessary information from the tariff commission. Now, with the knowledge that he has that power, we say, "Mr. President, we realize that you cannot make a general treaty with us without the consent of congress, but congress has given you the power to do these things now and if you are willing to act as respects this list of commodities, we shall be happy to meet you."

It may be asked why we mention these particular commodities. They happen to be staple articles, articles that interest both the East and the West. I mentioned the other day that cattle in the West and fish in the East are articles of paramount importance. The failure of the United States to admit Canadian cattle into their country is the cause of one of the gravest difficulties that our western friends have to meet, and the refusal of the United States to admit fish into their markets at reasonable rates, or free, constitutes one of the gravest difficulties existing to-day in the lower provinces. The exodus that has been taking place in Nova Scotia to the United States is largely from the fishing districts, due to their being shut out of the American market. I do not say that we are going to accomplish a very great deal; I do say distinctly that when we put this offer before the United States we are putting it in the most effective way; we are helping to educate the public opinon of the United States on the subject. At all events we are declaring our willingness to do these things, always by way of general treaty when they are ready to do it that way, but in the meantime if they are prepared to deal with us directly under the powers given to the President, then we say we are prepared to act. In both cases we are simply making a declaration of faith, stating something that we want to do, something that would be good for Canada if we could do it; and if we cannot do it, why, we have made an honest effort in that direction. That is the whole case.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The President's powers apply equally to every item in the tariff. Will the minister explain why he has onions in this class and has not fruit?

Mr. FIELDING: I am a very practical person. It was pointed out by a large deputation from Ontario that the failure of the United States to admit onions into their markets was a serious matter for that part of the country. That is why we included onions.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the minister not know that it is just as serious for fruit—even more so?

Mr. FIELDING: As a matter of fact the onion question has been pressed upon us very much more strongly than the fruit question. But then, where are you to draw the line?

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is what I say.

Mr. FIELDING: We selected a number of items; if you multiply them you may make it more difficult to attain your end. If we can get these staple articles into the United States at more favourable rates or free, well and good; if not, no harm is done by our making the offer.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The point is that onions, though a staple, are not nearly as staple a commodity as fruit. The United States

market. if we could get it and pay nothing for it, would be far more important to us in fruit than it would ever be in onions. It only illustrates this: In respect of every single one of them there is always a price to pay; the minister selects those where he thinks the price will be the least; those that they would undoubtedly ask for over there he leaves out, thereby disclosing the hollowness of the whole reciprocity case. That is the point I sought to make: the minister's courage in proclaiming his fidelity to the old pact increases with the remoteness of any chance of his being up against it as an issue in this Dominion.

Mr. FIELDING: It will be an unlucky day for my right hon. friend when it becomes an issue.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister said that in 1911. His enthusiasm to-day is not one whit greater than it was during the session of 1911.

Mr. FIELDING: I said the other day that there were hon. members in this House who opposed reciprocity in 1911 but who, I am sure, are prepared to vote for it to-day. There are scores of people all over the country who, blindly led by partisan zeal, voted against reciprocity in 1911, but who to-day are prepared to view it as an economic question and would rejoice to see the agreement of 1911 with the United States put into effect.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister is very emphatic in saying that anyone who voted against him was blindly led by partisan zeal. How does he explain the action of the multitudes who left the party that he then led, or nearly led, to vote against him? Were they blindly led by partisan zeal, too? When the minister designates the attitude resulting from an election he calls it a grouch, but he has been grouching since 1911 over the result of that election, and I fancy if he had another on the same issue he would have another grouch for the rest of his political career.

Mr. FIELDING: I am, however, inclined to think that one of these days there will be another election on that issue, and time will tell the result.

Mr. HOEY: The hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Forke) I understood, has suggested the amendment of this resolution by substituting the word "such" for the word "similar" in the fourth line.

The CHAIRMAN: An amendment has been submitted that on the seventh line of paragraph 8c the word "similar" be struck out and the word "such" be substituted therefor. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. FIELDING: I think that would be dangerous. I hope my hon. friend will not press that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What does this mean? I am glad the hon. member brought it up; I had not had the point drawn to my attention. The minster's answer would lead me to think that he understands by the word "similar" as it is there now that in the event of the United States reducing the duties on the articles named in the clause he and his government will have power to reduce anything else in the whole tariff schedule.

Mr. FIELDING: No.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Well, then, will they have power only to reduce in the case of the articles named in the clause?

Mr. FIELDING: I would say so.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Then would not the amendment suggested be right?

Mr. FIELDING: Well, I do not think the word "such" is objectionable. It really means that we offer reciprocity in these particular articles, so that on the whole I can accept the amendment. I do not think it makes any material difference.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That gives effect to what the minister said. Personally I do not think anything makes much difference so far as this proposal goes.

Mr. GOOD: If the intention is to deal only with the articles specified, then the amendment certainly is an improvement. But I read the resolution somewhat differently. I was going to ask the minister whether his intention was that the proposal should be in relation only to these specific articles, or whether it should extend to any articles of a like nature. I understand him to say now his intention was that the Governor in Council would be permitted to reduce the duties on these particular commodities and on no others.

Mr. FIELDING: I think that ought to be the meaning of it, yes.

Mr. GOOD: I want to say in connection with both these paragraphs that I am heartily in sympathy with their general purpose, but I am afraid they will not get us very far. I believe the minister is entirely in sympathy

with the proposal for reciprocity between Canada and the United States; I only wish I had as much confidence in those that are behind him so far as their support of the principle goes. I am inclined to think the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) is considerably astray in his estimate of public opinion on this point. I would like very much to see this issue decided on its own merits. I have some very distinct recollections of the election campaign of 1911, and I know of no election where there was so much confusion of issues as prevailed on that occasion. I have never regarded the decision then taken as being in any sense a decision on the merits of reciprocity. In conclusion I just want to say this: If we do not have commercial union with the United States in a reasonable time I do not think we are likely to be able to maintain the Canadian confederation. In my judgment we may have political union instead with the United States. I do not want to see that. I would like to see the experiment in confederation work out, but I do think that a very large measure of commercial union with the United States, with all that that involves, is an absolute necessity if we are going to preserve our political integrity.

The CHAIRMAN: The amendment is carried. Shall the resolution as amended carry?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I thought we might have the benediction or other comment of hon. gentlemen on the aspirations of the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Good). The silence is really oppressive.

Mr. FIELDING: Silence gives consent.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What to? Commercial union or political absorption?

Mr. FIELDING: To the principle of the best possible trade relations with one hundred and ten millions of the richest people on earth who live next door to us.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I had expected that we would have heard something from the government side, just some little thing as to the Canadians and the Canadian people; that even under the present administration every man in Canada could go to sleep knowing that this country can continue to function, and that we were not yet bound to deliver ourselves up to a commercial union on the one hand or a political union on the other. I thought I would have heard that from my friend, but it did not come. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, there is really only one thing that I object to in connection with this whole matter, and that is that to-day under the circumstances in which we now are Canada ought to be in a little bit better position than that of a beggar holding out her hand. I would have thought that my friend to-day would have learned the lesson which he professed to have learned in his budget, that he was wrong in connection with the French treaty in trying to trade without something to trade with, and that he would have had something to offer the Americans, who were described from the other side as good men of business in connection with their dealings —some reason why they should give reciprocity to a country whose markets at the present time they now to a tremendous extent occupy and enjoy. In a small matter my friend learns a lesson. He says that in connection with Australia we needed something to trade with, so we have put a duty on raisins. But there is absolutely nothing done by my hon. friend with regard to the United States, apart from the begging attitude into which we are put—we, next to Great Britain, the greatest national buyer in the world to-day from the United States, we who to-day are giving her the benefit of our markets to 68 per cent of our national purchases. There is not a single gesture from the minister to show that we have any independence of thought or liberty of action or courage—not a single gesture. Something is said about Nova Scotia and fishing. There is one thing to be done for Nova Scotia and fishing. Here you have the cod fishing beds close to Canada. There was a modus vivendi there, and you have now a tremendous tariff on fish. After that tariff on fish is effective you have the statement made that the American ports cannot be and shall not be open to the Canadian fishermen, and you have this government saying at the same time that Nova Scotia is depleted. You have this government allowing the American fisherman the full advantage of the Canadian location. Our ports are entirely open to him. He gets the advantage which we have by reason of the contiguity of our ports to the fishing banks. That is all right, we are told—everything is all right. Now, if my hon. friend wants to do business, why not try and do business in a businesslike way? Why not show that there is some object in having reciprocity with the Americans? If he is going to try and do business with them I would suggest that when he starts doing it he should have just as much to offer the fishermen of the United States as he wants for the fishermen of Nova Scotia. I would suggest that

5 p.m.

he do not go down there and ask that we get something for our fishermen which the American fishermen already have. I would suggest that when he is looking after our agriculture he put himself in the same position, for example that when he is trying to work out any treaty of reciprocity he should have something to deal with which would help that agricultural industry for which so much concern is professed. You will not get anything by requests and prayers. Take, for example, butter. I think it would be a good thing—

Mr. FIELDING: What about oleo?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I will come to that in a minute, I am glad my hon. friend gave me the suggestion. We have a four-cent rate on butter and the Americans have an eight cent rate. We have any amount of American eggs coming in here to-day at a rate which is half the American rate. Is reciprocity to be just a continuation down the line in these percentages? If it is not to be, I would suggest that my hon. friend ought to have an answer to the American tariff.

My hon. friend says, what about oleo? If there is one thing I want to congratulate my hon. friend upon it is his stand on the oleomargarine question. But he took his stand I think only half way. He said that oleo should be imported and manufactured, and he was perfectly right, under fair terms. The Americans have a duty of eight cents a pound on oleo. We have no duty; and if oleomargarine is to fulfil any real useful purpose outside of the purpose of being a very great necessity—

Mr. FIELDING: If it is prohibited what is the good of a duty?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend is quite right. The Americans do not prohibit, and my hon. friend would not prohibit, nor would I, but I am pointing out that the Americans had that duty of eight cents, and I was further going on to point out that if there is anything that oleo would be a good thing for outside of the help it gives to those who cannot, unfortunately, at times get butter when they need it, the thing would be to give a market for the amount of beef fats produced in this country and which run up into the millions of pounds. The Americans see to it that none of these beef fats get into the United States, while we had a provision under which everything could be rebated that was used in the manufacture of oleo. We require just a little reciprocity in tariffs at the present time if we are going to put ourselves in a position to do anything. We must have a little equality. And I think that if my hon. friend wishes to do that, he will put this House in the position in which he put it in relation to Australia. What is right for Australia cannot be wrong in connection with larger issues.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I think the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Good) was a little unhappy in his use of the term "commercial union" in his remarks a few moments ago. I hardly know what is implied by the term myself, and I doubt very much whether he knows. However, I am inclined to think that the idea he had in mind was reciprocal tariff arrangements. If that was what he meant, I very willingly give adherence to that view. If he meant commercial union, I say that, as far as I am personally concerned, I do not know what it means. It may mean a great deal more than he thinks it means, and I should hesitate to pledge myself to support that view, at least until I know what it means. Reciprocal tariff arrangements with the United States is one thing. Commercial union may be very much more, but just what I would not undertake to say.

Mr. FIELDING: The discussion this afternoon emphasizes the fact that, as regards the ex-Minister of Finance, his preaching is substantially different from his practice. He has again and again advanced the proposition that if you want to deal with somebody you have to have something to deal with. He referred to that again and again in connection with the French treaty. I would remind him that he sent his colleague, Sir George Foster, and others over the waters to negotiate a treaty with France, and he did not arm them in the way he says they should be armed. He sent them helpless, and they brought home a treaty. I am not finding fault with that, but the hon. member preaches the doctrine that if you want to deal with other nations you must jack up your tariff. He did not do that. That only proves that my hon. friend, when he talks this way, is not as much in earnest as he is in some other matter. As to the policy of increasing the tariff against the United States, have not hon. members made it a virtue in this country that they did not increase the tariff? Have they not tried to persuade the country at certain public gatherings that they had reduced that tariff, and that they had a tariff almost the same as ours? They undertook to prove that their tariff was lower than ours by some small fraction, and now we are told that the true doctrine is that if you want to negotiate you must jack up the tariff. My hon. friend's

practice and his preaching are widely different. I do not think he would ever go before the country and proclaim the doctrine he has proclaimed to-day.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am afraid that my hon. friend and I are never going to get this question of precept and practice settled. But there is a great distinction between my hon. friend and myself.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Yes, and we will come to it; hon. members need not be at all alarmed. There is a very great difference. So far as I know, at any rate, we have tried to put into effect the precepts that we taught and preached. So far we have not sought to discard any principle upon which we stood, for the sake of continuance in office. If we have done so I would be pleased if the minister would point it out. I have not the honour of being in the position of my hon. friend. He has asked "Why did you not do things when you were in office"? Why, my hon. friend knows perfectly well that when Sir George Foster went over to France the House was not in session. The budget was not pending. He knows also perfectly well that it was merely a temporary arrangement. Then he says "Why did you not do the same thing with the States? Why did you not raise the duty?" Surely, my hon. friend knows perfectly well that when we were in office the new rates, the prohibitive rates—and they were not even then as prohibitive as they are now —were brought in as a temporary measure. We desired to do nothing—and Mr. Chairman I think we were absolutely right in the attitude we adopted—which would give the slightest excuse for our friends to the south in proceeding in what we thought was a mistaken course. My hon. friend would have done exactly the same thing if he had thought the tariff was absolutely too low. He has raised some tariff items since he has been here. He has raised some items in this very budget. But if he had been where I was, and where the late government was at that time—never mind whether he thought every single bit of American goods coming into Canada was coming in at too low a rate—he would not, I venture to say, have raised a single tariff item. He would have been just as anxious as we were that the tariff wall should not be continued. I ask my hon. friend, were we wrong?

Mr. FIELDING: I think my hon. friend is wrong now.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Were we wrong thinking it was a good thing to give no reason or no excuse for a continuance of the Fordney Bill? To-day the matter is turned into a question of permanent tariff legislation, and it is my hon. friend who has to do it to-day. He says he does not believe in having something to trade with. Why did he advance the tariff rate on raisins? Why, of course, he knows there should be something to deal with; and if it were not for the fact that my hon. friend to-day feels that he is tied here and tied there with commitments in this direction and that direction he would see to it that his tariff arrangement was such that he could look for doing business on a proper basis with the United States as well as Australia.

Mr. GOOD: I think after the remarks of the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) I should perhaps make some explanation of what I meant by commercial union. I certainly did not mean reciprocal tariff arrangements. That might mean 50 per cent duty on both sides. What I meant by a large measure of commercial union was the obliteration of the tariff barrier between us and the United States. In connection with what the hon. ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) said as to the use of the tariff for bargaining, that might be all right if we were looking at it wholly from the standpoint of the producer. But it is a two-edged sword, and if we attempt to retaliate in matters of this sort we may be advantaging somebody on this side of the line and we may be correspondingly disadvantaging somebody else. We must, I think, look at these matters from the standpoint of the consumer as well as the standpoint of the producer. Reference was made to butter for instance. The Americans had a duty of 8 cents a pound and we had a duty of 4 cents a pound. That seems unfair. It depends on whether you look at it from the standpoint of the producer of butter or the consumer of butter. I think the inference is obvious.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member for Brant (Mr. Good) is frank, and what is more, he is logical in his definition of the term "commercial union." How it could mean anything else, I cannot understand. What I want the committee to understand is that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), in approving the words of the hon. member for Brant used a definition meaning exactly the same as the hon. member for Brant said, the closest possible tariff relations with the United States.

Mr. GOOD: Trade relations.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That means, no tariff between the two countries.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): That is surely a little different.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member for Halifax is becoming apprehensive. I see that he is roused. I am glad he is. Does he think there is anything closer in our trade relations with the United States, than no tariff at all? The Minister of Finance saye that commercial union means the closest possible trade relations.

Mr. FIELDING: I never said anything of the sort. I will speak of that in a moment.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I thought I had it exactly. I will put myself in the recollection of any other hon. member. If that was not what he said, I do not know what it was.

Mr. FIELDING: Let me say at once that I did not catch the words "commercial union" from the hon. member for Brant, and therefore I could not have had any reference to that. What I said was that I was in favour of the best trade—I do not know whether I used the word "closest;" I will use it now—the closest trade relations with 110,000,000 of the richest people on earth. That means trade relations, and only an unfair person would say that I had contemplated any other relations whatever.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not intimate that the minister contemplated any other relations than trade relations.

Mr. FIELDING: The right hon. member said that I had approved commercial union.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, because the hon. member said that was what the hon. member for Brant meant.

Mr. FIELDING: I said what I said, not what he said.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister said that the hon. member for Brant meant the closest possible trade relations with the United States.

Mr. FIELDING: I did not say what the hon. member for Brant meant at all. I said what I meant.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not like to contradict the minister but my memory is pretty good. However, this does not matter. That is what he wants himself. He does not mean anything except the closest trade relations only. The closest trade relations means no tariff at all.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Not necessarily.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What would be closer than no tariff at all, I ask those who interrupted with laughter? There could be nothing closer. If the Minister of Finance meant what he said, he wants no tariff at all between this country and the United States.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Commercial union might mean a great deal more than even that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It would eventually, in my judgment, as I have often said—and I know this is the judgment of the hon. member for Halifax too—but the hon. member for Brant does not think so.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): What is in my right hon. friend's mind is not the same as what is in my own at the moment. I know what he means—political union subsequently.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): It would mean also that the United States and Canada would have the same tariff as against every other country in the world, inclusive of Great Britain, and this would be in conflict with the declared policy of hon. gentlemen directly opposite. It was for that reason that I wish to dissociate myself with that view of commercial union.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think we have things straightened out now.

Mr. FIELDING: Not exactly.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I thought the Minister of Finance would want to correct something again. The intimation of the hon. member for Halifax is that the closest possible trade relations, meaning, as I stated, and as he does not contradict, no tariff, free trade between us and the United States—

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I did not say that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He would not stand for that.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I did not express my opinion at all.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the hon. member express one now?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I did not express an opinion on that point one way or another. I protested against the use of the words "commercial union," because I said in the first place that I was not quite sure what that meant, and I also expressed the opinion that the hon. member for Brant does not know

what it means. I repeat that. I like to give adherence to the things I understand, or partially understand at least.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I cannot get the hon. member to say what his opinion, stated by himself, of free trade with the United States would be. The hon. member might just as well speak out. He would fight that with all the strength of his being, the same as I would.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): The subject was not before the committee. I was not thinking about it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He might just as well say. What is more, the Minister of Finance would not have it, although one would gather that from what he said, and the hon. member for Brant had a right to comment on it in his remarks. The fact is that those things are impossible. Let me be understood anyway. I agree with the Liberal leader of 1890 who went out from his office, because he knew anything of the nature of commercial union could never stop with commercial union and was bound to lead to a far more disastrous outcome.

Mr. FIELDING: I should like to be judged by what I say and not by what my right hon. friend says I said. He said that I had approved commercial union.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did say that in effect but not in those words.

Mr. FIELDING: My right hon. friend did say that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In effect that is what it is.

Mr. FIELDING: He also said that I was in favour of no tariff between the United States and Canada. These are both inventions of my right hon. friend. I have talked often, perhaps too often, on the question of trade relations between the United States and Canada; but I challenge the right hon. gentleman to show that I ever said anywhere that I expected there would be no tariff between the United States and Canada. I have never had such an idea. I do not believe in it now; I never believed in it. The right hon. gentleman would have difficulty in convincing people that I said such a thing.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not think the minister meant that, but his reply to the hon. member for Brant—

Mr. FIELDING: I did not reply to the hon. member for Brant: I did not catch his remark.

[Mr. A. K. Maclean.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: His comment on the speech of the hon. member for Brant would lead hon. members of the House to think he did believe that.

Mr. FIELDING: I was commenting on what my right hon. friend said.

Mr. MEIGHEN: A minister who gets up and says that he believes in the closest possible trade relations with the United States—

Mr. FIELDING: That is right.

Mr. MEIGHEN: —has a right to have hon. members understand from that, that the Minister of Finance believes in no tariff between us and the United States.

Mr. HATFIELD: Whether it is the closest possible or not.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is the closest possible.

Mr. HATFIELD: I say it is not. It may not be possible.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly it is possible.

Mr. HATFIELD: I question if it is possible.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It may not be the greatest wisdom on the part of either country, certainly not of ours. The closest possible trade relations mean no tariff. What I protest against is this loose assumption, for the attraction of those whose minds lean that way, that hon. members are really in favour of the closest possible trade relations between us and the United States. They are not, and hon. members on all sides of this House, at least on two of them, know right well what the ultimate consequences of such a relationship would be.

As regards what the minister said, I want to say only one word before I sit down, because I think I can make the matter clear to the committee. He says: "If we were in earnest when we said that before he went over and placed himself in negotiation with France, he should first of all have had something to trade with by way of a higher tariff on luxuries, we would have done the same thing ourselves." The real central fact is this: The whole French treaty did not go out of effect until the session of 1921 was over. We had no prospect of a new treaty with France. We had to make a temporary arrangement in the summer after the session was passed. How could we have had the tariff raised unless we did that by order in council as the minister is taking power to do very often? We could not raise the tariff. So the minister's retort is entirely without any basis, entirely without any reason behind it. The minister went through a session, during every day of

which he knew he had to enter into trade negotiations with France. He let the session go by, and therefore he put himself in a position where he had no answer to France at all. As a consequence we have a treaty to-day which I think is the most unfavourable, the most unequal, and to us the most disastrous that we have been compelled to enter into in the history of our country.

Mr. FIELDING: The hon. gentleman sent a colleague to negotiate a treaty with France; whether that treaty was big or little, temporary or otherwise, is not of great importance. He sent him, not armed, as he said we should have been, but simply to negotiate a treaty as best he could, and there was every opportunity, before Sir George Foster went, of raising the tariff.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not at all; that is the point. The old treaty was in effect in 1920-21.

Mr. FIELDING: But you got notice that the old treaty was to terminate.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We also got notice later that it was not to terminate.

Mr. FIELDING: Oh, well.

Mr. MEIGHEN: France retracted her position and it was while I was in England that we got notice that the treaty was to terminate. There was no opportunity to come to parliament, and the hon. gentleman's contention has no force.

Mr. GOOD: I am rather glad that I used the expression "commercial union" because it has led to some illuminating confessions. I do not know what it means in ordinary usage, if it has any such usage, but I know what I meant by it: I meant exactly what the minister said when he suggested that we should have the closest possible trade relations with the United States. I do not suppose that we can reach the ideal, at least in any short time, but I do think that the political independence of this country is conditioned very largely upon our getting the closest trade relations that can possibly be brought about with the United States. And in that respect I take issue absolutely with the opinion of the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen). I am sure he is entirely honest in his views in that regard, but although this is a very complicated question, which I do not pretend to argue now, I certainly feel convinced from my study of the situation, and of history generally, that unless we can secure a large degree of commercial union, of close trade relations, or of reciprocity—I do not care what you choose to call it, but I hope the House understands what I mean—then it will be difficult for us to preserve our political independence. If we do get such a condition, it will of course be comparatively easy for us to maintain that independence.

Resolution agreed to.

BOUNTY ON HEMP

Mr. FIELDING: I invite the attention of the committee to the resolution on page 12 of the Votes and Proceedings of May 11, concerning bounties on hemp, in regard to which I want to make a change, not as to the amount but as to the distribution of it. I move the resolution, as amended, as follows:

Resolved:

1. That the Governor in Council may authorize the payment out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of the following bounties on hemp grown in Canada and used in the manufacture of yarn or twine, or in the manufacture of hemp further advanced than yarn or twine, manufactured in Canada and sold for consumption therein, during the periods and at the rates following, that is to say:

During the calendar year:

1926, one and one-half cents per pound;
1927, one and three-eighths cents per pound;
1928, one and one-fourth cents per pound;
1929, one and one-eighth cents per pound;
1930, one cent per pound;
1931, seven-eighths of one cent per pound;
1932, three-fourths of one cent per pound;
1933, one-half of one cent per pound;

2. That the sum to be paid as such bounty shall not exceed $125,000 in any one of the said periods;

3. That the said bounty shall not be paid on hemp yarn or twine, or manufactures of hemp further advanced than yarn or twine, exported from Canada;

4. That the Governor in Council may make regulations to carry out the intention of these resolutions; and

5. That the Minister of Trade and Commerce shall be charged with the administration of the foregoing provisions.

The resolution originally proposed to provide for a bounty for five years not exceeding in any one year $200,000, making a gross possible appropriation of $1,000,000. I am suggesting that the gross amount remain at that figure, but that we distribute it over eight years, the amount in any one year not to exceed $125,000. That gives a wider distribution, although the bounty is no larger. We propose that the first year shall be 1926.

Mr. HOCKEN: Has the minister any assurance that this arrangement will be sufficient to have the industry established?

Mr. FIELDING: I should not be justified in giving that assurance, but I expect that it will. Of course, the people who seek bounties generally want more than we are able to give them, and they rather convey the impression at first that the thing cannot be done unless

we can comply with their wishes to the fullest extent. I will not say more than that I am hopeful that what we propose will accomplish its purpose. I cannot give any assurance.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I assume that the extension of time now given is the result of further negotiation.

Mr. FIELDING: Yes. It in part meets their desire, but it does not provide all that they want.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Are their wishes met in regard to the extension of time? I take it that they probably wanted to have more in other directions, as well as respects the extension of time. But so far as that particular is concerned, have they been given just what they want?

Mr. FIELDING: So far as the resolution goes it is entirely in line with their wishes, except that it does not go quite the length they would like to have it go. There is one month of difference between the time at which we begin and the time they propose; we want the round calendar year. Otherwise the resolution is in accordance with their wishes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am referring to the question of time.

Mr. FIELDING: We are taking the calendar year rather than the month of December, for convenience sake.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I owe it to the minister to express approval of the attempt being made here, though he has not chosen the method which I think would in the end be best for the country. He has chosen one method which I earnestly hope will succeed. If we can make the growing of hemp in western Canada a real success, that is to say, if we can make it a competitive crop with the others, it would be a great thing for that part of the Dominion. That I am sure of. I do not like the bounty system. I do not think it is a sound one. There may be special cases where it can be justified, but I do not believe that you can get these things that have a strong foothold in other lands started in a new country, where all the experiments have to be undertaken and all the dangers of a new venture encountered, if you let things take their course, as some would advocate. Consequently, I join with the minister in the earnest hope that this will result in starting the hemp industry here, and that from this commencement the enterprise will go on and prosper.

Mr. HOEY: I cannot persuade myself that the minister is at all convinced that this is in any sense a successful attempt to establish this industry in western Canada. I do not know that we are justified in concluding that the project will be proceeded with. I am absolutely convinced, from intimate experience, that if this factory is established in Winnipeg, or anywhere else in western Canada, it will end in utter disappointment and disillusionment.

What are the actual facts? We are importing into Canada at the present time about 90 per cent of the binder twine used here. I have been informed on reliable authority that the binder twine interests in the United States cannot extend their markets into Europe. That market is pretty well served at the present time by European concerns, particularly by the Belfast Rope Works, the largest of its kind in the world. We are importing within 90 per cent of the actual binder twine used. Let us suppose that this industry is established on this basis, what is going to happen? Price-cutting immediately; the price of binder twine in western Canada will fall anywhere from 4 to 6 cents a pound. So that in the last analysis this is a direct subsidy to the farmers of western Canada. In no sense can it be looked upon as a subsidy to the industry that is being established. An hon. member in close proximity to me said a few days ago that he was opposed to this subsidy because the government did not subsidize him in his farming operations. But that is exactly what it is going to do if this resolution passes. There is going to be drastic price-cutting, and the only one who will benefit is the farmer. I would not support the resolution from that point of view, because I do not think that in the last analysis the western farmer can be helped by subsidies.

There might be some hope for the success of this firm if it were the mere expansion of an American industry, but as it is being backed by British capital it seems to me that there is absolutely no hope of its success. Are the American interests going to surrender their market in western Canada at a time when there is no hope of extending their markets in Europe without an attempt to crush this rising concern? If there is anything more cruel in modern civilization, anything that might be comparable to the thumbscrew age, it is an attempt to establish an industry in a protected country on a free trade basis. I heartily agree with the right hon. leader of the Opposition that if you are going to have a protective system you must extend that system, you must round it out. These people will pay duty on all the

machinery they import, they will pay duty on their belting; not only that, the agriculturist who is to grow the hemp will pay duty on his plows and his harness; and then if the argument of our protectionists is true, that protection increases wages, here you have an industry established on a free trade basis coming into the labour market in competition with protected industries. Now, I am absolutely convinced that this industry cannot be established on such a basis.

If it is the desire of the government and of the people that a binder twine factory should be established, other ways and means will have to be devised. But I am not sure that the establishment of this factory is an imperative necessity. Let us remember that for every acre grown in hemp there will be an acre less grown in wheat and oats, for the production of which western Canada is peculiarly adapted. The hon. member for Nelson (Mr. Bird) is not present, but I have understood from him that the growing of hemp in Manitoba can only be successfully undertaken in certain sections when the land is absolutely free from noxious weeds. It seems to me that this matter should have received much more careful consideration before any attempt is made to establish an industry on this basis.

Mr. GOOD: Mr. Chairman, I dissent from the opinion expressed by the right hon. leader of the Opposition in his criticism of bounties as a form of protection. I do not believe in the protective system, but if we are going to give protection to special industries I do think that a bounty is better than a tariff. It is open and aboveboard, and we know what we are paying; we only pay for what we get as we get it. The hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Hoey) has pointed out the peculiar condition surrounding this particular industry. Very frankly, I question the whole policy of subsidizing industries. It seems to me that when conditions are right capital and labour will be applied to natural resources to produce whatever is needed, and we cannot for any length of time subsidize an industry with any national advantage. But supposing that this is a desirable industry, then when conditions are favourable there is no doubt at all that those who are interested will invest in it and carry it on if there is any probability of its being successfully established. If, as has been pointed out by the hon. member for Springfield, the industry is doomed from the start—I do not pretend to pass an opinion upon that, but I think his argument is certainly worth considering—if that is the situation, then it simply means we are passing over a certain amount of our money to people who may undertake an enterprise of this sort which will sooner or later collapse and our money will have been wasted.

Mr. COOTE: Is this money to be paid to the farmer who produces the hemp? I think that could easily be inferred from this resolution.

Mr. FIELDING: No, it is to be paid to the manufacturer. I presume he will have to buy hemp from the farmer, who will not give it to him for nothing.

Mr. COOTE: If we are to pay a bounty on hemp grown in Canada, it does seem to me unfair that it should be paid to anyone other than the man who grows it. Does not the minister think so?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do hope that Hansard had the repeated "hear hear" of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe) to the contention of the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Good) that bounties are much better than a protective tariff, because I fully expect that next year we shall find his influence prevail in the government and there will be a bounty on artificial silk and we shall also find that the boot and shoe manufacturers hereafter will be granted a bounty and the duty will be entirely taken away. We have every reason to expect that from the interruption of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, especially in respect to boots and shoes.

Mr. COOTE: I would urge that the minister might give me his opinion at least as to whether, if a bounty is to be paid on the production of hemp, it should not be paid to the man who produces it.

The CHAIRMAN: The minister has already answered the question.

Mr. CAMPBELL: If we have to choose between a protective tariff and bounties, I certainly prefer the latter, but I do not rise to commend the action of the minister in this respect. Viewing it from the most favourable standpoint, and assuming that this industry would be successful, I can conceive of this company to which the bonus will be paid coming to parliament in the not very far distant future and demanding that a duty be placed on binder twine. That would naturally be the next step, and the farmers in western Canada are not prepared for anything of the kind.

Mr. McBRIDE: Mr. Chairman, if we are to have any new industries established in Canada we must expect to give them some

help at the start. I am more than surprised that the farmers of the prairie provinces object to this small bonus to assist this industry, as it is they, more than anyone else, who will receive the benefit of its establishment. And if the industry is established the people of Canada as a whole have nothing to lose by it, the firm itself takes all the chances; we pay no money over until the factory is in operation and turning out the finished article. Not until then does any bounty become payable. I think it will be one of the best things for western Canada that has taken place for many years. It will keep at least $10,000,000 of Canadian money in Canada, and that means something.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I do not doubt the sincerity of the hon. member for Cariboo (Mr. McBride) but that is the same old protectionist doctrine that has been preached in this country for the last seventy-five years. But let the industry become partly established and then there will be sufficient reason for your protecting it still further. The industry will still be there; the plant is in operation; if the protection is withdrawn large numbers of people will be thrown out of employment—that is the argument. I say that now is the time to begin. If this industry is what it ought to be; if it is indigenous to the prairie country, it will develop without any bonus.

Mr. COOTE: If the hon. member for Cariboo was logical I think he would support my contention that this bounty is being paid to the wrong parties. If he wants to bring about the production of hemp, surely he would urge that the bounty should be paid to those who produce it. If this bounty is to be paid to some manufacturer—and if I understood the minister correctly, that is the purpose of the resolution—then I want to register my protest against it. To my mind it is a most illogical proceeding.

Resolution as amended agreed to.

BOUNTY ON PETROLEUM

1. Resolved, that it is expedient to amend The Petroleum Bounty Act, 1909, being chapter forty-six of the statutes of 1910, by providing that the bounty shall be payable on crude petroleum having a specific gravity not less than .8235 at 60 degrees Fahrenheit's thermometer, produced from wells or from shales or other substances mined in Canada which have actually produced crude petroleum before the date of the coming into force of the act to be founded on this resolution.

The said bounty shall be paid at the following rates, that is to say:—

On such crude petroleum produced on or before the thirtieth day of June, one thousand nine hundred and twenty-four, the bounty of one and one-half cents per imperial gallon provided in the existing law shall be paid;

[Mr. McBride.]

On such crude petroleum produced on or after the first day of July, one thousand nine hundred and twenty-four, and not later than the thirtieth day of June, one thousand nine hundred and twenty-five, a bounty of three-quarters of one cent per imperial gallon shall be paid.

On and after the first day of July, one thousand nine hundred and twenty-five, no bounty shall be paid.

Mr. LeSUEUR: Before the committee passes upon this resolution I would like to place before hon. members, in as exact and as concise a form as I can, the facts surrounding this industry and the results which I believe must inevitably follow the adoption of this resolution. I think we should first get a clear conception of the two basic ideas on which I believe this resolution is founded. The first idea in the cancelling of these bounties is that the treasury of Canada might otherwise be called upon in a large measure for the payment of bounties on account of a possible large production of oil in the future in western Canada. My conclusion in that respect is based directly upon the remarks of the Finance Minister himself in his budget speech. He said:

The total amount paid in the form of bounty in 1922 was $93,636. The amount is not large, and if we had to consider only the conditions which existed when the bounty was applied it might not be worth our while to make any change. But oil has been found in our western country. There is a widespread conviction that we are on the eve of great oil discoveries in the far west and north. The development of great oil wells in that country would of course be in one way a blessing, as adding so much to the natural resources of the Dominion. But from the Dominion treasury's point of view that which might seem to be a blessing would be little less than a disaster. If there should be, as may very likely occur, great strikes of oil in the western country, the bounties we are called upon to pay would be a very serious charge upon the treasury. We are proposing, therefore—

And then follows an outline of the present resolution. I submit, therefore, that the primary object of the cancellation of these bounties is to prevent a call upon the treasury for large sums on account of the discovery of oil in considerable quantities in the West. The second object of the resolution is based upon a recognition of the fact that grave hardships and serious dislocations in industry will result from the repeal of the bounty; it is an attempt to ameliorate the conditions which would naturally be expected to follow from the repeal. I propose to show just what the withdrawal of these bounties means to the industry in question and to point out that both these objects can be accomplished in a workable and inexpensive way without causing any hardship to this industry.

First let us look at the exact position of the oil-producing industry in Canada. The output in 1922 of the oil producers of Canada

was about 178,567 barrels. Nearly 93 per cent of that production, or about 164,500 barrels, took place in western Ontario; in the county of Lambton alone the production was about 119,000 barrels, or 67 per cent. I mention these facts simply because I am well acquainted with the actual oil operations in Lambton county, which has 67 per cent of the total production. But when I describe the conditions of the oil fields in that county they may be taken, I believe, as applying generally to the oil-producing industry throughout Canada. In western Ontario, which produced about 93 per cent of the Canadian output, they are operating about 3,547 wells. About 216 power plants are being used to operate these wells. The investment in the industry is upwards of $2,000,000, exclusive of the value of the land, or the value of the leases, as we would call them.

The operation of these oil-fields is more or less along these lines. Most of these fields are old fields but the wells must be cleaned, the casing must be replaced from time to time, the pumping and the power transmission must be maintained, and the result is that it is a fairly expensive process especially when we remember that the 164,500 barrels of oil are produced from 3,547 wells. That means a rather small production per well. In addition none of these wells are flowing wells. In each case the oil has to be pumped and raised to the surface and then gathered to your central tank. That adds to the expense.

I would also point out that these operators are composed of farmers and small producers. They are the owners of a few wells. In no case is there a big powerful company in these fields. They are all small operators.

Now with regard to the cost per barrel of that oil, inquiry has been made among these operators, and they are men who have been in the oil business practically all their lives. Their method of operation is economical, and I believe the figures which I am going to give are accurate and can be accepted by the House with confidence. In fact, I have discussed these figures with independent authorities who have every reason to know whether they would be accurate or not, and I am told that they are. We have here the report of one property covering forty wells. It shows that in 1922 the average cost per barrel was $2.40. Another property operating sixty-three wells shows an average cost per barrel of $2.42. Another property operating fifty-seven wells shows an average cost per barrel of $2.51. Another operating 138 wells shows an average cost per barrel of $2.54; another an average cost of $2.58; another an average cost of $2.70, and another an average cost of $2.94 per barrel. That will give some idea of the cost per barrel of the oil produced in that country.

Now as to the price received for that oil during 1922. The average price received in Petrolia was $2.62½ per barrel, in Oil Springs, being a slightly lighter oil, the price was $2.69½. The price of Canadian crude to-day is $2.58 per barrel. The point I wish to make is this, that the margin between the cost of that oil per barrel and the average price received for it is very small at the best, and in some cases the margin is entirely supplied by the bounty of 52½ cents a barrel which this government pays. Now if this bounty is removed as this resolution proposes, what will be the result in that field in western Ontario? The result will be that a certain proportion of these producers will not be able to carry on without that bounty. Their costs are equal to or higher than the average price which they receive.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess

The committee resumed at eight o'clock, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

Mr. LeSUEUR: Before proceeding with my remarks I will, with the indulgence of the House, briefly summarize what I have said, so that this matter may be presented with some degree of continuity. We are dealing with the resolution on petroleum which is proposed by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding). The bounty at present is 52½ cents per barrel. The objects or purposes of this resolution are, in my mind, two; first, the primary and controlling one, namely, to prevent any large or substantial call on the federal treasury by reason of the discovery of oil in quantities in Canada and especially in western Canada. If it were not for that danger, and if conditions were to remain as they are and were, I take it from the budget of the Minister of Finance, there would be little object in taking off this bounty, as the payment for bounties is only $93,666, or possibly one cent per capita per year for the inhabitants of this Dominion. The other object of this resolution in taking the bounty off in two steps is, I believe, to create as little hardship as possible in the results which must inevitably follow this legislation.

I have briefly explained the oil position in Canada; that a great part of the oil produced in Canada to-day is obtained from western Ontario: that is production, representing 93 per cent of the total production of the Dominion, is approximately 164,000 barrels per

year, produced from about 3,547 wells, owned by small operators, no big companies being concerned, and that the oil must be raised, as there are no flowing wells. This oil must be raised and gathered, and owing to the small production per well, the large number of wells compared with the total production, the average cost per barrel is heavy. I pointed out in detail that these operators, who have been oil men from their youth upwards and know how to handle wells, show that their costs run from $2.40 per barrel to as high as $3 per barrel, and that the average Canadian price for crude oil in 1922 was $2.62½ per barrel in the Petrolia district, and $2.69½ in the Oil Springs district, there being a slight difference in the specific gravity of the oil. The result is that possibly the majority of these oil operators have no margin of profit, except the profit offered them by the bounty of 52½ cents per barrel, and that there are a large number who have a small margin of profit without the bounty.

That was the point at which we had arrived when the committee rose at six o'clock.

I should like to point out the result of the taking off of this bounty. The immediate result will necessarily be that a large portion of these oil producers must cease operations. A careful estimate has been made, and it is estimated that possibly between 50 and 60 per cent of the producers will have to cease operations, and this would mean a cutting down of possibly 50 per cent of the production in western Ontario. But it goes much further. That is simply the primary result. I would like to explain to this committee the method of handling oil after it is produced. In those fields there are receiving stations, and the oil is taken to the receiving station, or pumped to the receiving station, by the producer. From that receiving station the oil is then gathered to the central, larger tanks in the town of Petrolia. There it is taken by the main pipe line and driven by pumps for a distance of about 16 or 17 miles to the Imperial Oil Company's refinery at Sarnia where it is refined. That is the process of transportation.

That transportation system, I would point out, involves these receiving stations and their operation, and the gathering from the receiving stations to that central tank; this involves the measuring of the central tank or the strapping of it, as we call it. It also involves the pumping stations and the driving of that oil through a pipe line for 16 or 17 miles to the point of consumption. That means a very considerable investment, a considerable staff to operate the transportation system and a considerable overhead expense. This is the point which I am arriving at: If that production is cut in half by the removal of the bounty, as it certainly will be—there can be no other possible result—you then have a production in that western Ontario district of possibly 80,000 to 85,000 barrels, or not more than 250 barrels a day. What I say to this committee is that with a production of only 250 barrels a day, you have not sufficient oil to transport, to carry the overhead involved in that transportation system. Your 250 barrels a day will not support the keeping of the staffs at the receiving stations, at the central tank, and on the pump and pipe line operation. I can assure this committee with every certainty that if the production is cut in two in that way, it must necessarily mean the dismantling of the pipe line transportation system and the salvaging of what there is there. That will without a doubt be the result of the removal of the bounty.

What does that mean? You have still possibly somewhat under 50 per cent of your oil producers who have a sufficient margin between their cost of production per barrel and the average price which they receive, to permit them to continue operations; but as soon as that pipe line is taken out and dismantled, these producers must secure other means of carrying their produce to market. That means either tanking it by tank wagon or building lines of their own to stations, and erecting receiving racks and so on at those stations. That means an investment, and with this resolution in view, not one of those men will expend that amount. Furthermore, if they simply tank the oil by tank wagon to the Imperial Oil Company's refinery at Sarnia, that means an added cost which, I say, will wipe out, or very nearly wipe out, all the margin of profit they have, and the net result of this resolution means practically the complete elimination or wiping out of that oil field in western Ontario. These are facts which I do not believe can be refuted in any way. They are facts which, I believe, from close acquaintance with that field and with those conditions, make the results that I have indicated an absolute certainty.

Mr. GOOD: How does the hon. member figure the cost of production in this case?

Mr. LeSUEUR: There are many items in the cost of production. One could not, in the course of an evening practically, tell the hon. member all that enters into the cost of production; but it will mean your maintenance, cleaning, possible renewals, pumping and raising of your oil, gathering, maintenance

of power stations and so on. There are a hundred and one items.

Mr. SHAW: Could the hon. member inform the committee whether or not there are any customs duties on well-drilling machinery and appliances necessary for maintaining the pumping stations he suggests?

Mr. LeSUEUR: There have been duties on various articles used in the drilling of wells but an amendment has been made in the budget which is now before the committee. That would not enter much into this, because this is a field already drilled, already operating, and the item of removing the duty affects more a new field which you are going in to drill, to explore and to exploit.

I have arrived at the point where, I believe, I have shown that the removal of this bounty must mean the practical wiping out of this field. Let us see just what that means in the way of results. In the first place, I do not believe much could be salvaged from those wells, and this would mean practically the wiping out of the investment of possibly upwards of $2,000,000. It would certainly mean, conservatively speaking, the wiping out of a great deal of that investment, of very much the larger part of it. In the second place, the Imperial Oil Company pays for that oil, about 165,000 barrels, approximately $400,000 each year. That money is set in circulation in that district, including Bothwell, Petrolia, Oil Springs and so on, and it goes into every line of commerce. If this industry is wiped out, that money will be spent amongst the drillers in the mid-continent fields, which would be the natural place for that oil to be brought from if the Canadian oil wells are shut down. That is quite an item, and I would say that this is a big argument in offsetting the one cent per capita per annum on the inhabitants of this Dominion which this oil bounty at present calls for.

Another result is this: Petrolia is a town of possibly 3,000 inhabitants. It is a very nice little town with a certain quantity of pavements, with its public buildings, with a water system bringing water from lake Huron, a distance of 16 miles. In getting these improvements, in making Petrolia a liveable place, the town has incurred a debenture debt of approximately $435,000. The life of Petrolia is practically bound up in the oil industry. If you eliminate that oil industry, you are going to do a most serious injury to Petrolia. I think, without question, you will reduce its population by, at least, 1,000, many say by 1,500. You will cut it in two, because the hardware and other stores which furnish the oil well supplies and the centre of the oil operations are in the town of Petrolia. If you reduce the number of inhabitants, you are going to lessen the values of property; you are going to make houses and property a drug on the market, and you are going to strain very seriously the financial solvency of that town. You will hurt the whole district around. That will be the inevitable result of the closing down of the oil fields in that county and in those districts.

There is another angle from which to view this, and that is, this bounty had for one of its objects originally the encouragement of further drilling. There is not much further drilling in western Ontario, though there is more than one naturally thinks. There are, I think, at present some wells being put down near Colborne, possibly one near Melrose; there is one in York county; in Lambton there are several; in Sarnia township there is one, in Bosanquet township also and at Thedford. But these are more or less shallow wells in western Ontario going into what we call the coniferous formation which is a shallow formation and which is the usual well strata in those districts. If this bounty is taken off, I believe, at least, for all purposes of shallow drilling, this will produce a most detrimental effect on further exploration work. It will put a wet blanket on all parties who are either drilling now or are contemplating drilling for oil.

The great fear of the Minister of Finance in this matter has been that there will be a large production in western Canada. But that fear is unfounded; for while there has been spent in western Canada by one company several million dollars in oil operations, up to date the results have not been encouraging and the prospects are not bright. I understand that the president of that company has officially stated that they are not and never have asked or expected to receive this bounty, they are seeking for production on a large scale. That, of course, has nothing to do with the possibility that oil may be found; and I am quite in accord with the Minister of Finance in any measures he may adopt to safeguard the treasury against large drains from big producing wells. But I believe that this object of the minister's, as well as the purpose of assisting those who are look-for oil, can be most satisfactorily attained by a method which will avoid the hardships which the present resolution must inevitably impose on local industry in western Ontario.

The method which I feel sure will do this is the principle of limiting the bounty to so many barrels per well per day. For example,

I suggest that the bounty be paid only on the first five barrels per well per day. For example, the bounty would be paid on the first five barrels; and if a well produced any more than that, if it produced ten or a hundred or a thousand barrels per day, bounty would only be paid on five barrels in each case, nothing further would be paid. That would provide complete protection against the fear which the Minister of Finance seems to entertain and which apparently underlies the main purpose of this resolution. I offer that as a principle for the minister's consideration. He may consider that five barrels per day per well is not a wise standard; he may think it should be ten or twenty-five or any other number. That is a matter for him to consider. But I suggest that five barrels per day per well would be a fair amount on which to pay royalty.

Let me indicate a few points in relation to this proposal. In the first place this resolution confines the bounty to those who have already been receiving it, that is, to a particular proportion of the oil producers of the Dominion. The proposal I submit to the committee would treat all oil producers equally, and as a matter of fact it is the principle that is recognized in all countries. I am convinced of the soundness of it, and I do not think there can be any question about its being quite fair. It makes no distinction between the oil producer who has received a bounty in the past, and the man who is looking for oil and may find it later on. The proposal to pay a bounty on the first five barrels only would not only safeguard the treasury but, which is an equally important consideration, would extend the same treatment to all who are interested in oil. Some hon. members may think that this is more theoretical than practical, but it is something to be considered.

I submit, however, that the system is essentially feasible; and it is inexpensive, which is the second point I want to emphasize. We already have inspectors at these various points and they know the fields thoroughly. We have reports in the Department of Mines and in other departments giving accurate data on the wells, besides many other details, and while I do not know whether it is the fact in Canada, I know that it is quite the usual thing in oil fields for the government to be furnished with maps showing the location of wells, and so forth. I feel certain that the government inspectors at these different points are fully acquainted with the different wells and their production, and this system that I suggest, or at all events one similar to it, is more or less in vogue in other countries where it works satisfactorily. I am not speaking of bounties now; I am referring to the system which is indispensable if a proper calculation is to be made of production.

[Mr. LeSueur.]

In the third place, I would point out that the payment of the bounty on the first five barrels only would save the oil industry of western Ontario. I am sure it would. Some of the wells produce over five barrels a day, and they can take care of themselves; but the man who is especially hurt is the very man who would be saved by the payment of a bounty on five barrels a day. This would throw no burden upon the people of Canada. As I have pointed out, only $93,000 is paid per year by way of bounty, and that is less than one per cent per head of the population of Canada; and under this five barrel limit there would be practically no danger of that sum being increased, because nothing would be paid on any production exceeding five barrels. In that way the treasury would not be called upon to pay any substantial amount more than is paid at present.

The Minister of Finance very plainly indicates in his budget speech that if it were not for the fear of great production in the West he might not consider it worth while interfering with the bounty. So far as there is any fear from the West, I submit that it is completely dispelled by the limit that I have suggested. If they do get a large production there, as we all hope they will, the government will pay only on the first five barrels, and on nothing more; and that would not amount to a bagatelle. I submit, therefore, that the proposal I have suggested offers the minister a reassurance which must remove the fear he has of the public treasury being drained by reason of large productions.

Let me assure the minister in conclusion that I am not offering these remarks in any hostile or critical spirit. Far from it. But in view of my intimate acquaintance with these fields of western Ontario I think it is only my duty to state the facts as I know them, and, in as clear a way as I can, point out to the committee the results which I know must inevitably ensue from the enactment into law of this proposed resolution. I have tried to outline what I believe is a practicable, an entirely feasible and, at the same time, an inexpensive solution of this question, and one which, if adopted, would meet the end which this legislation is intended to serve, namely, the guarding of the treasury. More than that, it would alleviate the hardships which must follow of necessity if such legislation as this is carried out.

Mr. GOOD: The hon. member (Mr. Le Sueur) has given us a rather black picture

of the situation in Lambton county. I should like some additional information from him. In the first place, how constant is the cost of production? It would appear to me that a well giving 25 barrels per day would be very much more remunerative to its possessor than a well giving only 5 barrels a day, and that withdrawing the bounty might eliminate some of the less productive wells. Then is he quite within bounds in stating that the reduction called for by the resolution would lead to the scrapping of this equipment? I think some further evidence in that direction might well be called for. Further, why is it that the Canadian wells cannot compete with the American? If the refinery is near the field, how is it that the industry cannot compete with producers on the other side in the absence of this special assistance?

Mr. LeSUEUR: The hon. member is quite correct that the cost of production per barrel depends to a large extent upon the amount of oil produced by each well. A flowing well of course is the cheapest. It flows without pumping by reason of gas or other pressure. As that flow declines, naturally the pumping, cleaning, keeping in condition and so on of the well must be spread over a smaller and smaller return and the cost rises accordingly. As to the American fields, they are very large and the producers there have a correspondingly large production. The second question has escaped me for the moment.

Mr. GOOD: The scrapping of equipment.

Mr. LeSUEUR: No, I am absolutely within bounds in that statement. The hon. member refers to transportation lines. I can assure him there is no question but that with production cut in two the transportation plant will be dismantled.

Mr. GOOD: Can my hon. friend give the committee the maximum and minimum costs of production of the various wells? Between what limits do they vary?

Mr. LeSUEUR: One operator may have forty wells, another thirty, another twenty, and so on, but the costs which I have before me, and which I believe are accurate, run from about $2.40 to $3.

Mr. GOOD: Are those the average costs over the whole field?

Mr. LeSUEUR: No, these are the average costs of this particular producer and are averaged over the year 1922.

Mr. GOOD: They are not well costs?

Mr. LeSUEUR: No, costs per barrel.

Mr. GOOD: Can the hon. member give us the limits between which the costs per barrel per well vary?

Mr. LeSUEUR: That is what I have given, the cost per barrel; those per well I have not got.

Mr. MacLAREN: Mr. Chairman, I listened very attentively to what the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) had to say, at the time he introduced his budget, respecting the abolition of the bounty on Canadian petroleum, and, if I may say so, his reasons thereon were not convincing to me. He then said that he desired to do away with the bounties on certain articles, including petroleum, because he thought that these bounties had served their purpose. Are we satisfied that that is so? The purpose of a bounty is to encourage an industry in such a way that it may be made financially successful. Well, is petroleum produced in Canada to-day in that large and satisfactory volume which we would all like to see? I do not think any hon. member will say that it is, and I do not think we would gather from the remarks of my colleague from Lambton (Mr. LeSueur) that that is the case. Certainly I can say that oil is not being produced in satisfactory volume in New Brunswick. Indeed, the minister himself in the course of his budget speech stated that the operations carried on for the production of petroleum in Canada were never very large. They were chiefly in Ontario, and later in some degree in New Brunswick. Then comes this important statement:

> The operations have dwindled considerably.

I have no doubt that this statement is correct. And if operations have dwindled considerably, is this not an argument for continuing the bounty rather than withdrawing it? The minister added:

> The total amount paid in the form of bounty in 1922 was $93,636.

He admits that this is a small amount, and that were it not for certain future developments he would be disposed not to disturb this bounty. His words are:

> There is a widespread conviction that we are on the eve of great oil discoveries in the far west and north.

Is that sufficiently definite to justify the abolition of this bounty on petroleum? It seems to me that this is too indefinite. There is no doubt sufficient evidence to warrant the hope that in the future there will be a copious supply of oil in the far west and north, but, as the minister says, we are only "on the eve of these discoveries." That is too indefinite,

I think. In that case we are depending on the future. The experience of everyone in mining is that there are many disappointments; we can only count on the actual mineral production when we see it and when we have it. I quite understand there should be proper safeguards in the event of there being a tremendous discovery or production of oil, but that is against a future eventuality. That condition does not exist now, and in the meantime the bounties are being diminished or removed from industries that are struggling on, and before any considerable number of large, rich oil wells have been developed. I think this action is premature and I hope it will be possible for the minister to give some further consideration to the matter with a view to continuing the bounty or to taking such steps that those engaged in this industry may not have to look forward to its being cut off in two years, especially when there is no assurance of any substantial production for the future. I have heard from the manager of the New Brunswick Gas and Oil Fields, and he expresses the opinion that the removal of this bounty is likely to strangle the production of petroleum. One may ask, why all these difficulties? Why should the wells in Canada not be as rich as the wells in the United States? The answer is a very obvious one; we see it in everything. We have a great production of wheat in the West; why is it there is such a small production of wheat in certain portions of the Maritime provinces? Simply because there is a difference in the condition. You may have a fertile wheat producing country, or you may have a country which is not suited to the production of wheat. You may have rich oil wells, or you may have oil wells of low grade, and so it is with ours, or at any rate with a portion of ours. For instance, in New Brunswick it requires a depth of about 3,000 feet to reach oil, and at that the wells are of small productivity. It is plain, therefore, that there are variations in the wealth producing possibilities of different countries and of different parts of the same country. I urge, therefore, that this reduction of the bounty be not proceeded with; I certainly think it should not take place until we actually have the production of oil that is forecast, but which may never occur. In the meantime those industries which have been built up under the advantage of the bounty and which are now operating should not be disturbed. Capital has been invested in these properties, the work in connection with which is going on under the aegis of the bounty, and I urge most strongly that we should be slow to take action which may lead to very great loss and even disaster.

[Mr. MacLaren,]

Mr. GOULD: It has impressed itself upon me that this is another "infant industry". It does seem that when the term of the contract with all these so-called infant industries expires they always have individuals who will appear before the government and ask them to break the contract and to make further renewals of the privileges extended, whether they be in the form of subsidies or bounties. As to the oil wells in Lambton county, I may say that that is my own old county, and I recall that back in the year 1890 the production of oil there was a very flourishing industry. Even in those days oil was drawn past our home up in Warwick township and sold from door to door in the rural districts at 10 cents a gallon. The wells were bored at that time; they were a going concern, and later the prices were enhanced. A lot of people believe it is because of the imposition of these bounties and duties that the price has been enhanced. In any case, since they did all those things in the early days, why should they ask for a special privilege at this time? It is difficult for me to conceive that if there should be an unprecedented flow of oil from the wells of western Canada the consumers of oil would receive the benefit. I would like to see the day when the people should be getting some of the benefits of the natural resources of this country. But we always have someone to argue for a retention of bounties and subsidies, even in the face of the facts that I have submitted—that in the case of this industry they drilled wells and made a success of their operations as far back as 1890.

Mr. FIELDING: May I say a word first in regard to the observations of the hon. member for St. John City (Mr. MacLaren)? He advises that we keep this bounty on until we "strike ile", as the saying was some years ago in the West, and then stop it. Well, if my hon. friend will reflect for a moment he will see what the result would be: If we should then say to the West, "We have been paying bounties to the East for twenty years, but the moment you get any oil we stop them all," I would not like to have to answer the criticisms that would come from my western friends. One difficulty incidental, I suppose, to any system of protection, whether it is by bounty or by duty, is that the parties benefiting from it easily train themselves to depend upon it, and then if at a given moment it is deemed to be in the public interest to reduce or abolish that protection, instantly you are told that the industry is going to be destroyed. I suppose they believe it in all sincerity; they educate themselves to believe that without

this assistance they could not live. Now, we sometimes talk of infant industries. The oil industry is not an infant industry; why, it has almost attained its full age of twenty-one years; it is almost old enough to vote. As to the merits of bounties generally there is a difference of opinion, as we know from the discussion to-day, but I think we will almost all admit that we do not want a system under which a bounty must be perpetual. If there is anything to be said in favour of bounties it is that they may be put on at a certain stage to lend a helping hand,—even that would be debatable, I suppose. But surely it is pretty generally agreed that nobody wants a perpetual system of bounties. This bounty was granted nearly twenty-one years ago—in 1904. It was originally a very considerable industry. It has now, as I stated, dwindled considerably, but an industry that has enjoyed a bounty for such a long period as twenty years I do not think should make a great fuss if we find it necessary to stop the bounty. We are doing it very gently. We are giving them two years' notice before we stop it, and I do not think a strong argument can be put up against that. I differ entirely with the hon. member for St. John, who thought he had a simple solution—just abolish the bounty when the West gets any oil. We have been paying bounties for twenty years to the eastern oil fields, and I would not care very much to be Minister of Finance if the moment oil is found in the West I had to say: Now we are going to stop the bounty. I would not like to make a proposal of that nature. I hope and believe that the people in Ontario interested in the oil industry and in New Brunswick where they have the shales will be able to carry on. I think they magnify the trouble. They easily persuade themselves they cannot live without this artificial aid. I believe it will be found that notwithstanding the abolition of this bounty this industry will still have a fair chance of living. It is a waning industry in any event, and I believe it will be found that my hon. friend from West Lambton has magnified the danger of the whole thing.

Reviewing what has been said, a bounty has been given to this industry for twenty years. It has not been ungenerously dealt with, nor is it being dealt with ungenerously to-day, when we are giving them two years longer before the bounty is taken off. I think on the whole that the industry has been generously dealt with, and that there will be no ground for complaint if we allow this resolution to take effect.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Would my hon. friend tell us what the objection is to reducing the bounty by fixing the limit at five barrels per well as has been suggested? I think that would make a very large reduction in the expenditure and it would place the small operator in the position of being able to carry on. It would help the small producer; it would help the actual farmer who is carrying on operations. It would be of no help whatever to the large corporations. The larger interests have been getting the benefits of this bounty. Why not make a reduction by fixing the limit at five barrels per well and at the same time aid the small producer?

Mr. FIELDING: I think the people who are getting the benefit of this to-day are the ones who have been getting the benefit of it for a great many years. I do not think there has been any material change. I have not the list at hand, but I think the interests enjoying the bounty to-day are substantially the same as have been enjoying it in bygone years.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend does not catch my point at all, not in the slightest. I am not referring to the man who is getting the bounty to-day and the man who got it yesterday. We have had bounties paid without limit in connection with the production of oil. If a well had a capacity of one hundred barrels a day it received payment on the whole output; in other words, if you had a well with a capacity of a hundred barrels a day as against a well with a capacity of five barrels, it got twenty times as much. Now the proposition whereby the treasury can be helped, whereby reductions can be made, whereby no large demand can be placed upon the treasury by the discovery of large gushers that need absolutely no bounty, whereby also the small producer is enabled to carry on—I ask my friend to look into that and see if it is not worth while to try and save that small producer. It seems to me it is worth while to save him and at the same time save the country's money, but if my hon. friend does not think it worth while I am not going to press him any more. But I do not think he has the figures. I do not think he can now tell us what is the largest capacity upon which bounties are being paid, or how many small wells would benefit by fixing the limit at five barrels per day. Let me put it in another way: Rightly or wrongly a community has been built up in that part of the country. Improvements have been made and you have there a community that will continue to function perfectly well I think from what the local member has said, if the small man is looked after. Now is it

9 p.m.

not worth while to see if the country cannot protect itself and at the same time enable this community to continue and these small producers to carry on? If my hon. friend has any real reason, I could understand that, but I am sure he would want to have some real reason other than the mere fact that the solution is suggested by the local member. So far we have not had any reason given.

Mr. FIELDING: I have had representations from the oil interests, and all the facts that can be suggested in the matter have been presented to me. They have not commended themselves to my judgment. That is all I can say.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Will not my friend tell me this: What is the real reason why this reduction cannot be made by limiting the bounty to wells with a capacity of five barrels per day, instead of cutting the bounty in half? Why cannot it be done just as well that way?

Mr. FIELDING: I can only tell my hon. friend that having considered all these things his suggestion does not commend itself to my judgment.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then I am afraid, Mr. Chairman, we do not get very far. The hon. gentleman will give us no business reason.

Mr. FIELDING: I thought I had given reasons, but my hon. friend thinks I have not.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend will bear with me. He did give reasons pointing to the necessity for a reduction in bounties. Here is another way in which the reduction can be made and at the same time the small producer can be protected. Now the question I am putting to my hon. friend is this: What is the reason why the reduction cannot be made in that way? He says he does not like it, but that is not a reason. Of course, if he does not want to give me a reason, I am not going to press him any more.

Mr. FIELDING: I have answered my hon. friend.

Mr. LeSUEUR: I do not know whether I make myself clear to the minister, but the one object which the Minister of Finance clearly puts forward as practically the sole reason for the changing of this bounty is this, to give his own words:

> The amount is not large, and if we had to consider only the conditions which existed when the bounty was applied it might not be worth our while to make any change.

[Sir Henry Drayton.]

Then he goes on in the budget speech to say that practically the one reason for this resolution is the fear of big production in the West and the consequent drain on the treasury. Now fixing a limit of five barrels per well will certainly avoid all danger from that source, and at the same time it will save the dislocation which will inevitably follow in western Ontario from the introduction of this measure. I submit that we have sufficient dislocation of trade in Canada today without causing any more, and if we can get a solution which accomplishes the object of the hon. Minister of Finance and at the same time avoids further dislocation—I say that dislocation will follow; the minister may not think so—it will in any event avoid the possibility of it following, it will be taking the safe business course. Therefore I submit that we should put into effect a measure which will accomplish both objects.

Mr. LEWIS: When the budget was brought down it contained three or four proposals for granting certain bounties. I looked upon these bounties a little more favourably than I did upon the idea of imposing tariff duties, because it did seem to me that a bounty could be removed much more easily than a tariff. But apparently I made a mistake. It is just about as difficult to take a bounty off as it is to lower the tariff. At the same time a bounty should be arranged in such a way that it will be reduced until it finally ceases to be, and I see no reason why at the present time this item should not carry.

I am glad to find that the other bounties that have been suggested will be gradually reduced to the minimum, and that they will be put on the free list. I have much pleasure in supporting the resolution.

Resolution agreed to.

CHEQUE TAX

Customs Tariff:

Resolved, that it is expedient to introduce a measure to amend The Special War Revenue Act, 1915, and amending acts and to provide:

1. That the maximum amount of stamp tax payable on a cheque, bill of exchange, promissory note, advance on securities, overdraft, receipt by a person for money paid to him by a bank chargeable against a deposit of money in the bank to his credit, express company's money order or traveller's cheque, or post office money order be reduced to one dollar.

Mr. FIELDING: I direct the attention of the committee to this resolution, and I desire to make some changes, to which I will call attention. The resolution is somewhat comprehensive. I do not know whether we will be able to dispose of all the items to-night. In the first place, there is a proposal to

reduce the stamp tax on cheques. The maximum tax was $2 and we have reduced it to $1. According to the wording of the resolution, the reduction would apply to other things than cheques. It would apply to notes of hand and so on. We desire to amend the resolution so that the reduction will apply entirely to cheques. The item would then read:

That the maximum amount of stamp tax payable on a cheque, bill of exchange, payable on demand, or within three days after sight, receipt by a person for money paid to him by a bank chargeable against a deposit of money in the bank to his credit, express company's money order or traveller's cheque, or post office money order, be reduced to one dollar.

The effect of it is that the reduction will apply only to cheques and not to notes. I would therefore on that point move that resolution No. 1 of the resolutions of May 11, 1923, respecting the special war revenue act be amended to read as above.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The effect of this is to keep the promissory note with the unlimited stamp; that is to say, without any maximum.

Mr. FIELDING: Yes, the reduction applies only to cheques.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I want to have a word to say about that, not from a party standpoint, because I know it is lower than the rate that applied in the days of the late government, and that there was no maximum as respects promissory notes. Really, I cannot see the justice of that tax at all. For the life of me, I cannot see why we tax a man because he owes money. I know that you do not tax a man because he pays his debt. For my part, I do not think there is any justice in the cheque tax. It should be merely a tax commensurate with the advantage given him in paying that way. Even that is a mighty small justification or reason for it. But when you come to tax a man because he is in debt, I cannot see any justice, rhyme or reason in it. I hope I am not actuated by the fact that I have to pay considerable of a tax myself.

Mr. BUREAU: Fortunately, the hon. member has the money in the bank.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If ever there was an illogical tax, it seems to me it is that tax. It is not pretended that it should be paid by the creditor. You say to a man "If you are in debt, we will jump on your back and make you pay a little more to the treasury than the fellow who is not in debt."

Mr. BUREAU: Oh, no.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am not arguing this particularly against the minister. All he has done is that he has doubled it. If it is wrong in this case it was wrong as we maintained it ourselves. My attention was not particularly called to it then and indeed that feature of it escaped me personally entirely. I will call the minister's attention to the inequity of the whole thing. According to this principle, why not tax a man because he wears bad clothes?

Mr. BUREAU: Does my hon. friend contend that because a man gives a cheque he is in debt?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am not speaking of the cheque tax now. I do not think the minister's plan in regard to that is right. I think the plan of the late government in that respect was right, but I am not dealing with that now. I am on the promissory note or the overdraft at the bank. If a man owes the bank $20,000 or $30,000 he has to pay $10 for the privilege of owing it every month or so. Here is another instance. Suppose a man goes into the bank on the 29th or 30th March and borrows $20,000, on the next day there is a tax against him of, say, $4 or $5. He is assessed that amount because he is in debt. Suppose he goes in the next day and pays it off, the minister puts it on again. He has to pay for going into debt and has to pay to get out of debt. There is a toll as he goes in and as he goes out, even though he only owes the debt two days. The reason or the coincidence of it is this: That the banks collect every three months. The act must compel them to or they would not do it. That is to say, at the end of March, at the end of June, and so on, they collect, and if a man owes the money only a day before the end of March he is assessed the percentage of the note at the end of March. If he pays it a day after he is assessed again the same amount. If he does not, and waits until before the hammer falls at the end of June, down comes the minister with another tax on him, and if he pays two days after the minister is down on him again. Of all the utterly unreasonable taxes, I think this is the worst of all. It is wrong to my mind in principle, and the incidence of it is wrong. Why in the world a man who goes in debt on the 29th of March should be taxed far more than the man who goes in debt on the 29th January is a mystery to me. And why the fellow who pays his debt quickly is taxed still more I cannot understand. The man who pays on the 2nd April is taxed far more than the man who pays on the 2nd

of May. If there is rhyme or reason in that, I would really like to have the minister explain it.

Mr. BUREAU: What do you suggest?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I suggest wiping it out.

Mr. BUREAU: Where would you get your revenue?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I mentioned some methods to-day but I did not get much open support from the Minister of Customs. I think I have more support in his heart than in his expressions.

Mr. BUREAU: My heart is with the hon. member all the time.

Mr. FIELDING: I am really afraid that I cannot give any other reason than this one, that we need the money. I propose to move an amendment at a later stage. At present there is no date fixed for bringing the provision into force, and it is desirable that the date should be fixed. I propose that the reduction shall take effect on the 1st August. That will come up a little later.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the minister has to have this, no matter whom he takes it out of, why not, at least, have some common sense in the method of imposition? Why make fish of one and flesh of another? Why make it a mere matter of chance whether you pay $20 or $10? The minister might just as well collect by a lottery. That would be just as moral and just as sane. The way the matter stands now, it all depends when you happen to make the note and when you happen to pay it. One man may have a note for three months and pay a certain amount only; another man may have a note for three days and pay twice as much. I should like the minister to look into the matter and make it rational, for to-day it is utterly irrational; there is no common sense to it at all. In my judgment, the whole idea is wrong; it is founded on a principle utterly wrong from the beginning. But if the minister is bound to keep it up, why impose these foolish regulations that fall with utter inequality upon debtors?

Mr. FIELDING: My right hon. friend says that this is inequitable. He is not alone in that criticism. I do not know of any item in the customs tariff that someone does not say is inequitable. I have no hope that we shall ever get taxes in any form which will be admitted to be generally equitable.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Could the minister not do this? This is not a matter of somebody saying that the tax is inequitable; it is a matter of whether the tax is inequitable or not. If the inequality is clearly shown, why continue it? If the minister is bound to tax men because they are in debt, all right; tax them according to the length of time. The length of time now is supposed to be the measure of the tax, but it is not at all. This is just a mere matter of chance. Why not say that a note that stands for six months will pay so much, a note that stands for three months so much, and so on? Make the tax proportionate to the time. There is no common sense to this from whatever angle you view it.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Is my right hon. friend contending that because a note is liquidated in three days, it should pay a different tax from one liquidated in three months—one that runs the full tenure?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The way the matter stands to-day, a man might make a note on the second day of January and carry it on to the 31st day of March, and he pays the tax once. That is three months all but a day. But if he makes it on the 30th of March and pays it off on the 1st of April, he pays a tax twice, although he has had the money for only two days.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Is the tax not on the instrument itself?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, it is not. It is the minister's regulation. In one case the man has a note for three months and he pays the tax once. In the other case, he has it for two days, and he pays it twice. The minister says he has to continue that because he has to have the money.

Mr. FIELDING: While the rate has been increased, the wording of the law is precisely the same as it was before. I do not think this is a new feature. We have increased the amount of the tax; but the method is pretty well established; people get used to it, and I think we can look to have it a little while longer.

Mr. HANSON: One can get used to having one's teeth pulled.

Mr. BUREAU: No, one cannot; I have had experience.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I venture to say the people have not gone into the matter and learned the meaning of it. It is the minister's regulations that are at fault, not the law. Why should such a thing as I have described be continued? One hangs one's head in shame before a debtor when he comes and complains. The thing is ridiculous. Let the minister make

the tax proportionate to the time if he wishes to continue the tax. A change in the regulations should be sufficient. The way the thing is now, actually one can hardly have the patience to discuss it, because it is not only inequitable, but grossly absurd.

Mr. NEILL: I also think this tax is inequitable, but on different grounds from those advanced by the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen). I do not think that his point is well taken in the illustration that he gave of a man who borrows money on the last of the month and repays it in the early days of the ensuing month, and he draws from that the suggestion that the man should pay stamp tax for the length of time he has the money.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It all depends on the month. One month he pays one thing; another month, another thing.

Mr. NEILL: The same argument might hold good as regards postage stamps. I might argue: Why should I pay three cents to mail a letter to Hull, when three cents would take a letter to the Pacific coast? The argument is the same. The time for which the note is drawn, whether for a shorter period or a longer period, has nothing to do with the tax; the tax is a tax on making out the note, in the same way as the postage stamp is applied in a generic way.

The objection I take to the clause is this: The Minister of Finance has said that there is an absolute necessity to obtain revenue, hence this clause. Why not leave this clause out and let the tax go on at two cents for every fifty dollars as the amount increases? Why reduce the maximum from $2 to $1? That will produce, not more money, but less money. In its very essence and nature, the tax is unjust as between the small man and the man who handles money in large amounts. A man pays two cents every time he draws a cheque under $50. That applies if he draws a cheque for $2, and the leader of the Opposition might object to that. Let us take an average and say that his cheques average $25, that is for everyone who draws cheques under $50. That would mean that he would pay .08 per cent on the amount of his cheques. But if a man drew a cheque for $5,000, he would pay only .02 per cent. That means that the small man pays four times as much as the man who is able to draw a bigger cheque. From the point of view of inequality between the tax on the small man and the tax on the big man, and from the point of view of revenue, I can see no reason for the change in the maximum from $2 to $1.

Mr. FIELDING: The object of the reduction was this. There are many transactions in which the same amount of money passes through two or three hands. Really it is the one transaction, the one deal, and the cheque has to be given two or three times. Representations along that line were made and we were impressed with them so that we reduced the maximum from $2 to $1 largely to meet cases of that kind.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I admit there is a distinction between the position of the note and the overdraft and the cheque. Indeed, I think it is because there is that great distinction, that the cheque tax becomes all the more abominable. The cheque is an instrument which is drawn by the bank's customer who deposits the money which renders it possible for business to be carried on. He is the man who renders it possible for the borrower to get his accommodation. The one man is taking advantage of somebody else's assets for the purpose of carrying on his business. The man who draws the cheque is the man who makes it possible for that business to be carried on. There is a great difference in principle between taxing the man who discounts his paper and has his overdraft at the bank and the man who draws cheques. But my chief quarrel with the cheque tax is because it is perfectly without rhyme or reason; it cannot be supported on any principle, while you can support the other two taxes that my hon. friend is referring to. You cannot support a tax on a cheque of any idea of value given on any ascending or other scale. I object to it not only on that ground, but on the ground that it is not being and cannot be equitably carried out, and the minister himself does not know what the law calls for. I can make that statement without fear of contradiction by anybody who has made a study of this legislation. The government are not collecting this; they cannot. It is being collected by the banks, and if there is one there must be thirty rulings given by the department from time to time on the different matters that come up. It is a difficult thing to know how to charge these stamp taxes. Just to see whether I am right or wrong, I am going to ask the minister a few questions. Take the tax on cheques and drafts. What stamps have to be affixed; first, on a draft for $50, payable at sight or within three days thereafter? Secondly, on a draft for $50 payable in ten days?

Mr. FIELDING: That would be 2 cents.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The minister says 2 cents; I am afraid he is incorrect. To start with, it would be $2.

Mr. BUREAU: Two dollars on fifty dollars?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I said $50,000

Mr. BUREAU: You said $50.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then, I beg your pardon; I meant to say $50,000. Let me again put the question. What stamp must be affixed on a draft for $50,000, payable at sight or within three days, and on one payable in ten days? What is the difference, if there is any? How many managers of branch banks could answer that question? The Minister of Customs (Mr. Bureau) does not know now, and it is his department that is concerned.

Mr. BUREAU: We do not determine the amount of the stamps by the length of time involved. It is the amount of the money on which the tax is to be charged that determines the quantity of stamps, and the charge on $50,000 will be as many two cents as there are multiples of fifty in $50,000, whether the time involved is three or four months. My hon. friend was referring just now to an overdraft. Well, the law provides that he who draws on the bank or gets an accommodation for, say, $50,000, shall pay as many times two cents as there are multiples of fifty in the total.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Just as I thought, the Minister of Customs knows absolutely nothing about it.

Mr. BUREAU: I am following the lead of my predecessors, and I do not wish to put them to shame.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The hon. gentleman's predecessors gave him no such lead. They had no system of multiplying taxes.

Mr. BUREAU: They may not have done that, but very often they knew nothing at all of what they were doing.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The simple fact is that no one would know anything about this matter unless he had made a special study of it. The difference is that a draft for three days is a cheque, but when it is for ten days it is "time," and you have the $2 limit in one case, while it does not apply in the other. Now, you have these instruments going up and down the country and no one knows anything about the matter. In fact, the minister who is in charge of the whole business does not know. Let us take another illustration.

[Sir Henry Drayton.]

Mr. BUREAU: Does the hon. member say that a draft for three days is a cheque?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Yes, sight or three days.

Mr. BUREAU: Under the special War Tax Revenue Act?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Under the hon. gentleman's act. Let me take another simple case. What stamps must be affixed to a bill of exchange for $10,000: First, when the bill of exchange is drawn in Canada on a person in a foreign country payable on arrival of goods? Secondly, when the bill of exchange is drawn in Canada on a resident of Canada payable on arrival of goods? And, thirdly, when the bill of exchange is drawn in a foreign country on a resident of Canada, payable on arrival of goods? I know that my hon. friend cannot tell me, and it is not fair that we should wait for an answer. He does not know. Yet you have that sort of conundrum put up day after day under this precious system of multiplying stamps on cheques and bills of exchange all over the country. Let me get something really simple. Have stamps to be attached to bills or drafts when delivered to the bank for collection, or need such stamps not be affixed until such drafts are accepted?

Mr. FIELDING: My hon. friend might ask me fifty questions of that nature, and I should have to have time to consider them. It is a difficult matter to interpret the act on the spur of the moment. The hon. gentleman really magnifies the trouble, for I have not heard of any difficulties. The banks make their returns and we get the money. However, if he is really earnest in the desire to obtain information, if he is putting these questions for the purpose of eliciting information that he wants, I will take them into consideration. But I do not want to interpret the act right off the bat.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: But this is not doing it right off the bat. Here we have an act that has been running for over a year, and the Minister of Customs, who is enforcing it, knows nothing about it. I do not blame him at all. The whole truth is that we have an act which is enforced here and not enforced there, and you simply cannot help it. You have such a mixed up state of things that it takes a Philadelphia lawyer to answer the questions that arise in consequence. My hon. friend says he has heard of no difficulties. Apparently they do not come to his notice, but he would find if he went to the Bankers' Association that there has been any amount of

trouble. He would find the same thing if he went to the Department of Customs; he would discover trouble there.

Mr. BUREAU: Oh, no.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The hon. gentleman says "oh, no." He has dodged the trouble; he has officers who do the work for him. But I know about the matter because I happened to be held up in connection with stamps on one of these documents. The bank said they had to make the charge under the act, and I pressed for the authority. The authority came in the shape of a ruling from the Department of Customs and Excise, and my hon. friend, the Minister of Finance, takes the only safe position that he can possibly take when he says that I might ask him fifty questions and he would not be able to answer without having an opportunity to consider them. He is absolutely on safe ground, because that is the literal truth. But if the Minister of Finance, the author and creator of these ascending stamp taxes on cheques, cannot tell you, then how on earth do we expect anything like uniformity of enforcement throughout the thousand and one branch banks in the country? The fact is that we are not getting it. I could go on piling up illustration upon illustration in proof of this. The tax is wrong in principle and is unfair in application; and it is not and cannot be enforced evenly everywhere. Just as my hon. friend has trouble in arriving at conclusions, so will others experience the same thing, and in greater measure. Put his intellect against the intellect of a branch manager or of a receiving teller. If the hon. gentleman has difficulties, what must be the difficulties of those officers? One man thinks there is a difficulty here and he makes application to the Bankers' Association. The Bankers' Association make a ruling and they send it to the Department of Customs to see whether they know anything about it. Sometimes, Mr. Ross, of the Bankers' Association, has difficulties, and appeals to the department. Now, that gentleman is supposed to know something about the matter, but at one time he is told that he is right and at another time they tell him he knows nothing about it. And yet we are seriously supposed to regard this tax as having been fairly and equitably administered. My hon. friend says he has got a lot of money out of this tax. I do not see how he can have any idea of the amount.

Mr. FIELDING: I could ascertain.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Has not my hon. friend ascertained?

Mr. FIELDING: I have not at the moment.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then it is certainly something we ought to know. I tried to get the information earlier in the session and was then told that it could not be furnished.

Mr. FIELDING: The hon. gentleman probably knows that in the inland revenue service postage stamps are used to a large extent. I propose to change that. But you cannot tell exactly what money has come into the inland revenue and what into the post office by reason of this tax. My hon. friend says that if I would consult the Bankers' Association I would find there is a great deal of dissatisfaction. I have not consulted them, but I am in contact with them frequently and I am not conscious of any difficulty in administering the act. My information is that the act is working satisfactorily.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The hon. minister tells me first that he can ascertain what money is being obtained from this tax.

Mr. FIELDING: As between the two departments.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then he tells me that postage stamps are used in the one case and not in the other. Surely my hon. friend will admit that it is impossible for him to tell to-day what revenue he is getting out of this tax.

Mr. FIELDING: Because of the difficulty as between the postage stamp and the inland revenue stamp, that is correct. We can tell what amount of money we are getting on cheques from inland revenue stamps and from postage stamps, but we cannot allot the revenue between the two departments. We propose to change that by our amendments to-day and cease the use of postage stamps for the purpose.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: In other words, my hon. friend cannot say how many cheques have postage stamps on them. And he is quite right, nobody can.

Mr. FIELDING: My hon. friend had the same rule.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: In connection with what?

Mr. FIELDING: Postage stamps.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: In connection with a single stamp on each cheque.

Mr. FIELDING: What is the difference in principle?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Everything. We made arrangements for the embossing of cheque stamps and were getting in a position where we would know pretty well. I admit we did not have a complete check, but it is something to get an idea as to the number of cheques so stamped. It is a comparatively easy thing to do that.

Mr. BUREAU: No, it is not an easy thing.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: But it is difficult to get an unknown multiple of stamps.

Mr. BUREAU: The stamps are there to show if you can get the cheques.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: But I suppose my hon. friend has tried to do that?

Mr. BUREAU: I only try to do things that have sense in them.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: As a matter of principle should stamps be affixed to drafts when delivered for collection, or not until after they are accepted?

Mr. FIELDING: As I said to my hon. friend a little while ago, he can ask very many questions of this nature which I prefer not to answer by way of interpretation. If debatable questions, I shall be very happy to deal with them. I suppose when he puts them that way he regards them as debatable.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I tried to get this information before in order to advance matters so that I would not have to bring it up now.

Mr. FIELDING: I have no recollection of any such attempt.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I put a question on the order paper and was told there were not any such rulings.

Mr. FIELDING: When.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: At the earlier part of the session.

Mr. FIELDING: I have no recollection of it, but I will look it up.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am not pressing the question, but I do not want it to be understood that I have held this matter back just to bother my friend. I tried to get the information in the proper way. I also tried to get these questions on the order paper so the government would know just exactly where they were, but I was informed that under the Speaker's ruling these questions were out of order because they involved an interpretation of law. I thought it would have been easier for the government if the matter had been so dealt with. But I am not asking for an interpretation of the law, I am asking as a matter of principle. No matter what the law is, is it right? Take this case: Drafts sent in for collection—not accepted—returned with notification—new drafts drawn by the same drawer and sent back to the same bank; should there be a duplicate set of stamps?

Mr. FIELDING: Whether the draft is paid or not, I think it would have to bear the stamp. I do not recollect the question my hon. friend put on the order paper. My desire is to see that every information he sought on any public matter should be given to him in all due courtesy, and if he asked any question of that kind, and it was not fairly answered, I shall be glad to look into it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am not complaining.

Mr. HANSON: I put a series of questions with respect to these rulings on the order paper, and they were returned by the Clerk of the House with the intimation that they were out of order because they involved an interpretation of law.

Mr. FIELDING: If they had not been out of order, and they were addressed to me, I would certainly have declined to give any interpretation of law in that way. I do not think it is the business of ministers to give interpretations of law.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I was referring to an older question than that again, to a question I put in the early days of the session as to what rulings had been made in connection with these very stamps. I was told there had been none. I am quite sure that was an oversight, and I am not making any complaint in regard to it. Does my hon. friend think as the author of this tax whether, as a matter of principle, there should be two sets of stamps affixed to the transaction I mentioned?

Mr. FIELDING: I think it is a very legitimate means of raising money for public purposes, yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then, Mr. Chairman, I just want to show what is being done. A draft is sent in to a bank, and under the rulings, not of the department in the first instance, but of the Canadian Bankers' Association, endorsed by the department, that

draft, which is not a completed instrument until it is accepted, has to have stamps attached to it to the full amount, if it be a time draft, before it is sent for acceptance; and if that draft is not accepted and returned, under the rulings of the department a duplicate set of stamps have to be placed upon another draft for the purpose of effecting one and the same transaction. Does my hon. friend really think that is right?

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: If my hon. friend will allow me? When a draft is sent and not accepted for cause, I suppose the party who draws the draft has to put a stamp on it. Can the party who accepts a draft send back this draft again without putting any stamp on it?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Under the rulings each is looked upon as a separate transaction. I venture to say that in nine cases out of ten that ruling would never be followed by any banker in ordinary practice.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: It is generally accepted by banks.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: There are any amount of others just to show how hard it is to administer this stamp tax. Take for example where an American bank deposits cheques, drafts, travellers' cheques, money orders, notes and other items on which the stamp tax has been duly assessed, is such American bank entitled to withdraw the same by settlement draft without further tax, provided said settlement draft is payable to order of another bank?

Another little question: In case of customers borrowing under section 88 of the Bank Act, and who conduct a sales and purchase account, is it in order to debit the sales account with the amounts to be applied on the loan, instead of obtaining cheques or bills of exchange to which stamps would have to be affixed?

Another question—and I might go on ad infinitum—upon the request of a customer, may his account be debited with the cost of drafts—foreign or domestic—sold to him, without obtaining from him a cheque or any other form of requisition on which stamps would have to be affixed? Another question: In case stamps have to be affixed to cheques or other requisitions for drafts, must similar stamps be affixed to the drafts also? I do not suppose it is worth while going on with the mess, Mr. Chairman. I will ask this question: Under this mixed-up law, in connection with which so many questions can arise and so many different rulings can be given, how is the collection of the tax checked?

Mr. BUREAU: Does my hon. friend want to know the amount we get from the tax?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: No.

Mr. BUREAU: What, then?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: How is the collection of the tax checked?

Mr. BUREAU: Does he mean by that, how do we collect on cheques?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: No, I did not ask that. I know you do not do the work; I know the banks are doing it. But how do you check the work of the banks?

Mr. BUREAU: That I cannot answer.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I was quite sure that my hon. friend could not answer, because it is not done.

Mr. BUREAU: The law provides for that. A banker is not to accept a cheque unless it bears the stamps. Does the law not say that? Now, the bankers are a lot of men whom I think we ought to have confidence in. My hon. friend seems to have, anyway; their rulings are accepted by him as the law. Now, we cannot check smuggling, although smuggling is against the law, but whenever we catch an offender we punish him. If the banker accepts a cheque to which no stamp is affixed, he is liable to penalty. We presume the bankers are doing their duty; they are helping us to collect the revenue of the country. Unless they want to render themselves liable to penalty they do not cash cheques unless the proper stamps are affixed thereto.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend says the bankers' rulings have my respect. I am not giving them any. It is my hon. friend's department that is doing it.

Mr. BUREAU: What?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Giving this great respect to rulings of the banks.

Mr. BUREAU: Yes, you have.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Now, I wish to ask another question.

Mr. BUREAU: I will not be cross-examined here.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Well, my hon. friend may not be willing to answer the question; nevertheless I will put it and he may answer it if he likes. He has said there is a penalty in connection with these stamps. Will he tell us what that penalty is?

Mr. GAUVREAU: The cheque is no good; that is the penalty.

Mr. BUREAU: The penalty is mentioned in the act. If the cheque bears no stamps, he is liable to penalty. If it bears only a two cent stamp, there is no penalty; it was omitted last year.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Of course it was omitted.

Mr. BUREAU: My hon. friend thought he was going to catch me.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: No, because—

Mr. BUREAU: Is my hon. friend going to say that he told me about it? He did not tell me; I spoke to him about it. I asked him how he would draw the amendment.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend said a moment ago that there was a penalty.

Mr. BUREAU: Yes, there is.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: There is no penalty except that which is provided for failure to place the initial two-cent stamp on the cheque.

Mr. BUREAU: Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: There is nothing provided as a penalty for the omission to affix any stamps in excess of two cents.

Mr. BUREAU: I admit that.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Very good; now, what is the penalty as against the banker?

Mr. BUREAU: Oh well, if my hon. friend wants to play that game; if he wants to get smart, let us go out in the open, get a mattress and have it out. This is not carrying on the business of the country. He knows very well that the penalty was imposed by himself when the law respecting the two cent stamp tax was enacted.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: As to the two cents it is all right; but where is the penalty on the bank for not seeing to it that the proper amount of stamps in excess of two cents is affixed?

Mr. BUREAU: I will ask my hon. friend a question: When the law respecting the two cent stamp tax was enacted, was that his law or not?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Yes.

Mr. BUREAU: Was a penalty put on them?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Yes.

Mr. BUREAU: Then it is there, and he knows all about it.

[Mr. Bureau.]

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Yes.

Mr. BUREAU: Then what is the use of keeping that knowledge away from the public?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The whole thing is too plain for words. There is a penalty for not affixing the two cent stamp, but absolutely nothing in respect to the multiplication of stamps involved in the tax above that amount.

Mr. BUREAU: I admit that was omitted.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It was. Now as I say, it is unnecessary to go on multiplying instances—

Mr. BUREAU: We know what your knowledge is—now quit.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: If my hon. friend wants a lot more questions I will give them to him, but a moment ago he said he did not want to be examined.

Mr. BUREAU: No, I do not want them. You had better answer them for the benefit of the House and of the public.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am not supposed to tell the government what it is to do in all these things; in any case, they would not take my word for it.

Mr. BUREAU: You are supposed to tell us what you know, anyway.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It would take too long if I told all I know about the mismanagement of this administration.

Mr. BUREAU Publish it—Webster's dictionary.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I submit in all seriousness to the Minister of Finance that he has a tax which has not been and cannot be equitably enforced. He has a tax which is illogical, a tax the receipts from which he himself does not know, a tax which—he will correct me if I am wrong—is not imposed in any other civilized country. So far as the stamp tax on cheques is concerned, the minister is putting Canada just where he claimed the vote on oleomargarine was putting it the other day. Why should a tax of this kind be further insisted upon? My hon. friend has given some relief; he has taken the maximum tax on cheques down to one dollar. Why not make a fixed rate on cheques. Why not have two cents for cheques up to $50 and five cents, if you like, for all cheques in excess of that amount? Why not, at any rate, have some specified amount so that everybody will know what the law is? And if that cannot be done, what logical

reason in the world is there for giving the relief upon cheques of the larger sums instead of the smaller sums? Why not leave the cheques in the higher registers as they were and absolve from this multiplication of stamps all cheques, for example, under $500? If there is to be any relief, let us have it where it will do some good. Why stick to relief in the upper registers instead of the lower, instead of in those cases where the people concerned are those who really require assistance?

Mr. FIELDING: My hon. friend is imagining difficulties which to the best of my knowledge and belief have no existence. He suggests that the tax is not being and cannot be collected. All I can say in that respect is this: The information that has come to me is that the tax can be collected; it is being collected, and it is a very considerable source of revenue. As for the action of the banks in the matter, my hon. friend may have seen some banker who disapproves of it, but I believe the banks are doing their duty in collecting the money, and there are penalties if they do not do it. I say that my hon. friend is imagining difficulties for the sake of offering criticism.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I cannot understand my hon. friend saying that when a moment ago he told me I could easily ask him fifty questions that he could not answer.

Mr. FIELDING: Yes, I said fifty; make it one hundred if you like. You can ask all sorts of questions with regard to the interpretation of any act that for myself I would not undertake to answer. If my hon. friend has any real questions to put; if he really wants information, I shall be happy to inform him as best I can. But I do not think my hon. friend does want information. He is as capable of judging these disputed points as any person else, and I am quite sure that he knows more about these matters than he is willing to admit.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The minister does not get my point at all. What I am saying is that we have no right to have a law that is so complicated.

Mr. FIELDING: That is a matter of opinion, not of fact.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It is not that I want the information. I have it; I have looked it up. But I am going to give my hon. friend these questions, and by the time he has gone through them and got the answers right he will find that this is a complicated thing and complicated in a way in which it ought not to be.

Mr. NEILL: I do not wish to assume the attitude of matching my puny financial knowledge against that of the Minister of Finance. That would be absurd, but this question is one that interests everyone. It comes right home to us all. I have been trying to digest the answer the minister gave me half an hour ago in connection with changing the maximum on big cheques from $2 to $1, and if I have followed his answer right it is this: He said that in certain transactions it became necessary to issue a cheque for the same amount practically two or three times, and consequently the parties to that transaction paid two or three times over, which was really unreasonable, and therefore he made this change. Now I cannot see—it may be my lack of financial ability—that that is logical. I recall a case some months ago in which I was involved in a transaction for $1,700 or $1,800 as near as I remember, and before that transaction was complete somebody had to pay the stamps three times on that $1,800. Under the amendment proposed by the Minister of Finance to-night I will still have to pay three times on $1,800, or three times if the amount was $3,000 or $4,000. That gives me and people of that class no relief whatever. If we were allowed to add these three amounts together then it would be logical, but it does not say that. It says if you have any transaction involving the payment once, twice or three times of a sum under $5,000 you will pay it every time, but if it is only one transaction you will only have to pay once. It is not logical either as applied to the big man, because he will have to pay three times the minimum anyway if the transaction involves two or more cheques. I cannot see how it is logical on that argument to make the change. In view of the necessity of money—and I am not aware there is any intense demand for this change—I would be willing to vote for an amendment to leave the amount at $2.

Mr. FIELDING: I might mention that an argument was used that on the border where accounts might be kept on one side of the line or the other, the effect of this tax was to induce people to withdraw their money from Canadian banks and keep it on the American side. I thought there was some force in that although possibly the argument was strained.

Mr. HANSON: Does the minister think he is meeting that objection by reducing the tax from $2 to $1. I think the reason will still prevail and that accounts will be withdrawn to American banks. That is a very

real condition on the American border. A great deal of money on deposit in Canadian banks by American citizens residing along the border has been withdrawn just as a result of this stamp tax.

Mr. GOULD: I wish to endorse the sentiments expressed by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni. If it were a matter of equity alone I think the Finance Minister would be more warranted in making the maximum tax $3 instead of $1. As the hon. member for Comox-Alberni has pointed out, in the case of the individual who writes a cheque below that amount, more particularly the man of small means who cannot write cheques for large sums of money, the same argument applies. The argument of the Finance Minister is just as applicable to cheques of $10 and $25 as to cheques for a larger amount. I have some sort of an idea in the back of my head that in the case of individuals who are favoured with a $1 tax on a $5,000
10 p.m. cheque the law of gravitation applies, and perhaps that is the only benefit a smaller man would get. In sending out a cheque covering co-operative shipments, for instance, they would get the benefit in being able to send out a large sum of money in one cheque but it would be made up of a number of small cheques going to the parties who make up the shipment. As one hon. member has suggested, in the case of a man who is obliged to go into debt and borrow money to meet an obligation, it does seem to me that he should not be fined for that. It is bad enough for the individual who is fortunate enough to have money on deposit. We will not have very much sympathy with him if he is fined, but the man who has been obliged to go and borrow money to keep himself in business standing, and I speak from experience, is fined at the present time. I think it was earlier in the session that I pointed out that this government was not the only one that might be termed guilty. The former government when individuals bought school lands, for instance, and made a solemn contract with the government to pay 5 per cent, and through some visitation of Providence they were unable to meet their obligations, increased the rate of interest two per cent. That is the thing that people are protesting against, that when in difficulties over which they have no control the powers that be sit on them and fine them a greater amount. I do not think it is fair or just that people who through no fault of their own get into such circumstances, should be obliged to furnish the revenue of this country, when in my humble judgment other and better means could be found.

[Mr. Hanson.]

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Can the minister give the committee an estimate of the reduction in revenue that will be caused by reducing the maximum tax on large cheques from $2 to $1.

Mr. FIELDING: I could not at the moment. I am not sure whether it could be done at a later stage or not. I doubt if it could be done. If it could be done I would be very willing to get it for my hon. friend, but offhand I could not tell him.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: I would just like to join with the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Gould) and the hon. leader of the Independent group (Mr. Neill) in voicing my protest against the special privilege given to corporations, companies and financial institutions in this reduction from a maximum of $2 to $1. I find by figuring that the largest sum of money on which a company will pay a tax at the rate of 2 cents for $50 is $2,500. They will pay a tax of $1 on that sum. If a farmer should be fortunate enough to get that much, on the basis of paying 2 cents on an average of $25, he would pay $2, or double the amount. On a cheque for $10,000, and many of our large corporations pay $10,000 cheques quite frequently, the maximum amount they would pay would be $1, while if a farmer should by some unknown method be able to realize $10,000 in a year's operations and pay it out on the basis of $25 amounts he would pay a tax of $8, or eight times the amount that the strong financial corporation would pay. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that this is unduly penalizing "the under dog," if I might use the expression. Of course, the "bark" is pretty well out of the under fellow now. He might not "bark" very much at this moment, but there is a little "bite" left in him, and he may "bite."

Mr. FIELDING: The arguments of several hon. gentlemen would almost lead to the idea that we should have a graduated tax without limit on cheques and documents. I confess that at one stage that seemed to me to be a fair proposal, but on further consideration it was found not to be expedient. Therefore the maximum was fixed at $2, and now it is proposed to reduce it to $1. I think my hon. friend is mistaken in imagining there is anything in this that is levelled at the farmer. We are all interested in the larger transactions of business. We do not want to crowd big business all the time, and I think the concession that is given, whether it is big business or not, from $2 to $1, is a reduction which ought to be accepted by the House. At first glance a tax graduated simply according to the size of the cheque might appeal to some hon. gen-

tlemen, but I think on reflection they will find it would not do at all.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think the general consensus of opinion here is not only against graduating indefinitely, but against graduating at all. If we could only get a small flat tax we would all know about it. I propose to move in amendment the following:

That no addition be made to the 2 cent stamp on cheques until the amount of such cheque be $500 or greater.

The effect of that would be that there would be no graduated scale on cheques until $500 is reached.

Mr. LEWIS: I hardly know what to say about this amendment, but I did think in the first place the maximum might be reduced to $1 on the larger amounts. It seems to me it would be a good thing to start at the other end also. I do not know about the transaction of $500 with the 2 cent stamp, but there are a great many smaller transactions, say, of $4 and $5. It would be lifting a burden from the poorer people if the stamp tax were removed altogether, say up to $20 cheques. I find that in the case of the family man the stamp tax sometimes leads to what might be called a little extravagance. For instance, I notice that in the West, when a man receives a certain amount of money for a shipment of grain, instead of placing that money in the bank and utilizing the bank, he keeps the money at home, with the result that very often money is expended on things that would never be purchased at all if the money were safely deposited in the bank. If the minister can see his way clear, not only to help the financial interests by reducing the maximum stamp tax to $1, but also to have the stamp tax taken off altogether in regard to cheques under $10, I think it would be a great benefit to the people.

Mr. FIELDING: With reference to the amendment proposed by the hon. member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton); at the present time a cheque for $500 would pay a 20 cent tax. My hon. friend proposes to reduce that tax to 2 cents. I do not think the House ought to make such a reduction. I think we need the money. I do not think it is a proper motion, and I hope the committee will not agree with my hon. friend.

Mr. RYCKMAN: I desire to oppose this tax on the grounds already stated and on two additional grounds. It is well known that taxes generally are unpopular, but this is certainly the most unpopular tax ever levied in Canada. I know that the Minister of Finance must have the money and I appreciate the situation in which he is placed in that regard. If it is necessary to impose taxes in some other way, all right; but relieve us of this stamp tax on cheques. I know that the Minister of Finance in the past has considered suggestions made to him, and while I would not offer him advice, I would like to present the most urgent plea. My first objection to this tax is one that has not been given voice to in the House tonight. We find cheques with a score and more of these stamps on them. The minimum cheque tax is 2 cents, and the provision starts with a 2 cent stamp tax. Then in the case of a larger amount, the cheque will have a number of these stamps affixed to it, and it is a disgusting and unsanitary nuisance to have to affix these stamps to cheques. It is irritating in the extreme. I hope the Minister of Finance will live a long time, but after he is gone he will be well remembered, and the only thing that will militate against his reputation will be when these cheques are produced, as they must be hereafter, in generations to come, the people will wonder why, in 1923, we ever submitted to the disgusting practice of affixing stamps to cheques, and why it was that we could find no better way of raising money. The minister intimated that he did not know that the bankers objected very much to this. I heard, within a very few days the manager of a bank refer to this taxation as "Fielding's filthy licking stamp tax," and those who have had experience know exactly what that means. We would gladly pay for that irritation, if we could get rid of it. It is all very well if you can indent the stamp on the cheque, but to go through the practice with ten or twenty stamps is very irritating, and I think the Finance Minister, in the kindness of his heart, should relieve us of it.

I have another objection. There are many bills that have to be paid by a certain date. In the city we have the taxes, the water rates, and the gas bills to pay; and the merchants at times avail themselves of discounts if they can pay before a certain date. At least three instances have come under my notice where a very considerable sum was lost by reason of the fact that after office hours, and after the banks were closed and stamps were not available at the post office, the cheques could not be sent out. A direct loss resulted on account of the parties not having sufficient stamps. You cannot tell what provision to make in a case of this kind, and the result is that the irritation is repeated. Loss results, and the whole thing is so unpopular that I submit, in the interests of the country, of business, and of the Fi-

nance Minister's immortality, this tax should be removed.

Mr. SHAW: I would like to ask the hon. mover of the amendment if he is really accomplishing the purpose he seeks to accomplish by it. Suppose, for instance, the amendment were given effect to, and a man wanted to issue a cheque for $2,500; at the present time he would be called upon to pay $1. If the amendment were in effect all he would have to do would be to issue five cheques of $500 each, and he would be called upon to pay a tax of 10 cents. It seems to me the amendment is not effective for the purpose the hon. member has in view.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The hon. member has not caught the idea of the amendment, which was, in the first instance to help the man who I thought required assistance in this country—the man who was issuing small cheques. I wanted to keep the tax down to 2 cents. I think $500 would fairly cover all these small cheques. In the second instance, from the other end, the absurdity of this graduated tax on cheques is abundantly shown. Of course, it is all right to show the absurdity at the other end, just as was shown by the hon. member for Kindersley (Mr. Carmichael) a moment or two ago —quite all right to show that the $10,000 cheque in the one instance pays $1 and the $10,000 cheque in the other instance pays $8. It is all right to show the anomaly there. Of course, you show the anomaly when you pay it at the other end just the same, but that is no answer to it. The answer is that there ought not to be a graduated tax on cheques, and if you are going to get away from the graduated tax on the small cheque, there is no other way of doing it.

Amendment (Sir Henry Drayton) negatived.

Mr. FORKE: I should like to say, in prefacing the amendment which I intend to move, that the remark has been made tonight that this is a very unpopular tax. I suppose all taxes are unpopular.

Mr. RYCKMAN: This is the most.

Mr. FORKE: Perhaps it is; but I can recollect for fifty years back seeing stamps on cheques and receipts. That has been an old-established custom in Great Britain for many years.

Mr. RYCKMAN: One stamp only.

Mr. FORKE: I cannot remember; I cannot go back and make any statement as to the amount; but as long as I remember I have seen stamps on receipts and cheques. I move, however, in amendment:

That the words "reduced to" in the fifth line of clause 1 be struck out, and the words "two dollars" be substituted for the word "one dollar" in the same line.

That is putting the maximum tax back to two dollars as it was before.

Mr. FIELDING: May I suggest to my hon. friend that while he can move a reduction in the tax, I do not think he can move to increase it. He is supposed to be in favour of reducing taxation, not in favour of increasing it.

Mr. FORKE: I suggest to the minister that he accept the proposition.

Mr. FIELDING: You can take almost any item of our system of taxation and show that it is very unpopular. My hon. friend is right: all taxation is unpopular. Please keep this in mind: We need the money, and if you are going to reduce the revenue from this source, you may have to find it somewhere else. We cannot afford to give up any considerable revenue of this kind, and I am bound to say from all the information I have—

Mr. KNOX: This will produce more money.

Mr. FIELDING: I think not in this case. I think not. There are cases where reduced taxes will produce more money—my hon. friend is right at times—but I think in this case it would not. I think the proposal to reduce the tax to one dollar is a reasonable one, and I earnestly ask the committee to consider the matter and to accept these changes.

Mr. STEWART (Humboldt): Do I understand the minister to say that he thought reducing the maximum to one dollar would bring in as much as if it were two dollars?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): That might very well happen.

Mr. FIELDING: The point I raised was that the hon. member (Mr. Forke) could not move to increase the tax. I think it is possible the maximum of one dollar may produce as much money as the two dollars. There are cases where reduction of taxation brings in more money. On the merits of it, however, as a fair tax, I think one dollar is a very moderate charge to make, and I might reasonably ask the committee to stand by it.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I wish the minister would have that view with regard to the tariff.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The minister wants more revenue. A ruling has been given in connection with receipts. We are not chang-

ing receipts at all now apparently, and I suppose this is the best place to refer to it. More money is required and there has been a ruling in connection with receipts, in connection with certain forms of letters, forms of printed letters and the like, postcards, which obviates the necessity of paying a tax on the receipts, on the idea that the same instrument has already paid a tax. If my hon. friend wants more money, that is one thing he might consider.

Mr. FIELDING: That will be considered.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Another thing that the minister might consider is this: The receipt stamp, having regard to cheques, is disappearing entirely. My hon. friend is really losing money in connection with his receipts. This is a form of cheque which is now used by railway companies. The face of the cheque reads:

In full payment for services rendered during the month of....

The endorsement reads:

This cheque is accepted by me in full payment and satisfaction of all claims for services rendered as specified in the body of the cheque. I also hereby acknowledge to have received the amount this cheque calls for.

According to the ruling of the department, there is no stamp attached to that.

Mr. BUREAU: There is to the cheque. The same ruling applies.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Owing to the ruling of the department, no stamp whatever is attached to the receipt, because the department rules that the instrument, that is the cheque, has been stamped. The instrument has never been stamped at all. The cheque is one thing and the receipt is another. If we are really going to have fairness in connection with the enforcement of the law as regards receipts, we must see that this is not merely an endorsement of the cheque for the purpose of drawing the money. It reads in so many words that it is an acceptance—

In full payment for services rendered during the month of. . . . I also hereby acknowledge to have received the amount this cheque calls for.

There are some 300,000 of those cheques issued monthly in Canada with those receipts which under the ruling of the department, have not to be stamped. But there is another thing my hon. friend will find is going on throughout the country. I am reading the form now from a sample invoice. There is a new way of getting out invoices that are perforated at the top. The customer is asked·

Kindly return this part of the statement with your cheque.

That is just the top part of the invoice. You retain the invoice which shows you what you have. At the bottom of the invoice is printed:

An endorsement of cheque is your receipt. No other acknowledgment will be forwarded unless specially requested.

So you have to send a special letter now in many cases if you want a receipt. The whole fact of the matter is that, under the present rule the department is losing money on its receipt law and regulations. Why, instead of getting answers now, you do not get any answers at all. You send a cheque with a bill and you do not get any reply. The government loses the two cents which it would get for the postage, or if the letter is sent out of town, three cents, and it is not getting the additional two cents. It is plainly printed upon the top of the statement:

Kindly return this part of the statement with your cheque.

Under the statement is printed:

An endorsement of your cheque is your receipt. No other acknowledgment will be forwarded unless specially requested.

I am afraid this is only another way of annoying the public without raising revenue.

Mr. FIELDING: If my hon. friend imagines that you can put on the statute books any law that somebody cannot evade for a time, I have no such confidence. Every law is evaded for a while until, in the light of experience, you can meet the difficulty, and this is not the exception. I am not astonished to find that some people are evading this law. We shall be glad to be able to deal with those cases. The mere fact of an evasion of the law is not proof that a law is wrong.

The CHAIRMAN: A point of order is raised by the Minister of Finance. I quote from May 12th edition, at page 462:

The principle that the sanction of the Crown must be given to every grant of money drawn from the public revenue, applies equally to the taxation levied to provide that revenue.

The footnote, No. 5, states:

When it appeared from the debate that an amendment proposed to a resolution reported from the Committee of Ways and Means would increase the charge, the Speaker ruled the amendment out of order.

As this amendment is to increase the charge, I rule that it is not in order.

Mr. NEILL: I would suggest the following amendment which I think would be in order:

Strike out the words "reduced to one" in the fifth line and insert the word "two", and add at the end of the line "and the minimum amount to be two cents on one hundred dollars."

The effect of that will be to reduce the revenue sufficiently to bring the amendment in order, and yet it will make no substantial reduction. The smaller cheques would pay only two cents on $100, and on the larger ones the maximum would be $2 as it is at present.

Mr. FIELDING: That is the same thing in another form.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It cannot be the same thing in another form, because one does one thing and another something else. The one is objected to because it raises revenue, but this is a reduction.

The CHAIRMAN: The amendment proposes to strike out the words "reduce to one" in the fifth line, and to add at the end of the line the words "the minimum amount be two cents on $100."

Mr. NEILL: I do not think you have quite correctly read the amendment, Mr. Chairman. Perhaps my writing is not as good as it might be. The amendment proposes to strike out the words "reduce to one," and insert the word "two" in the fifth line, and to insert at the end of the line the words "and the minimum amount shall be two cents on one hundred dollars." The effect is very simple. You san issue a cheque for any amount up to $100 for two cents, and above that the present law would operate, of two cents for every $50; and when it came to large sums the maximum, as at present, would be $2 instead of $1. The general effect would be to ease the tax on the small amounts, and to keep it as before on the large amounts; but in the total the reduction would be very little.

Mr. FIELDING: The hon. member proposes to make $2 the maximum.

Mr. NEILL: That is only a part of the amendment.

Mr. FIELDING: But that part I have correctly stated.

Mr. NEILL: That is only half of it.

Mr. FIELDING: It therefore does increase the taxation—from one to two dollars.

Mr. NEILL: But the amendment should be taken in its entirety.

Mr. FIELDING: Surely.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I want to raise a point of order myself. I think we are all under a misapprehension. This does not come into effect until the first of August, so that it is not yet within the inhibition of the ruling. We are not raising the tax; we are simply keeping it as it is to-day.

[Mr. Neill.]

Mr. FIELDING: The ruling applies to the papers before us.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think not; I think we are ruling on the effect of the papers before us, and the basis of the ruling is that if the motion were given effect to we should be adding to the rate of taxation, which we are not doing.

Mr. FIELDING: In the first place, the first of August clause is not yet adopted; but I do not dwell on that point. The question is as between the motion that is placed before the Chairman and the amendment and there can be no doubt about the effect of the amendment.

Mr. BAXTER: I rather think that the question must be decided by the burden to be imposed on the people. The proposal would be all right so long as it did not increase the burden on the subject, and that theory must be borne out by the authorities. I invite the committee to consider the point, because otherwise we are reduced to a state of abject helplessness.

The CHAIRMAN: Before the point is debated any further, I desire to cite May for the information of the committee. At page 462 there appears the following:

> The principle that the sanction of the Crown must be given to every grant of money drawn from the public revenue, applies equally to the taxation levied to provide that revenue. No motion can therefore be made to impose a tax, save by a minister of the Crown, unless such tax be in substitution, by way of equivalent, for taxation at that moment submitted to the consideration of parliament, nor can the amount of a tax proposed on behalf of the Crown be augmented, nor any alteration made in the area of imposition.

On the same page there is a quotation from the House of Commons Debates of the British parliament. I shall read it:

> Thus on the 12th April, 1916, the Chairman, in allowing an amendement to be moved in committee on the Finance (New Duties) Bill with the object of altering the method of levying a new tax, insisted that the amendment should be so framed as not to increase the charge that would be imposed on any individual payer of the tax
>
> When it appeared from the debate that an amendment proposed to a resolution reported from the Committee of Ways and Means would increase the charge, the Speaker ruled the amendment out of order.

The question arises whether the amendment now before the Chair would increase the taxation on any individual taxpayer, or would alter the area of imposition.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Does it not rather turn on the question as to whether or not the increase has reference to a tax that is now existing and not to any charge proposed to be made effective?

Mr. BUREAU: May includes taxation proposed.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think the rule has reference to new taxation rather than old.

Mr. BUREAU: The quotation which the Chairman read from May refers to proposed taxation, which is the present case.

Mr. BAXTER: No, to taxation in existence.

Mr. BUREAU: We are not discussing taxation now levied, we are discussing proposed taxation.

The CHAIRMAN: Let me just quote again the last words of the authority I cited:

> Nor can the amount of a tax proposed on behalf of the Crown be augmented, nor any alteration made in the area of imposition.

Mr. BUREAU: That clearly refers to proposed taxation.

The CHAIRMAN: I must rule that the amendment would in effect augment taxation and alter the area of imposition. It would increase the taxation on some individual taxpayer, and I must therefore rule it out of order.

Mr. NEILL: If I may be allowed to add to what I have already said, Mr. Chairman, I may point out that while the amendment will increase taxation on some individuals, we must remember that although in the maximum he would pay a little more he will get the benefit of the minimum provision, so that what he loses at one end he will gain at the other. As regards the area of imposition, the amendment proposes no change whatever. If I were suggesting the infliction of a tax on a man who owns a motor car that would be changing the area of taxation, but it cannot for a moment be considered that you are changing the area of imposition in this case because it is confined strictly to the original class of taxpayers affected namely, those who issue cheques. I therefore do not see how the amendment can be ruled ont of order on that ground; and as I have already indicated, the taxpayer ultimately will not have to pay any more, but rather less.

Mr. BUREAU: It affects the individual taxpayer so far as the amount is concerned, because it increases the maximum from one to two.

Mr. NEILL: In an individual instance, yes. But I maintain, and I think it will be admitted by everyone, that while the taxpayer may pay a little more at one end he will in the long run gain what he lost in that direction, because of the saving in regard to the lower amounts. The general result must be to reduce taxation to the individual. I submit that the amendment must be taken as a whole. You cannot discuss one section of it for the purposes of one line of argument, and then take another part of it for some other argument. That is not logical. I say that the amendment in the end reduces taxation instead of increasing it, and that I am sure is the spirit of May's ruling. I would point out, however, that while this is a comparatively trivial matter, it is a matter of great importance so far as the ruling is concerned, because that ruling will govern the House in years to come.

Mr. FIELDING: No man can possibly tell how much the individual will gain at one end and lose at the other. You must deal with the individual case, and in the individual case there is to be increased taxation.

The CHAIRMAN: I must rule upon the authorities which I have cited to the committee in the discussion of this point of order that this does increase the charge which would be imposed on any individual payer of the tax, and that on the other hand there is an alteration in the area of imposition that is being placed upon a certain class of individuals who fall within this rule; therefore I declare the amendment moved by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill) is out of order.

Amendment (Mr. Fielding) agreed to.

Resolution agreed to.

EXCISE TAX ON WINES

Mr. FIELDING: I beg to move resolution No. 2, Mr. Chairman, on the same page:

> 2. That after a date to be fixed by proclamation of the Governor in Council the excise tax on wines of all kinds, except sparkling wines, containing not more than forty per centum of proof spirit be reduced to seven and one-half cents per gallon, and the excise tax on champagne and all other sparkling wines be reduced to one dollar and fifty cents per gallon.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I really think my hon. friend must feel it is very unkind that this resolution is printed right after the resolution dealing with the stamp duty on cheques. There was only one argument why people should pay the tax—that the minister wants the money. Then in the very next resolution, which is now before us, he is cutting in two the taxes on champagne and sparkling wines. I am afraid my hon. friend is not consistent. We all know why. We all know the mess he has got into by reason of the French treaty.

Mr. FIELDING: That is the unkindest cut of all. Hon. members on my friend's

side complained of the advantage given French wines under the French treaty, and we at once stated we would deal with native wines if they would wait patiently. Now we are dealing fairly and equitably with these my hon. friend is unhappy.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Not at all. I think it is the inevitable result of the French treaty.

Mr. LEWIS: What was the tax before?

Mr. FIELDING: Thirty cents and three dollars.

Mr. LEWIS: This is an instance where by reducing the duty it is expected people will drink more wine and consequently there will be a greater revenue?

Mr. FIELDING: This is in order to place native wines in an equitable position with respect to French wines.

Resolution agreed to.

CONFECTIONERY AND BEVERAGES

Mr. FIELDING: The next resolution deals with the sales tax. I do not want to go on with it to-night. I propose to proceed with No. 4 in the latter part of the resolutions. I move:

That Schedule 1 to the said act be amended by striking thereout the items respecting confectionery and beverages.

That is one of the items announced in the budget speech and fully discussed some time ago.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Marcil, Bonaventure): Shall the resolution carry?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Yes, resolutions 4, 5, 6 and 7:

4. That Schedule I to the said act be amended by striking thereout the items respecting confectionery and beverages.

5. That Schedule II to the said act be amended by striking thereout the item respecting beverages and by adding to the said schedule the following item:

"Carbonic acid gas in cylinders, per pound. . . . one cent."

6. That the provisions of the said act respecting stamp tax on receipts be amended by providing:

(i) That paragraph (b) of subsection four of section fourteen of the said Act as enacted by said chapter forty-seven be amended to read as follows: "(b) a receipt or document in the nature of a receipt which is taxable under section twelve of this act."

(ii) By adding provisions for the better enforcement of said section fourteen.

7. That the provisions of this resolution, except the provision proposed by section two, shall come into force on the first day of August, 1923.

Resolutions agreed to.

[Mr. Fielding.]

USE OF POSTAGE STAMPS FOR INLAND REVENUE TAXES

Mr. FIELDING: Mr. Chairman, I mentioned it was proposed to provide that hereafter postage stamps should not be used for inland revenue purposes. The resolution I beg to move on that subject is as follows:

That the resolution respecting the amendment to the special War Revenue Act be amended by adding thereto the provision, that subsection 3 of section 19 of the said act, which provides that postage stamps may be used in lieu of stamps specially prepared in fulfilment of any requirement under part 3, be repealed, and that any enactment founded on this provision shall come into force on the 1st day of October 1923.

The effect of that will be that on and after the 1st October postage stamps will no longer be used, and inland revenue stamps will be required for inland revenue purposes.

Resolution agreed to.

SALES TAX

Mr. FIELDING: Take No. 3, Sir, on the order with regard to sales tax. The substance of this is that instead of the varying rates hitherto imposed we are to impose practically a general rate of 6 per cent. That is the principle involved. The machinery by which it is to be carried out is set forth in the resolution and is not free from difficulty, but we think we have got it in fairly good shape.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I understood my hon. friend did not want to take up the sales tax resolution.

Mr. FIELDING: I laid it aside for the moment, I had other things before me.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am afraid some of the members have left the chamber.

Mr. FIELDING: If my hon. friend wishes that it be postponed, I will agree.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Personally I do not wish to postpone it, but some of the members have left. However, I do not suppose we could finish it to-night anyway. There is a lot yet to understand in connection with it.

Mr. FIELDING: In that case we had better postpone it.

Resolution stands.

Progress reported.

SUPPLY

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

The House again in committee of Supply, Mr. Marcil (Bonaventure) in the chair.

Dominion Lands and Parks—Canadian National Parks and Historic sites, $1,250,980.

Mr. SHAW: Has the department come to any conclusion in connection with the matter of the granting of additional power privileges to the Calgary Power Company in the national park at Banff?

Hon. CHARLES STEWART (Argenteuil, Minister of the Interior): A good many representations have been made against the granting of the application, but so far no conclusion has been reached by the department. I do not intend to move in the matter until I have visited the park during this summer, particularly the Spray lakes, which it is alleged, would be affected by the granting of the application.

Mr. SHAW: What is the policy of the department, either past or present, with regard to applications for power privileges in the national parks?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The present government have not adopted any definite policy. An application was granted on lake Minnewanka in the Banff national park to the company making the application in the present case. I would not like to admit that that was establishing a precedent; however, it will have to be definitely settled whether applications of this kind are to be granted, at least on certain areas that are of considerable importance. I may say that applications have been made, though not actively pressed, for the raising of the levels of Waterton lake for the purpose of irrigation in southern Alberta. Of course that is a question in which the United States government would be interested.

Mr. FORKE: I may inform the minister that I have been receiving telegrams from the West protesting against the granting of any further power privileges in these parks. It seems to be a very lively question in the prairie provinces. I simply call attention to that fact.

Mr. GARDINER: The public parks of Canada have been set apart for the use of the Canadian people. I would like to ask the minister whether he thinks it is within the power of the government to grant such privileges on these areas.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes, it is within the power of the department to do so. We have a bill on the order paper which would put under the control of parliament water-powers as well as other privileges in areas set aside for park purposes, but I may not press that bill. My own inclination is in the direction of reserving these areas purely for the purposes for which they were set aside. But to lay down the hard and fast rule that in none of these areas—and there are immense areas set aside for park purposes in the Rocky mountains—should any power privileges be given, would perhaps be going quite a long way.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not know just what is the minister's mind in the matter, but if I could judge from his last sentence or so, I do not think I am very far removed from him in opinion. I have read some editorial references to the application of some Calgary power company for power privileges on the Spray lakes in Rocky mountains park, or, as it is now called, Banff national park. These references are wholly antagonistic and seem to be based on the supposed principle that when a park is established as such, no use must be made of any of its resources. The point raised by the hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Gardiner) seems to rest on the same assumption, that is to say that since the parks are for the whole people of Canada, no use should be made of the resources therein for any practical purposes. I must support the minister when he intimates that it would be utterly impossible to follow that principle. Why, we do not follow it anywhere in Canada. I am not saying a word on behalf of this particular application. I have had no communication whatever from the company directly or indirectly. I do not know whether its application has the least merit or whether it has not; it may be quite the right thing to refuse it. But to lay down as a general principle that because a power is in a park it is sacrosanct and cannot be made use of seems to me absurd. It is a wholly wrong conception that the use of the power of a water is any less for the public than the leaving of it in nature's state that the public may look at it. I would be very sorry to see anything done in the Banff park that would seriously interfere with its value for scenic purposes or its value as a park, and it might be that no substantial use could be made of that power without such interference with its scenic value as would by no means be compensated for by the use of the water for that purpose. At the same time I would think it should not be impossible to provide by regulation for such construction as would not interfere with its value for scenic purposes, but might indeed improve it. It might not be impossible. If it is not, then unless the power is absolutely essential for public use I would not spoil the park for the power. But what I object to is this general assumption that because we have laid aside certain areas and established there parks we must shut out the hand of man and say: Here you may starve for power, industry

may be utterly without the means of sustenance, the public outside may simply be hanged, we have got to keep this thing a thing of beauty. Why, if that were done at Niagara Falls where would we be to-day?

Mr. FORKE: I do not think there is any general assumption along that line.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Every argument I have seen is based on that. It is not for the sake of a company that the power right is granted. It is because the public need the power. The company has no more claim than any number of people. It has just the same, but it has no more. I have seen articles in American and Canadian magazines about the profanity, the blasphemy of harnessing Niagara Falls and thereby diminishing the flow of water down this great cataclysm of nature. Well, I consider that rubbish. Imagine the people of Ontario to-day with their own backs and hands doing the work that the falls of Niagara are doing, in order that wedding couples could see more water falling over the top! That seems to me ridiculous, and the same is true of Banff national park. I hope the minister will take the greatest care that no matter for what purpose no great substantial injury is done to the scenic beauty of the park—I would not say no matter for what purpose, for if the purpose be great enough I would spoil the whole scenic beauty, but no purpose is great enough to warrant that. I hope every reasonable precaution will be taken to preserve the beauty of the park, but at the same time I hope solid common sense will be used and that especially in those parts of Canada where power is very scarce no rigid rule will be adopted that will shut out the utilization of power merely because it is in a park. That is all I wish to say about it. I repeat what I said at first, I have had no communication from anybody on this subject. I have not the faintest knowledge as to who the company is, but I must say that the appeals I read in the press made a very weak impression on my mind.

Mr. FORKE: I would just like to suggest to the minister that the utilization of these powers be not so much for the benefit of a company but for the use of the people in any case where they are granted.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Hear, hear.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): That goes without saying. I may say in fairness to my predecessors that without adding a single additional provision for safeguarding the public interest, that has been very well taken care of so far as granting water power privileges are concerned.

[Mr. Meighen.]

There seems to be a misconception about the application of the Calgary Power Company. I am speaking neither for nor against them. I am in a different position, having to make a decision, because I have in my department the Water Powers branch, who look at this matter from the standpoint of power, the standpoint which has just been enunciated by my hon. friend, that is, the advantage of having cheap power for the development of industry, and on the other hand I have also in my department the
11 p.m. Parks branch, whose business it is to preserve the scenic beauty of our parks for tourist purposes and as a playground for the people of Canada, and the views of the two branches are widely at variance on this question. The Parks Commissioner takes the ground that we should close the parks absolutely so far as water-powers are concerned. Now I frankly admit I have an open mind on this question. I am keen on scenic beauty, so much so that last summer when this question was very much to the fore I refused the application of the Calgary Power Company to further raise the level of lake Minnewanka. Anybody who has been at Banff knows that lake Minnewanka is within a few miles of the centre of the attractive portion of the park. The Calgary Power Company already have a concession on that lake, and they have increased the lake level, and their application last year was for the purpose of raising it by another ten or fifteen feet. After looking it over I came to the conclusion that it would absolutely destroy the scenic properties of that particular lake. It was very close to where all sightseers of the park come, and obviously if we are to get any return for our investment in our national parks we must keep them attractive enough to draw tourists, and on these grounds I refused the application of the company. They subsequently made application for the Spray lakes. I have not seen them. They are on the other side of the town of Banff. I am not an engineer and cannot tell from a study of the maps just what the effect of raising the level of the Spray lakes would be. However, it is rather an expensive undertaking, and in fact would cost a great deal more than the company would feel warranted in expending at the moment in view of the amount of power they could sell. I think my hon. friend from Calgary is well posted on this question. He represents the city that is most vitally interested, and I believe that the city is somewhat opposed to the granting of the application. I have a perfectly open mind on the question. I want to know what effect it would have on the scenic properties of the park and how it

would affect the river flowing out of the town, because if they draw off a tremendous quantity of water, which they would do in the winter, of necessity the river would be a very small stream for a large portion of the summer while the reservoir was filling up. The reservoir is a huge one, I would gather from a perusal of the maps and plans, but without seeing the actual ground one cannot form a very definite opinion about the matter.

I agree with my hon. friend absolutely that to say that the water-powers of the park shall not be used to serve say that huge area including all the Rocky mountains might be going very far, but on the other hand care should be taken to preserve the scenic beauties of the park. All reasonable precautions should be taken not to impair the scenic properties of our parks, which not only attract tourists but serve as a playground for our own people.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The increase in this item is really alarming, and I cannot see why it is consented to in silence by hon. gentlemen who denounced the voting of about two-thirds of this amount a short time ago. There has been an increase of I think about 20 per cent in two years. What is being done with the money? Where is the tremendous increase going? I have as high an appreciation of the value of our parks as anybody, I think. In fact, I conducted a pretty difficult battle on their behalf against the silent witnesses of this vote, but still I want to know what the extra money is going for.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): My hon. friend I think was not in the House the other evening when this item was pretty fully discussed. The item was left over at the request of the ex-Minister of Finance in order that the leader of the Opposition might have an opportunity of discussing it. There is considerable increase in the item. One of the very heavy increases is due to the fact that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, which operated the mines in the vicinity of Banff, are closing down the mines, and consequently we are unable to secure the electric light that we formerly got from this plant, and we have to take steps to construct a new electric light plant. That will represent $150,000. And indeed that is not all it represents. I think it represents nearer $200,000. We have not capitalized the charges with respect to the parks. All the expenditure being taken out of ordinary revenue, it comes out of one year's appropriation. The same thing applies in the little town of Canmore, where we had a near-epidemic owing to the unsanitary conditions, and we were forced to take precautions against the conditions there which were very bad. We are spending $17,500 to better the sanitary conditions this year. Then at Wainwright we have the problem of taking care of more buffalo than the fenced area will maintain. The herd has grown to about 7,000 head. The area is only capable of maintaining 5,000—I think, much more properly, 3,000. But we are forced to reduce the herd, and as the buffalo are somewhat difficult to handle, we will have to spend $13,000 on the construction of a slaughter house to kill a certain proportion of the animals. I mentioned the other night that we had under consideration the advisability of taking some of the younger animals and turning them loose in the north country, with the herd that we now estimate may be about 2,000 or so, that have gone into that country and are established north of the Hay river along the Mackenzie. But unfortunately we have discovered that we have tuberculosis in the herd, and there is some question as to whether we should allow animals from the parks to mingle with those out on the prairie, where they are undoubtedly free from contamination. We require this amount for that purpose. Then at the Lamont park we have under consideration the advisability of fencing in a larger area for the animals that are there, including a small buffalo herd left there, which I believe was the first buffalo herd in the country. That herd has grown to much larger proportions, and we have to take in a larger area, which will cost $24,000. That practically makes the total increase, or nearly all of it. This might in my opinion under other circumstances be charged to capital account, but the parks appropriations have year by year, no matter what the expenditure amounted to, been charged to revenue account and cleared up in the year in which the work is undertaken. It has the advantage that you are not accumulating any capital charges.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is the minister harnessing the water power to get the electric light?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The Calgary Power Company applied for increased storage on lake Minnewanka, and there was a reservation in the agreement with that company that in the event of the government requiring water for the purpose of producing electric light for their own purposes, they were to have it; and we are taking advantage of that reservation.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am not objecting at all. I was thinking it would be rather inconsistent for us to be harnessing the water and at the same time saying to the public of Canada, "We will not let anybody in

Mr. FORKE: I do not think the right hon. leader of the Opposition is quite correct. I do not think anybody ever said that nobody could get in—not in this House anyway.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not say that any one in this House said it. I mentioned the source from which it came.

Mr. LEWIS: I see there is an increase in the item for the national parks, and possibly quite rightly too. The minister gave one or two reasons why there was an increase. He said we should reserve all historical sites, and two reasons were given why we should do so. One was to induce tourists from other countries to come to see the beautiful spots of Canada. He went on to say these sites and parks were the playgrounds of Canada. That is the point I wish to attack for the moment. If these sites or parks happen to be the playground of the people of Canada, who are the people that are able to look upon them as a playground? At the present time these parks are practically situated in one place in Canada, with the result that there are thousands and thousands of people in Canada who are not able to visit them. As far as Saskatchewan is concerned at the present time, I know of no national park or no national playground that we can visit. Yet we have to help bear the burden. As a large amount of money is being spent almost entirely on one spot, to induce tourists from the United States to come along the national highway which has cost a great deal of money, it seems to me, that certain beauty spots should be placed in other provinces; so that all the people of Canada would have the right to enjoy the national playgrounds, the expense of which they have to bear. Is there any possibility of having a national park somewhere in southern Saskatchewan—not eastern Saskatchewan, around the Assiniboia—but somewhere in the western part of Saskatchewan?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I was going to remark that I think it would be rather difficult even in Saskatchewan to establish a park much closer to my hon. friend than Banff. I may say to him that some of the visitors to Banff come there in Ford cars. They are provided with camping facilities. I was simply amazed to find how many people camp in that way, and visit in Banff park, at very little expense. We are proposing to do something in southern Saskatchewan, in the constituency of my hon. friend, at Estevan and Vidal, where we are making preparations for a park that will be a playground for the people of Saskatchewan, where there is reasonable opportunity for it, and where the cost will be reasonable. We could establish these parks in territory that is not fit for other purposes, and I feel that it would be good business to set aside these areas for this purpose.

Mr. LEWIS: I suggest that there is a beautiful spot on the south Saskatchewan river, in the southern part of Saskatchewan.

Mr. FORKE: The minister has mentioned the fact that Ford cars go there. He means that the farmers are taking advantage of that.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): They do not all go in Ford cars.

Mr. FORKE: It would be only the farmers who would go there in Ford cars. I see how it works out all right.

Mr. LUCAS: Can the minister give any estimate of the amount Canada derives from the tourist traffic at the present time?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): It would be a very difficult estimate to make, but we think that somewhere between fifteen and twenty million dollars is brought into the country in this way. That seems a lot of money but if you go to the Banff hotel and stay there for a day or so, and then go to the other points of interest in Canada and stay for a day or so, perhaps the sum would not seem so extravagant after all.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: I do not oppose the granting of money for our national parks, but I would like to point out that it was my privilege to go to the Banff national park a couple of years ago. Before being permitted to enter I was charged, I think, the fee of $1. In view of the fact that we are donating such a large sum of money under this item, I do not know whether it is fair and equitable to impose on Canadians a penalty on entering their own park which is kept up by their own money. I do not see that it would be inequitable to charge American tourists. I am rather of opinion that the charge is just the same for both American and Canadian tourists. In connection with the Banff national park, I should like to know if the money charged at the toll gate on entering that park is sufficient for the upkeep of the park.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No. I could say at once, without the question being asked, that it does not begin to keep up the expenditure on the park. I think my hon.

friend would realize, driving over the roads alone, that there is a tremendous expenditure in roads for the benefit of the man who pays that dollar and who takes his car into the park. That is not altogether the idea. The idea is to have a complete record of those who enter the park and a knowledge of where they are, because, while 99 per cent of the people who go into the park are careful, one careless individual or one individual letting fire loose can do a tremendous amount of damage. It must be remembered that we must guard pretty carefully, not so much the people, as the park itself, to prevent, for instance, fire from spreading. Then there is the possibility of people in the park destroying animals in an endeavour to get souvenirs in the way of game heads and that sort of thing. All that work is expensive, but still it must be done. My hon. friend will realize that it is an excellent thing for the visitors to see the mountain sheep which are tame and which come down to the roads. That could not be accomplished unless we looked after the visitors fairly carefully. Perhaps 99 per cent of the visitors do not need supervision, but some create trouble for us.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Is it not a fact that the amount levied is the same for American as for Canadian tourists?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: In the opinion of the minister, would it not be wise that a distinction should be made, a smaller charge being imposed on the Canadian tourist and a larger one on the American, who contributes nothing for the upkeep of the park?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I must confess that I have paid the charge on entering the park, and I never thought it was extravagant. It is $1 for your car. You have a week.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Perhaps it is not extravagant for the Canadian, but for the American it should be relatively more.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): That would be a matter of opinion. We do not look upon this as a revenue producer. It is rather more a keeping of someone there in order that we may have an accurate knowledge of who enter the park, who come out, who are in the park.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Has the minister figures to show what the revenue is in the Banff national park for one year?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): About $8,000. That is not exact.

Mr. LEWIS: The minister a few moments ago stated that it was estimated that the tourist traffic coming into Canada was worth in the neighbourhood of from fifteen to twenty million dollars. A few minutes ago we heard the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) say that it was very difficult to raise money. I was wondering whether the Dominion government had found ways and means whereby they could get a share of that fifteen to twenty million dollars coming into the country.

Mr. SHAW: There seems to be an impression in the conversation between the hon. member for Kindersley (Mr. Carmichael) and the minister, that there is a toll levied upon people who go into the park. There is no toll levied on any person going into the park. There is a toll of one dollar charged on a person taking a car in. I think that is the correct situation.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): That is correct.

Item agreed to.

Government of the Yukon Territory:	
Salaries and expenses connected with the administration of the territory..	$ 65,000
Grant to Local Council..	45,00
Grant for maintenance and construction of roads..	80,000
	$190,000

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): In view of the memorial that I understand has just been received by the government from the Local Council, the Territorial Council of Yukon, for an increase in the membership of the council and an increase in the indemnity, what policy has the government decided upon in that respect?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): This is a matter that we have discussed in council in respect to both the memorial received and the representations made by my hon. friend. It is felt that there are two requests, the request that the indemnity be increased, and the request that the membership be increased in view of the Mayo silver strike. While the population of the Yukon is not decreasing, I think within the last couple of years we cannot discover that there has been a very marked increase. For that reason it will appear that they have ample representation in the three members. Perhaps in the location of territory there might be some change, but it would not appear to be advisable to increase the number.

As regards the indemnity, I have some sympathy with the request. Nevertheless, during

all these years they have got along with this amount, and with a population not much more than that of a small-sized city, it would not appear that we would be warranted at the moment in increasing the amount. If the population should increase, then in all probability there would be something to be said in favour of increasing the indemnity.

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): Since the last census returns were made, the population of the Yukon has materially increased owing to the discovery of silver ore in large quantities in that territory. A very important silver mining camp has been established and will continue to grow. I have not the slightest doubt about that. An area which was practically unpopulated before except for a few explorers, is now becoming populated. Towns are being established there and permanent settlement is taking place. That part of the territory is entirely isolated from the older and more settled portions. The constitution of the Territorial Council at the present time is practically that of the legislatures of the provinces. The Territorial Council has the same power to legislate as provincial legislative assemblies have. The suggestion was that the membership of the council, which is now three, the members being elected from the city of Dawson and the town of Whitehorse and one member representing the mining community, be increased to four, and this new mining district be given a member. The indemnity is now the small sum of $400 a year. It was reduced to that sum only in the year 1918 when the late government in a burst of economy picked on that item for purposes of reduction, although they might have saved hundreds of thousands of dollars more properly in other directions. The reduction in this respect was entirely improper and was made without reference to any one in touch with the facts. It was done blindly and the matter should now be remedied. I would ask the minister to take it into consideration, with a view to making a grant in the Supplementary Estimates for the purpose.

Mr. COPP: What was the indemnity previously?

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): At the time of the reduction it was $600 per annum, and some years before that, $1,000. I am sure that in view of the cost of transportation, living and other expenses in that country this is not an extravagant sum.

Item agreed to.

[Mr. C. A. Stewart.]

Government of the Northwest Territories—	
Salaries and expenses in connection with the administration of the Territories, including the erection of buildings and investigation work, etc..	$114,000
Establishing and operating wireless stations, including buildings, etc..	55,000
Administration, N.W. Game Act, etc.. ..	33,500
Northwest Territories, explorations	80,000
Purchase and maintenance of new ship.. ..	40,000
	$332,500

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): As in the case of Banff, we are faced with a difficult proposition to give an adequate service over a very wide area. We have not a telegraph service in the Department of Interior; the service is under the Public Works department and has been rather expensive. We propose this year to substitute a radio service in the north country, putting in a station at McMurray, one at Fort Simpson and another at Dawson, which will enable us to dispense with a very expensive line service running into the Dawson territory, and as well a telegraph service reaching from McMurray northward. That will cost $55,000. It seems a fairly large amount, but fully half of it is expended in the Public Works department on repairs of lines that now give a very indifferent service and which we shall be able to do without. Then we have the expedition to the northeastern shores of Canada, to those islands in the northern sea, where we have to establish ourselves. We sent an expedition last year for which we voted the sum of $45,000, but we found this totally inadequate and had to supplement it by a grant which will come up in the Supplementaries for discussion. We are asking this year for an increase over the $45,000 voted last year of $35,000. We have an old ship belonging to the Marine department, known as the Arctic, which has made several voyages into the northern sea. It is now becoming obsolete; it is very slow and is costly to operate, and it is dangerous to send into these northern seas a ship of this kind, owing to its age. However, we are sending her this year to establish a post at Cape Sabine just off the shores of Greenland, which residents of Greenland cross to Melville sound. More particularly are we anxious to establish this post because Captain McMillan proposes wintering there with an American expedition. It will be recalled that Captain Peary wintered there on one of his expeditions, and we are somewhat fearful of claims being set up to these northern islands. We are desirous of establishing a police force there to maintain sovereignty and hold the islands for Canada. It may be said that they are

not very valuable, but there is evidence of very extensive mineral deposits on the islands, and in future they may become of great value. For that reason we are asking for an increase of $35,000 to send the Arctic back into the north. Further, we have purchased from the British Admiralty a steel vessel that has a speed three times as great as that of the Arctic. That ship will be sent there annually for the purpose of relieving the mounted police force and taking in food. We thought we could put it into commission this year but that is not practicable. It was built in 1920, and is of the trawler type, with a speed of 12 knots and a large capacity for fuel. It was not built for northern waters, and will have to be reinforced in the hull.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Why not take one of the Merchant Marine boats?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): We had every one of them thoroughly examined, but none of them could be converted for the purpose. Besides, they are slow sailers and speed in this matter is an important factor. This ship cost the British Admiralty $200,000 to construct. We purchased it for $55,000, and it will cost in the neighbourhood of $25,000 to reinforce the hull, but we shall have an admirable ship for the purpose for which it is required.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Where is the rest of the purchase money?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I shall have to ask for a further sum in the Supplementaries in addition to the $40,000.

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): I just want to say a few words by way of comparison of this service, which it is intended by this expenditure to inaugurate in the north country, with the present service and also as to how the cost of the present service has been distributed, and may be materially reduced. I was glad to hear the minister indicate a reduction in connection with the item. I understand it is intended to erect a wireless station at Fort McMurray, one at Fort Simpson, and one at Dawson in Yukon. This item should to a large extent take the place of item 360 under Public Works, to be found at page 62 of the Estimates, which shows a vote of $277,000 for the Yukon telegraphic system. This item, ranging from $275,000 to $300,000, has appeared in the Estimates each year for the past twenty-three years. It has been a hardy annual, and while it is perfectly right that we should pass it this year, I think this should be positively its last appearance. The cost of the administration of government of Yukon would be substantial, if only the amounts legitimately chargeable were included, but when very large items that should be charged elsewhere are charged to Yukon the apparent cost of administration of that territory is much greater than the actual cost.

The establishment and maintenance of the Yukon telegraph line has been a great boon to the people of that country. They are isolated as it is, but without the telegraph lines, particularly in winter, they would be cut off from the world. The line is often put out of business by storms in winter and by forest fires in summer, but it has always been patched up again and communication ultimately restored.

Probably nowhere is a daily telegraphic news service so much appreciated as in Yukon. Notwithstanding the period of contraction the Yukon has passed through, the enterprise and initiative of the proprietors and publishers of the daily paper at Dawson, the Daily News has always been such since the very early days of the gold rush that that paper has never missed an issue on a working day, in addition to which they have frequently published very creditable special editions, expending money very generously to give the public an admirable news service, because you cannot get telegraphic news up there without spending money. The people are solely dependent on that line and the paper to keep them in touch with the events of the day. In winter it takes over a month to get a letter to Dawson from eastern Canada. So the House will realize how important this line is not only for news service but for all business purposes.

The line has always cost a lot of money—much more than it should have cost. It was built on a most improvident and extravagant scale in 1900—twenty-three years ago—and it has been most expensively maintained ever since, but there is no longer any excuse for this service costing the country approximately $300,000 a year. There has been little excuse for the expenditure ever since wireless telegraphy came into practical use. What has been done by this vote to-night should have been done ten years ago. I will point out how a very great saving can be effected annually in connection with this northern telegraph line without impairing the service. In fact my suggestions will, in addition to saving about a quarter of a million dollars a year, materially improve the service.

I am going to give the House a few figures which I think will be interesting, though sometimes figures are not. My authority for these figures is the Auditor General's report

for the year ending March 31st, 1922—the latest report available—and Hansard of this year containing answers to questions as to the expense of the line. In that connection I would point out to the House and to the government not only the unfairness but, I think, the incorrectness of the government's method of keeping its accounts in connection with this very large expenditure. My attention was drawn to this apparent error in book-keeping by the answers given by the government last session to questions asked by the present Acting Minister of National Defence (Mr. Macdonald) as to the costs of administration of Yukon. The amounts stated were astonishing, and I have taken the trouble to examine and analyze the figures. In the first place let us consider the mileage on the land line. The main line in the Yukon territory is 511 miles in length, the branch lines 60 miles, making a total mileage of 571 miles; whereas the main line in British Columbia is 1,226 miles and the branch lines 1,491¼ miles, or a total of 2,717¼ miles in British Columbia, which with the 571 miles in the Yukon territory gives a total of 3,288¼ miles. So that the actual mileage of the line within the territory is not much more than one-fifth of the total. These branch lines extend between points in British Columbia having nothing whatever to do with the Yukon territory—no more to do with that territory than lines in Nova Scotia, yet the expense of them all is charged up to Yukon. For instance, the lines between Hazleton, Port Simpson and Prince Rupert, and between Williams lake and Quesnel Forks, Quesnel Forks and Barkerville, Williams lake and Bella Coola, have nothing whatever to do with Yukon.

The annual cost of maintaining that mileage within the Yukon territory for the main line is $40,599, the cost of maintaing the branch lines is $1,660, or a total of $42,259; whereas the expense of maintaining the British Columbia portion of it is annually for the main line $142,588 and for the branch lines $79,471 or a total of $222,059, making with the $42,259 for Yukon a total for the year ending March 31st, 1922, of $264,318.

Mr. McBRIDE: Will the hon. member give us the figures of the revenue received from the lines in the Yukon and in British Columbia respectively?

Mr. BLACK: Yes, I can and will. The total expense for the year ending 31st March 1922 was, as I have said, $264,318. The amount voted for the year ending 31st March, 1923, was $287,900, and the amount voted this year $277,000. I say of those amounts the proportions fairly chargeable to the Yukon territory are as follows:

Annual cost of maintenance:	
Yukon main line..	$40,599 83
Yukon branch lines..	1,659 90
	$42,259 73

And I say one-half of the annual cost of maintaining the main line in British Columbia is properly chargeable to Yukon, or $71,293.90—in all, $113,553.63 should be charged to Yukon. The amounts fairly chargeable to British Columbia are:

Half cost of maintaining main line in B.C.	$71,293 90
Branch lines in B.C...	79,471 76
	$150,765 66

So that at least $150,765 is annually charged to Yukon that should be charged to British Columbia. This has been going on for over twenty years. As a matter of fact the Dominion government has paid out in that time for British Columbia, and charged to Yukon in connection with the telegraph line, $3,467,-509. The same applies to other federal services in Yukon. Take, for instance, the mail service, about a third of the total charged to Yukon should be charged to British Columbia and for international services—in connection with the mail service in the past twenty years they have charged up over a million and a quarter dollars that should not have been charged to Yukon at all.

Another aspect of this overland line is worth considering—that it parallels the Grand Trunk Pacific line in British Columbia, 159½ miles, which stretch costs annually $47,135 to keep up, and has each year since the Grand Trunk Pacific was built—an absolute waste of money. There has not been the slightest excuse for that expenditure since the Grand Trunk Pacific line was built.

Now, as to revenues. The revenue from the Yukon telegraph system in the year ending 31st March 1922 was $23,279, at a cost of $42,259. That is, it cost almost two dollars for each dollar taken in on Yukon business. The revenue for the British Columbia business was $65,070 at a cost of $222,059. In other words it costs almost four dollars for each dollar taken in on British Columbia business. That is the remarkable state of facts.

But what should be done? I submit that the land line should be abandoned south of the station at Tagish in Yukon and a wireless station established at Whitehorse or Dawson in Yukon territory to connect with Prince Rupert, British Columbia, where they now have a wireless station; or to connect with the wireless at Fort Simpson, Northwest Terri-

tories, and McMurray, Alberta, to be established by the vote now before the committee. The land line should be extended to the silver camp at Mayo, Yukon Territory, or a wireless station should be established at this point, thereby at once creating a remunerative system.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): We are going to bring down an appropriation for that in the Supplementaries this year.

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): In that connection I would like to say that I have been making it my business to try to keep track of the government's plans. I have had very cordial co-operation from the officials of the Department of the Interior in the matter of their plans to lessen the cost of this public service. It is proposed by this vote to establish three stations, at McMurray, Alberta; Simpson, Northwest Territories; and Dawson, Yukon Territory, respectively. In the meantime, in a direct line with these three stations, there has sprung up the mining camp at Mayo, which has no telegraphic communication at all; it is entirely isolated. Upon the matter being taken up with the Department of Public Works the situation so impressed the minister that he decided to put an item in the estimates of this year to extend the land line to the Mayo camp. But when it was found that the Department of the Interior had in view the establishing of these wireless stations, it was decided that a wireless station at Mayo would do all that a land line would do; that it would be less expensive and more efficient. Consequently, as the minister has stated to the committee, a vote is contemplated for the Supplementary Estimates which will also provide for a wireless station at Mayo.

I understand that the establishing of these wireless stations is being undertaken by the Department of National Defence in connection with its army work. That I think is a very fine idea; it is something of use that the Department of National Defence can put its people at. But we all know that in army matters they are supposed to "muddle through." I hope the new Acting Minster of National Defence will be able to inject into that department something like business methods. I have a letter here from the Deputy Minister of the Department of National Defence which would indicate that these business methods have not yet come to pass in that department. The original plan was to build the stations at McMurray, Alberta; Simpson, Northwest Territories; and Dawson, Yukon. Now, the stations at McMurray and Simpson are in the valley of the Mackenzie river, separated by a great range of mountains from the station at Dawson on the Yukon river; there is no relation between the one and the other. In conversation with officials of the Department of National Defence I found that their plan was to send one party forward to do this work, commencing at McMurray, journeying thence to Simpson and from there to Dawson. That trip would take two or three years. They could not possibly go across that chain of mountains and take their equipment. They might perhaps leave their bones on the way. This was their plan of procedure, instead of going about it in a businesslike way and sending two parties at the same time, one into the Mackenzie valley and the other up to Dawson and the Yukon, where they could put up their stations at Dawson and Mayo as separate enterprises. And now the Deputy Minister of National Defence informs me in his communication that, apparently, the department has undertaken more than it can do this season; that they will not be able to put in the four stations, and as the scheme first evolved was to put in the McMurray and Simpson stations this year they feel that they will have to proceed with those and let the stations in the Yukon valley, Dawson and Mayo, go until some other time. In other words, they are putting the cart before the horse, starting in the usual army method to "muddle through." I do hope that the Minister of the Interior will have sufficient influence with the Department of National Defence to have the matter reconsidered and that if any of the stations are to be dropped for this year, which I hope will not be the case, those in the Mackenzie valley will be dropped, because except as connecting stations for the purposes of the business originating at Dawson and Mayo, where the people are and where the business is transacted, these other stations are of no use at all. If they have no connections with these other points, Dawson and Mayo, there will be no business for them. Of course, the few people at McMurray and Simpson might listen to radio concerts from Edmonton, Calgary and Winnipeg, but from a business standpoint, from the point of view of the public service, those stations would be utterly useless. So I trust that the Minister of the Interior will endeavour to induce these army people to commence at the right end of the job.

Now by this establishment of wireless the government will get an increased revenue and will actually save very large sums of money. In the first place, they will cut off from the annual expense of maintaining that land line

no less a sum than $222,000, and the annual cost, instead of $264,000 as it was for the year ending March 31, 1922, will be approximately as follows: Cost of maintaining land line within Yukon as at present, $42,259; cost of extending land line to Mayo, or to establish a wireless there, and wireless at Dawson or Whitehorse, say, $50,000—which is a very liberal estimate—making a total of $92,259 instead of $264,319. There will be a saving of not less than $172,000 for the first year, allowing for construction. The annual expenditures thereafter will be approximately as follows: cost of maintaining land line in Yukon, $42,259; cost of maintaining land line to Mayo or wireless there and wireless at Whitehorse or Dawson, say $20,000 or a total of $64,259 per annum instead of $264,000, a saving of $200,000 a year, with a more efficient service and greater revenue. If we vote this item of $55,000 and about $20,000 in the Supplementary Estimates to cover the cost of constructing the wireless station required at Mayo, during the ensuing years we will save about a quarter of a million dollars annually, and at the same time give a better service. I say this is too important a matter to be overlooked by the government. No question of politics intervenes to embarrass the government or hamper efficiency; it is a plain business proposition, an opportunity to save annually a quarter of a million dollars of public money. I submit that the suggestion is a very practical one; I doubt if the government has received a suggestion much more in the public interest in the course of considering supply this session. I would also like to impress on the government the importance of that inaccuracy or error in book-keeping and that by a more equitable distribution of the expenses of administration the real cost of administering that territory should appear in the public accounts. The impression has been created, and not without cause, that the administration of Yukon has cost a great deal. But there has been a big revenue from that territory, and having regard to the amounts of the annual grants to the provinces, I do not think that when the items are properly adjusted the cost of administration of Yukon will be found to be so very extravagant after all.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I would just like to say a word in reply to my hon. friend in reference to the construction of the wireless telegraph stations. I thoroughly agree with him. Our understanding was and is that all three stations would be constructed. Indeed, pressure was brought to bear upon us early in the winter to come to a decision in the matter in order that they might buy the necessary supplies, because some of them it appeared had to be bought abroad. It was rather difficult because we had to take a chance on parliament voting the necessary supply, but we did take a chance purely in order that the work might be completed this year. My hon. friend can rest assured that anything I can do towards pressing for completion of the stations will be done.

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): I omitted to say that on speaking to the Acting Minister of National Defence this evening and calling his attention to the rather unbusinesslike proposal of his department he assured me he would look into the matter at once and endeavour to co-operate with the Department of the Interior.

Mr. SHAW: Does the Wrangel island vote come under any of these items?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No.

Mr. SHAW: Where can I find it?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): There is no vote for Wrangel island.

Mr. SHAW: Do we own it or not?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I do not think we own it.

Mr. McMASTER: Hear, hear.

Mr. SHAW: I am glad to hear it.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Mr. Stefansson is very much interested in Wrangel island and he is bringing the matter to the attention of the British government.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I thought we were told last year that we owned it. Has there been any change in government policy with regard to Wrangel island? Is this not a case of what we have we hold?

Item agreed to.

Further Supplementary Estimates, 1922-23—North West Territories, explorations—further amount required (Governor General's warrant, January 15, 1923), $60,000.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): This is the item of which I gave an explanation with respect to the expedition that went into northern waters last year.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The money has gone anyway.

Item agreed to.

Further Supplementary Estimates, 1922-23—Canadian National Parks—further amount required (Governor General's Warrants of October 9, 1922, and January 15, 1923), $57,000; to provide for balance of salary of Alfred Larocque, Assistant Power Development

Engineer, Water Power branch, at the rate of $2,200 per annum from October 1, 1922, $60.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is the reason for that $57,000?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): An amount of $22,000 is for settlement as a result of the arbitration proceedings in connection with Minette Hot Springs when the addition to the Banff national park was made into British Columbia. Private parties in England had secured a lease from the government of the Minette Hot Springs for the purpose of putting up a hotel, but inasmuch as we thought it wise to retain these springs action was taken by the government in order to secure them for the park. Arbitration proceedings resulted, and finally there was an adjustment of $22,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Who was the arbitrator?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I cannot say at the moment. Then there was an advance of $35,000 for the purpose of commencing work on the electrical plant. That should be added to the $150,000 that we voted in the regular estimates.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The electrical plant at Banff?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes, those two items make the total.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It seems irregular to issue a Governor General's warrant under the circumstances. There was no emergency there.

Item agreed to.

Main Estimates—Department of the Interior—salaries, $1,502,982; contingencies, $115,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It seems to me this was one of those cases where we had a discussion that stood over.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): There is no change in the number of employees. There is nothing additional here except the statutory increases.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Perhaps that was one of the complaints.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I have no knowledge of any complaint. As this is the last item I have to take up—

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: You should be kept on then.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): If there was any reasonable ground why we should not deal with this item now, if we had had an increase in staff—

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It seems to me that this item stood for some purpose.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): What happened was this: The item was called in mistake for the civil government estimate in connection with the Department of Immigration. The chairman called the item but I drew his attention to it and we went on with the civil government Immigration item.

Item agreed to.

Main Estimates—Legislation—Senate—salaries and contingent expenses, $162,040.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: This item is as presented from the Senate. I think as a rule it goes through more or less formally. It shows a decrease this year.

Item agreed to.

Pensions—Mrs. Wm. McDougall, $1,200.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: There are a few pensions on page 23 of the Main Estimates that parliament has been in the habit of voting annually to the persons named. They are the same as last year. These items were not called when Pensions were being dealt with the other evening.

Item agreed to.

To provide for retiring allowances to former employees of the Department of Public Printing and Stationery, $55,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Has that matter not been exhausted? Was the reorganization not finished?

Mr. MURDOCK: No. This amount will be required for the former employees of the Printing bureau who were retired prior to the passing of the Calder Act, for various periods from one to five years. Some of those periods have not expired yet.

Item agreed to.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I will call the items that I think are non-contentious, and the other items will be held over.

To provide for the administration of the Business Profits War Tax Act, 1916, and the Income War Tax Act, 1917, and amendments. Appointments for the purpose and an additional salary of $4,000 for the Commissioner of Taxation may be made without reference to, and notwithstanding, the provisions of the Civil Service Act, $2,200,000.

Mr. McMASTER: What will the commissioner's salary be with this additional $4,000?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: $10,000.

Item agreed to.

British Empire Exhibition, $500,000.

Mr. McMASTER: That is a very large sum. Is there any explanation?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Perhaps it had better stand.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I may say to my hon. friend that there was some discussion about this matter at the beginning of the session, and commitments were made with respect to it. The Australian government, the New Zealand government, and practically all the overseas dominions, are participating. The Australian government expects to spend over a million and a quarter, and the $500,000 will not anything like meet the expense for Canada, before we are through with this exhibition. This amount is simply for the construction of the building. In all probability, as far as we can judge now, when the total is all in, it will cost $850,000, but we are asking for this sum for the construction of the building.

Mr. McMASTER: Is the minister recommending that, with our budget failing to balance by about $50,000,000, if not more, we should enter on a scheme of further expenditure?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): All I can say in reply is that certain commitments were made in respect to this exhibition when it was discussed in its initial stages, I can say frankly that, it is a very heavy expenditure at this particular time, and it is questionable whether we should continue to participate in exhibitions of this character, but we found ourselves committed to this exhibition, and we found that the other overseas dominions were making heavy expenditures in connection with it. If we go into it, it appears to me we ought do so in a way commensurate with our standing as a dominion, or keep out of it. I do not believe we would be warranted in remaining out.

Mr. McMASTER: When were we committed to this?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): At the discussion that took place in 1921, when the exhibition was first mooted. At that time it was intended to hold it in 1923. It has been delayed for a year. My hon. friend will remember that Colonel Belcher toured the dominions last year on behalf of this exhibition for the purpose of interesting the dominions and the states, that is the states included in the dominions, in the exhibition itself.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not think the hon. member is right if he looks upon this as a legacy. I think it is his own child, but it is probably the best child he has been able to produce. I do not know why he is apologizing for it. He may have a little red blood in his being, and he may want to stand up for it. It is not anything left over; it is the result of the visit of Colonel Belcher.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: When the present government came into office, there was an undertaking, or what was virtually an undertaking that Canada would participate in the Empire exhibition. Colonel Belcher's tour was simply carrying out an understanding reached at the last conference of Prime Ministers in England.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The whole matter was entirely up in the air, in general; there was nothing specific or concrete. Canada was asked if there should be an exhibition, and we said we thought there should be. The whole thing was in the air. I do not know why my hon. friend is apologizing for the exhibition. There is nothing to be ashamed about in regard to it. I should have thought it was something the minister would say he believed was right, or else he was not going to go on with it. I believe he thinks it is right. If we go into it properly, if we are even going to have any proper understanding and to get any proper distribution of the business we require so much at the present time, particularly in view of the existing American tariff, this is the greatest hope, the best chance you have.

Item agreed to.

Supervision of government purchases and sales, including salary of L. R. La Fleche at $6,000, $25,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Stand.

Mr. SHAW: What are the particulars?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: This is to provide, just as the item reads, for the supervision of government purchases and sales. As my hon. friend is aware, there has been and is at the present time a Purchasing commission so called. As a matter of fact, the commission has never had more than one commissioner, Colonel La Fleche. He and his staff have to do with the obtaining of tenders on government contracts. As, however, the system operates at the present time, this commission acts as a body by itself, makes its report to myself as Prime Minister, and I certify whatever is sent to me in presenting matters to council to be passed by council. As a matter of fact, I have never felt that I had any real knowledge of what I was certifying to beyond the statement as sent to me by Colonel La Fleche. I think the system as it is working is anything but satisfactory. I proposed to my colleagues, and I think they are agreed, that a better supervision of government purchases would be obtained if a committee of

council were appointed as a committee to supervise all government contracts and purchases, to which committee there should be attached a permanent secretary who, we propose, would be Colonel La Fleche himself, and that he should have associated with him such members of his staff as might be necessary to enable them to have a supervision over all government contracts. I think that would be a more effective method of maintaining a responsible supervision of government contracts than the present system which leaves the whole matter to one head of a commission, who carries on his own inquiries without any minister being responsible for what is done.

Mr. GOULD: We find now that by this reorganization we save $47,000?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: This is not a reorganization; it is a painful contraction practised almost to the point of extinction as regards real use. At one time we had a commission which did the buying absolutely without the control of the ministers. From time to time departments have made inroads into that, until at the present time, as the Prime Minister says, instead of three men, some of them at least accustomed to making purchases and the like, we now have Colonel La Fleche looking after the matter by himself.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That was the position when we took office.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think the others got out just after the election.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No, they got out long before.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think they read some of the things said in this House beforehand.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I beg my hon. friend's pardon—

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: There is no secret about the attitude taken by my hon. friends in connection with the present commission. If any object is to be gained, it is quite easy to turn up Hansard. The fact is that the departments are now doing their own purchasing. The minister places his contract where he wants to place it. That is the fact to-day. If it is not the fact, I should like to be corrected. The ministers look after their own purchases now, I do not know just exactly—

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Did my hon. friend say "now"?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Yes.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No. I might say that ever since the Purchasing commission was established, certain departments of the government conducted their own purchases wholly irrespective of the commission. Since the present government has taken office, virtually the same practice has been followed as was followed by the previous government. There is but one commissioner, and the different departments make use of him to the same extent as was done before.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Does the Post Office Department make purchases through this commission?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I cannot say at the moment positively, but my recollection is that the Post Office Department does when it has any considerable purchases to make.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Yes, when it has anything the minister thinks does not matter. Will my hon. friends say that the regular supplies in the Post Office Department, for example, are bought to-day through this commission?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I will not be positive on that.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I suggested that this item might stand to be discussed. I am ready to discuss it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I would say that if there are any articles purchased by the Post Office Department that are not purchased by the commission, they will be purchased by public tender in a manner that is entirely regular.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My information is entirely to the contrary. It is that the articles have not been so purchased, and complaints have been made in connection with the department as to that. I suggest that the matter should stand until we have someone here who is looking after it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am prepared to look after it. I will get any information my hon. friend may wish.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I should like brought down to the House before this item is discussed, the advertisements for tenders for public supplies of the Post Office in the last year, the tenders received, the action taken by the commission, and when the commission first heard of the matter.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: All right.

Mr. McMASTER: Before we leave this item, may we look back to a time in the last parliament, when the government of the day

wished to load upon this country with all its shackling powers a commission to purchase everything from brooms up to cars for the railroads; and I remember a brilliant speech made against it by the late Mr. Stewart, afterwards Minister of Railways in the government, of which my distinguished, learned and hon. friend (Sir Henry Drayton) was Minister of Finance. I remember with what bitter criticism from his own side of the House the proposal of this unlimited commissioning of sales was greeted, and I think perhaps that what the Prime Minister suggests is a step in the right direction. We are pleased to see that there is a reduction of some $47,000, and that hope is held out for even more efficient and economical administration. I recall, too, that in the course of that interesting debate it was pointed out by the late Mr. Stewart how much more efficient the number of purchasing agents in the different departments were than people who were brought from outside, and how the worship of machinery did not of necessity bring about that efficiency desired by the taxpayers.

Mr. LAPOINTE: And the two bills were withdrawn at two consecutive sessions.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: If it is a farce why continue the vote at all?

Mr. LAPOINTE: It was done by order in council without any right.

Mr. SHAW: From the little information I have it appears to me that the Purchasing commission acted without jurisdiction. In any event, it seems that they are not functioning to any great extent, so far as many departments are concerned. I am interested in what the Prime Minister says because I have been under the impression for some time, and I propose to give it some effect when the report on the Civil Service committee is submitted, that not only is it essential to have some central organizing body to do the purchasing, but that there be some factor which will co-ordinate the various departments of government in order to prevent any overlapping and overmanning. In that connection I may observe that the Treasury department of England is empowered with that special function. Our Treasury board in Canada has not now, apparently, the necessary statutory powers. It seemed to me that the Prime Minister might be called the general manager of the country and the one who should be charged with the duty of purchasing and also of co-ordinating the departments of government, and that there should be an expert employed by him to look after both these functions. I think it is desirable, and much money would be saved in both directions. It is an urgent requirement.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What my hon. friend has just expressed conveys better than my own words could what I have in mind in the proposal in view in this matter. There is in regard to appointments and different increases in the public service a treasury board before which all these various appointments and promotions have to go, apart from the Civil Service Commission. There is attached to that board an officer of the Department of Finance, whose business it is carefully to go over all appointments to see, so far as the different departments are concerned, that they are all working on a proper basis. The arrangement I am proposing is that in connection with government contracts there shall be a similar body composed of ministers who will correspond to the Treasury board; and similarly attached to that body there shall be a permanent official to be its secretary, a man of experience, with such staff as he may require, who will carefully review all government purchases and contracts and keep the Prime Minister informed on matters that are pertinent thereto. Then when various contracts in the form of orders in council come before the Prime Minister he will be in a position to inform his colleagues of precisely the position in which the matters stand. At the present time, under the arrangement that has been in existence, a recommendation comes to Council and the Prime Minister has to put his signature to it as a matter of course. He has to take the entire responsibility without having any kind of responsible supervision.

The CHAIRMAN: Carried?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: No, stand. I understand that the Prime Minister is going to give me some information as to one department. What the member for Calgary (Mr. Shaw) says is absolutely right. I do not know why there is any beating about the bush. Speaking generally, the departments to-day do not pay the slightest attention to the Purchasing commission.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is not correct; he did not say that.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That is what I understood him to say, and I understood the Prime Minister to concur in the statement.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: He said that the commission was not functioning.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then the Prime Minister does not concur in what the hon.

member says, and we get back to where we were before. The Prime Minister, then, will give a list to-morrow of all requirements of the Post Office, tenders, amounts paid, and so forth.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Are you allowing the item to pass?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: No.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Very well, we shall hold it.

Mr. MURDOCK: The hon. member knows that all stationery for the Post Office is purchased through the Stationery branch of the Printing bureau.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That is another case in which the commission has nothing to do with it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That course has always been followed ever since the commission was created.

Item stands.

Canadian National Safety League, $25,000.

Mr. GOULD: This is a new item. The committee would like to have it explained.

Mr. MURDOCK: The Canadian National Safety League is a body of which Major-General Sir John M. Gibson is president, the general manager being Mr. J. F. H. Wyse. For a number of years there has been an Ontario Safety League. To be exact, it has been existence for about nine years, and is said to have done splendid work. It has received some assistance from the Ontario government.

Mr. McMASTER: Safety in what regard?

Mr. MURDOCK: Safety from industrial or other accidents.

Mr. MEIGHEN: From political catastrophe too?

Mr. MURDOCK: No—

Mr. SHAW: The league will be needed shortly in Ontario.

Mr. MURDOCK: —otherwise my right hon. friend would have been more fortunate in 1921. The League in Ontario has been doing accident prevention work for some years throughout the entire province, and the statistics for the city of Toronto are particularly interesting. The ninth year of safety work was completed in 1922 with sixty fatalities fewer than in 1913, the year immediately before the league started work, in spite of an increase in population of 91,000 with its proportionate increase in industrial hazards and an increase of 32,000 in automotive vehicles. There has been a saving of 759 lives in the nine years of safety work and this is all the more remarkable in view of the large increase in the number of such vehicles. The proposal has been to establish a Canadian National Safety First League to inaugurate and carry on a safety first campaign throughout the length and breadth of Canada. Not with just the amount of money that is here voted, but with this assistance and other contributions and resources which the Canadian National Safety League is to secure, it is believed that the work will be very effective in saving Canadian lives and limbs. That, briefly, is the intent of the vote. Last year there were 1,107 fatal accidents in Canada, or an increase of 185 over the preceding year, which would appear to indicate urgent necessity for safety first education.

Mr. BAXTER: Who is the president of this league?

Mr. MURDOCK: Sir John Gibson. Mr. Wyse is general manager.

Mr. BAXTER: What organization have they in the province of New Brunswick?

Mr. MURDOCK: I think New Brunswick is one of the provinces in which the league proposes to get under way a safety first campaign this year.

Mr. McMASTER: Mr. Chairman, I must ask the government what method is pursued in establishing this list of what might be called grants in aid? Most of these are excellent societies. The society for preventing people from being killed by automobiles or other accidents is no doubt very meritorious. But is it the duty of the federal government to pick out this, that and another society and give them grants, while there are scores of other societies just as worthy which do not receive any aid from the state? Unless the state proposes to help all meritorious societies with altruistic motives which operate to the benefit of the public—and I do not doubt that most of these societies do so operate—then I think it is poor legislation to favour them. It looks to me as if a friend of whatever administration may be in power has some pet society, and he comes and asks for a grant in aid, and sometimes he gets it. That is one point I want to make.

The other point is the utter disproportion of the amounts that are granted. Here is the Victorian Order of Nurses, one of the very best orders that we have in the country.

I know recently there broke out in a little village in my riding the terrible plague of typhoid. The Victorian Order of Nurses went on the scene at the beginning and established hospitals, and did real national service. They get $5,000. Then comes along an Alpine club for the purpose of encouraging climbing in the mountains of Alberta. One would think that that alone would be sufficiently attractive without any aid, but the club receives $5,000. I protested against that time after time when I was in opposition—and I suppose when I am in opposition again I could protest with just the same effect. Then we have other societies, no doubt good in their way. But my submission to the committee is that it is not the business of the state to operate certain specific charitable societies. If it is the duty of the state to operate charitable societies in general, then there should be a general scheme. This giving small donations or large to this or that particular society is unsound legislation and should be stopped. When we have such a tremendous deficit I certainly think it is a mistake to increase the list of these favoured societies. Now, $25,000 for helping people to look after themselves so they will not be run over by automobiles is, I think, far too large a sum. I do not doubt it is a good society, but I do not think it is the duty of a state which has the deficit we have to go in debt to the extent of another $25,000 for this aid. If the government feels this is such a society that it should be bonused, then I certainly protest against its being bonused five times as much as the Victorian Order of Nurses.

Mr. MARLER: The hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) has very largely and very correctly expressed my own ideas on this particular subject. This is an entirely new vote. To my certain knowledge the Victorian Order of Nurses has pressed the government for a larger vote. The Victorian Order of Nurses is an organization extending over the whole Dominion and doing most excellent work, but notwithstanding that it is given precisely the same grant as last year. Another national organization is the Boy Scouts—badly in need of money; their grant is not increased. Another national organization is the Girl Guides; their grant is not increased. Why, therefore, when an entirely new society comes along it is given a grant of $25,000, while these and other societies throughout Canada of a national and educational nature and of a character which we need in this country are overlooked, I do not understand. Some time ago I approached the government with a view of allowing deductions under income tax statements for grants or donations to educational and charitable institutions, but I was met with the rejoinder: We cannot do it, we need money in the worst way. Notwithstanding that, when the Estimates come down we find an entirely new vote of $25,000. I protest vigorously against this vote, I do not think it should be granted. But if votes of this description are to be granted, the votes of institutions which we know of and which have done good work for many years should be increased instead of new votes being added to the list.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Chairman, it is quite true, as the hon. member for Brome has said, that in regard to many of these grants to particular organizations there is a certain element of chance; that is to say, the government is made aware of their needs, and naturally such action as the government takes is based upon the information it receives. But I think it is only fair to say that every one of these grants is based upon the merits of the organizations as presented to the government and in the light of the conditions and circumstances at the time. I think if my hon. friend who has just spoken (Mr. Marler) will refer to some of the earlier grants made to one or two of the organizations which he has mentioned, he will find the amounts may have been larger in order to help the organization, and what are now being given are contributions after the organization had become well established and well supported throughout the country. This is a new organization, but it is doing a class of work which has come to be recognized as of the utmost importance in the conservation of human life. It is true that the work in Canada is in its infancy, but if my hon. friend will take account of what has been done in the United States by the safety first organization that has carried its propaganda throughout all the states, he will find not only that hundreds of thousands of dollars have been saved to the nation, but that many hundreds, even thousands, of human lives have been saved through the greater precautions taken by the people to safeguard themselves against accident. Anyone travelling through the United States cannot but be impressed by the warnings placarded at almost every turn, designed to instil into all the people the necessity of guarding against accident.

Mr. McMASTER: Would the Prime Minister say whether the federal government of the United States bonuses this very excellent society?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I cannot give my hon. friend an answer at the moment, but whether they do or do not, I would say it is essentially work of a national character and in the national interest, and that if some private agency did not take it up, the government itself ought to do so. The conservation of natural resources is an important work of the government service, but I think the greatest of all the resources of a country are its human resources, and the conservation of human resources is an important part of the government's work. I believe a great deal can be done in the saving of life and the preventing of accident throughout the country by well-organized propaganda along the lines of safety first. It is not work that the government, perhaps, is as well organized to carry on as a private organization might be, but where a private organization is established with a promise of doing efficient work and rendering service to the public, and where the work is of national interest, the government ought to give it some aid. I would go further and say that I think the government should not undertake any work which can be carried on by private organizations and which it is in the interest of the state should be undertaken. But where a private organization of itself is not able to carry on efficiently the work that is in the national interest, and if that work can be made efficient through government aid, I believe it is economical in the end to supplement that private effort rather than institute the work as a federal enterprise. It is in that spirit that the government has sought to give this assistance to a work the object of which is to conserve human resources, to prevent accident and injury to life and limb.

Mr. BAXTER: No one would object to anything that is of a philanthropic or generally useful character; at the same time I think we ought to give just a little attention to the objects that this institution is said to have in view and the methods by which it is supposed to carry them out. In most of the provinces we have what are known as factory acts, which make very definite and useful provisions to guard against accident in industrial employment. As to the automobiles about which so much has been said, we have in every province more or less rigid—generally a very rigid—automobile law; and the criminal law of this country goes so far as to provide that if a man drives a motor car while intoxicated he may be subject to imprisonment without the option of a fine. All these things are effective; what, then, is left for an institution of this kind to do? Is it to regulate traffic on the railways? Why, every railway—I believe the National Railway does it; I am sure the Canadian Pacific Railway does it—gives special attention to promoting conditions of safety. We have all these agencies both legislative and private, working in the direction of safety first, and before we are asked to vote $25,000, or even $5,000, we ought to have a much clearer designation of the means by which this society will operate or the results that it is likely to produce. We have simply been asked to vote $25,000 on the strength of the names of a few people who are said to have an organization in Ontario. So far as any statement submitted to this committee is concerned, I would not say that the existence of that organization has resulted in an increased slaughter of one hundred or more, but the slaughter has increased in spite of its existence, and that is not a very wonderful recommendation for an organization which is operating in that very province.

Mr. MURDOCK: The hon. gentleman is mistaken—that increase was in all Canada, not in Ontario alone.

Mr. BAXTER: Then we were not given statistics for Ontario where we were told such beneficial results were being produced by this organization. In other words, we have not been given one single, genuine piece of information upon which to determine our vote upon this subject. I know where this whole thing begins and I know where it ends. You will find the same conditions existing in practically every municipal organization organization throughout the country.

Mr. MURDOCK: Will the hon. gentleman pardon me? I said that 759 lives had been saved in Ontario during the past nine years as the result of the work of the Ontario Safety League. The increase of deaths from accident in Canada was 185 during last year alone, due to the fact that no safety first organization is operating in every part of the country as it is in Ontario, resulting in the saving of lives.

Mr. BAXTER: I am sorry I entirely misapprehended the remarks of the minister; I think I have got it straight now. But by what system of investigation or of statistical record can the number of lives that have been saved be determined? I would say there are several million people in Canada who have not been slaughtered by any device known to modern science and I do not know that you can attribute their safety to any particular organization. Now, the point I want to make is this: A few well-meaning, and praiseworthy people in the community get together. They

have a definite and a desirable object, for the purposes of which they subscribe their own money. Sometimes it requires the rental or erection of a building, the employment of a staff, the organization of agencies to carry out their philanthropic work. They do it; they do it well, and it is a good thing for the country, a good thing for every community that that praiseworthy spirit exists. But after a while even the best people become a bit weary of well doing. The effort slackens; they do not want to see their pet child altogether deserted, so they turn to the nearest thing at hand, the municipal organization, and they ask for a grant. A little money is given; the thing is got on a kind of public footing; later a larger grant is given, and by and by the whole institution is shouldered by the municipality. That is not fancy; it is not a mere gathering of statistics, it is an absolute fact. It occurs in community after community throughout the length and breadth of this continent; it is a prevailing public tendency. This organization has succeeded very early in impressing not merely the municipality but the federal government that it is no longer capable of carrying on its work through its own efforts; it comes here as an easy means of obtaining some money. It may be all right to grant the money, but before we do I think we ought to have some clear statement as to the nature of the organization. We do not know yet whether it is something that operates by putting out signs on highways warning people to keep out of the road of automobiles. It may be that it puts up these signs we see all over the country "Dodge Brothers Car." I have never been able to understand that. I do not understand why it should not be necessary to dodge sister's car, dodge father's car or dodge anybody else's car. I do not see why it should be limited to dodging brother's car. I would like to know whether this organization has been operating along that particular line. I want to know whether it is by signs, by teaching in the schools, by lectures in the churches or what particular means they are taking. Do they form classes like the St. John's Ambulance Association? I want to know the particular method by which they save the lives of people. We have not been given one word except certain statistics. I do not know yet whether they operate within the factories of my own province of New Brunswick, whether they supplant the factory inspector and the Factory Act. I do not know whether they render useless certain provisions in our Workmen's Compensation Act. I do not know a thing that has been done by this organization. I am not throwing cold water on it, I am not sneering at it, I am only referring to the inconsequent way in which this committee is invited to vote $25,000 without being told how it is going to be spent or being shown the connection between the expenditure of that money and the result which it is said is to be produced. Now perhaps I have invited, not reprisals I hope, but the distribution of some essential information.

Mr. MURDOCK: It may be possible as some hon. gentlemen have intimated, that this is not a legitimate function for the federal government to participate in, or for it even to care as I understood some hon. gentlemen to intimate whether people are careless and indifferent about protecting their own lives and limbs and those of others. The hon. member for Brome inquired about the United States in this connection. I might say that during the war period the United States had control of the railroads and one of the first things it did was to place the most effective, nation-wide, safety first system on the railroads of the United States. It is probably the best system that has ever been used in any country in the world, and it worked with wonderfully beneficial effects in the saving of life and limb.

Mr. BAXTER: I would ask my hon. friend if the railroad systems of this country are not doing that very thing now.

Mr. MURDOCK: I was coming to that. Canada has 22,000 miles of nationally-owned railroads now. Some gentlemen are talking about the expenditure of $25,000 on this particular item. I want to say as a man who has been a railroad man for more than thirty years that I think if we could inaugurate the real spirit and a recognition of safety first among the great majority of the railroad men in Canada who have to work on the Canadian National railways we would be amply repaid for this proposed expenditure.

Mr. BAXTER: What I want to get at is this: Is it part of this organization's work to teach the railway men of the Canadian National Railway System the principles of safety first? Does that come within what this money is being spent for?

Mr. MURDOCK: If my hon. friend would only possess his soul in patience—

Mr. BAXTER: It is five minutes to one.

Mr. MURDOCK: —I would try and give him the information I think he wants. This is not for the special and particular purpose of inaugurating on the Canadian National railways the safety first movement, but it is for the purpose of inaugurating in each of the

provinces outside of Ontario among the responsible citizens in all walks of life a safety first organization that will keep before the public, including the railroad men, the necessity of safety first, to co-operate with such safety first organizations as are on the Canadian Pacific, on the Canadian National and as are in the various industrial concerns in New Brunswick and the other provinces in Canada.

Let us see what accidents there were in Canada last year; 1,107 fatal accidents can be divided as follows; 141 deaths were recorded on the steam railways. I know something about how some of these deaths occur.

1 a.m.

It is just from sheer, absolute carelessness. Might I give an example? You all remember the days when there was the link and pin coupler on the railroads, and when the brakemen used to connect the cars by inserting the link in the drawbar and then putting in the pin. To-day they have the automatic coupler, and what do we find? It might be your boy or mine, twenty-two or twenty-three years of age, young and enthusiastic, careless and carefree. He goes on the road and sees two cars coming together with the alignment of the drawbars not exactly as it should be. What do we find? Only too often as the records of the railroad organizations and of the railway commission will show he puts up his foot and kicks the drawbar over with the result that only too often he loses his leg, or possibly he is dragged under and killed. We want a campaign of safety first for that young fellow and the young fellow who is taking the same kind of unnecessary chances in the lumbering industry. We want to educate him by some kind of campaign that will prevent him from doing that kind of thing. We are willing to spend $25,000 as it were on immigration, to save to this country 185 valued citizens to work on the farms and in the factories of Canada each year. I am sure that it would be preferable to put up that amount of money in the protection of the lives of the citizens who are here, protecting them against themselves. Not one cent of this money is to be used for any purpose in Ontario. The sum of $10,000 has been voted by the Ontario government to the Ontario Safety league for the past four or five years, and the results speak for themselves, and only that my hon. friend has referred to the lateness of the hour I could read the records and show just what has been accomplished in Ontario in nine years, apparently by this Ontario safety first movement. The figures, if my hon. friend had the time and opportunity to go into them, would show conclusively that the other provinces need the nucleus of a responsible safety first organization that will gather to it those interested in the railroads, in the lumbering industry and in the factories of the provinces to work together with the common end in view of having people take the first necessary precaution to save their own life and limbs. That is the campaign that is proposed to be conducted.

Last year 71 deaths occurred on steam railways through people being struck. Surely some of those deaths might have been prevented with just a little reasonable recognition by the victims of their responsibilities to themselves and their families and their country. By perhaps just a little more care they might have been saved. Some of them were run over and crushed; 24 were due to collisions; 24 to falls from cars or engines; all these last were among railroad men.

In the mining, smelting and quarrying group 168 deaths were recorded, of which 97 occurred in coal mining. We all know the necessity for safety first in those industries. Falls of rocks and cave-ins accounted for 65 deaths. 37 deaths were due to explosions and 19 to mine and quarry cars. In the manufacturing industry there were 159 deaths reported, 43 of which occurred in saw and planing mills, and 39 in iron and steel mills. In the saw and planing mills 20 deaths were due to machinery and 9 to flying objects. In lumbering there were 147 deaths reported of which 36 were due to falling trees and 37 to drowning. In the construction group there were 145 deaths, 40 of which were due to falls and 32 to falling objects. Of the total of deaths in industry for the year, explosive substances were responsible for 58 and electric currents for 41.

And, Mr. Chairman, we talked here at considerable length about forest conservation. Here we have $25,000 proposed for the conservation of human life and limb. We have talked about forest conservation in this House and very properly so, and I would not wonder if we will talk in this House still more about forest conservation. Shall we hold up our hands and say "Hands off, it is none of our business, pass it on to the big industries, and to the railroads and say that we will not expend $25,000 for the purpose of inaugurating in the provinces of Canada a real honest-to-goodness safety-first movement that will assist in preventing accidents with consequent loss of limbs, or death, to Canadian citizens whom we have here, and want to keep here for the

benefit of Canada. That is what there is in this proposal.

Mr. HUMPHREY: In what way are we going to bring this propaganda directly to the attention of the working men whom the minister speaks about?

Mr. MURDOCK: By the formation of these safety-first organizations in various towns. The Canadian National Safety League has a membership in the following places; Calgary, Edmonton, Granby, Halifax, Montreal, Quebec, Regina, Shawinigan Falls, St. Jerome, Three Rivers, St. John, Sydney, Toronto, Vancouver, Winnipeg, and other places. There is a general safety-first organization in all those cities. The proposal is to extend that work.

Mr. BAXTER: By lectures and signs?

Mr. MURDOCK: By education, by getting together those who are really interested in life and limb conservation to work under the direction of the safety-first organizations.

Mr. HUMPHREY: Does the minister really and truly believe that he can get the railroad men throughout the length and breadth of Canada to come and attend these different lectures which will be given on behalf of this safety-first league?

Mr. MURDOCK: I think that it would probably be difficult to do so. I would imagine that this Canadian National Safety League would undertake the work in co-operation with other organizations. For example, the Canadian Pacific Railway has a safety-first organization and the Canadian National also has such an organization. I presume that in such towns as Moose Jaw and Saskatoon, where both the Canadian Pacific and Canadain National to-day have safety first organizations, those organizations would be co-operating with the central safety-first organizations in those particular towns. In other words, they would convey information to each other and co-operate in various ways. I do not know just what the plan might be, but considering the remarkable success which the figures show in Ontario, and the increase of 155 last year in fatal accidents in Canada, I cannot help but feel insistent that there is necessity for a campaign in other provinces, similar to that which has appeared to do such good work in Ontario.

Mr. GOULD: How many deaths were there from automobile fatalities?

Mr. MURDOCK: I am afraid I have not got the exact figures for the automobile fatalities, but that is very important, and there is necessity for a safety-first movement of some kind, even amongst automobile drivers.

[Mr. Baxter.]

Mr. IRVINE: Does the hon. minister think that the prohibitionists in Ontario will permit him to claim that all this good work in saving life is due to this movement?

Mr. MURDOCK: The way in which prohibition works only too often I am sorry to say in Ontario—and I am just giving this as my opinion in answer to the hon. member—

Mr. McMASTER: Not officially?

Mr. MURDOCK: No, but it may help to cause accidents rather than to prevent them, I am afraid.

Mr. IRVINE: After the very exhaustive and comprehensive interpretation of the item given by the Minister of Labour, I am sure the government will agree to the suggestion that the whole matter be dropped.

Mr. McBRIDE: The minister says he really does not know how the system will work out, and I quite agree with him. From what I have heard him say, I do not think he knows, and I think the House is entitled to know how it will work out before we invest the money of this country, to the extent of $25,000, in the proposition.

Mr. GOULD: I believe this will work out so that there will be overlapping. The provinces have inaugurated a system. In the first remarks offered by the Minister of Labour he cited Toronto. I claim that either Ontario, as a province, or the city of Toronto, should be responsible for the safety-first expenditure in the city of Toronto. I would be more prepared to support the $25,000 vote if it were used for the purpose of apprehending some of the speed artists in Ottawa and other cities. These automobile artists have persuaded the government to spend hundreds of millions of dollars to provide good roads through the country, so that they may travel on these roads, and have signs placed on them, but I must be on the lookout, and prepared to step out of the way of these speedsters. They create conditions which enable them to sweep along and kill many people in the country. Signs are placed on the road and we are supposed to get out of the way. That is the condition at the present time. I do not approve of spending $25,000 for the purpose of having signs placed up on these roads, which mean that we have to hop out of the way of the individual who comes along in his automobile and forgets to blow his horn. If this money were to be expended in apprehending some of these individuals who drive through the country and do not blow their horns, I would support it.

Mr. HAMMELL: Did you ever drive a motor car in the city or in the country either.

Mr. GOULD: Yes.

Mr. HAMMELL: Nine-tenths of the accidents are not due to the drivers of automobiles in this country. I want to endorse this vote. I have had several years' experience in driving motor cars in city, town and country, and I can vouch for the fact that you cannot drive down the easy-going streets of Ottawa without having several hair-raising experiences—do not laugh about it, because I will take some hon. members down and show them how people dodge about, cross the streets at intersections and run in front of automobiles.

Mr. FORKE: It is the hair we want to see.

Mr. HAMMELL: I have never had the misfortune so far, and I hope never to have it. But I can tell hon. gentlemen that the need is very great to educate the people of all the towns and cities of this country as to how they should act. It is at present almost impossible to avoid an accident, and I heartily endorse this appropriation.

Mr. MURDOCK: The hon. member for Cariboo (Mr. McBride) asked for certain information. I did not give it just out of consideration for the hon. member for St. John City (Mr. Baxter) who referred to the lateness of the hour. This is a memorandum which my hon. friend should have, which explains the obligations and the purposes of this organization:

The Canadian National Safety League was incorporated in 1918 by Dominion charter, and without share capital. Its objects are:—

1. To safeguard and protect the public, especially children from the dangers of automobiles, railroads, street railways and all forms of vehicular traffic on the public highways in the Dominion of Canada.

2. To educate the public through schools, churches, literature and all channels of publicity upon matters pertinent to public safety.

Mr. McBRIDE: How are you going to do that?

Mr. MURDOCK (reading):

3. To minimize the injuring and killing of persons employed in stores, factories, workshops and all departments of industrial and mercantile activity, by instilling into the minds of employer and employee the full meaning of "Safety Always".

4. To co-operate, so far as lies in the power of the league, in preventing the useless destruction of life and property by fire.

5. To advocate and secure possible remedies and preventives and to assist in the enactment and enforcement of ordinances requisite to carry out the foregoing by means of—

(a) Bulletins, education, or any other method of propaganda that may from time to time be considered advisable.

(b) To be the clearing house of all information, bulletin service, safety films and all literature bearing on accident prevention work, issued under arrangements to the various provincial leagues.

The operations of the corporation to be carried on throughout Canada.

Those are the purposes briefly.

Mr. HUMPHREY: I did not understand the Minister of Labour to say that this society would make a point of co-operating with railroad companies.

Mr. MURDOCK: I should say, as my view, they would do that.

Mr. HUMPHREY: That was the minister's own view.

Mr. MURDOCK: Yes. This is their statement:

To co-operate, so far as lies in the power of the league in preventing the useless destruction of life and property.

The whole proposal is to bring about co-operative arrangement between all who are interested in this important life and limb conservation work.

Mr. HUMPHREY: I quite understand the remarks of the minister in that respect, that it is their aim and object to do that; but I am a little concerned whether it will be possible or not to bring about that state of co-operation between the societies and the different railway corporations and their employees.

Mr. MURDOCK: The hon. member is probably right.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I say just one word further in regard to this item? When it is apparent to members of the committee that the object the government had in view in giving this support was that of helping an organization that was already established, that had been doing effective work in one province over a period of five years, which work had come to be generally recognized as a great human service, to organize similar classes of work in all the provinces of the Dominion, so that this "safety first" movement would receive the cumulative effect of all the provinces of the Dominion working together in a great educational campaign in a variety of forms towards furthering "safety first," probably the committee will be willing to let the item pass without further discussion. It is not proposed at all that this should be an annual grant to this par-

ticular organization. It is simply to enable an organization, which has made good in one province and which has shown its capacity to do effective work, to get similar organizations or branches formed in all the provinces of the Dominion, so that there will be a nation-wide "safety first" organization carrying on conservation work in human life and limb in all the provinces.

Mr. BAXTER: One would naturally concur in the view expressed by the Prime Minister as to the desirability of carrying out the objects of this society, but we have heard the explanation of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock). We heard first his verbal explanation that this was practically to do the work of "safety first" on the railways and particularly amongst railway men.

Mr. MURDOCK: My hon. friend is mistaken.

Mr. BAXTER: That was mentioned. I thought that was pretty well covered by the Canadian Pacific agency and the Canadian National must have some similar organization. But when he came to read the detailed statement of the objects of the society, we found that the railway men were not specially mentioned; that they came only under a very general class, and that the primary object put forward was the protection of the people themselves from vehicular traffic. It is either the one thing or the other that is the chief point. The hon. member who asked: How are they going to do that? has struck about the right note. We have not got anything very definite about that yet. I can understand that the organization will spend a good deal of money for secretaries and all that sort of thing in the different provinces. That is very easy to do, and it does not produce very much result. The Prime Minister says that there have been good results in one province. Why not, before you ask us to pass an item of this size and character in this committee, give us a statement of just what has been done in that province. I do not know yet and nobody in this House does; or if they do, they have kept the knowledge very well to themselves. We can prove almost anything by statistics. I do not know whether the Minister of Labour is familiar with the Clemens' tables in regard to the place of death. I do not know whether he has the tables prepared by Samuel L. Clemens, who many years ago compiled statistics on the subject. I forget the figures, but Mark Twain pointed out that the most dangerous place in the world was a man's own bed, because more people die in bed than anywhere else. That is quite in keeping with the nebulous character of the information that we have been able to elucidate in regard to this item. Perhaps this is an item to keep men out of bed in order that they may preserve their lives. If so, it has served its purpose admirably well.

Item agreed to.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the House adjourned at 1.25 a.m. (Friday).

Friday, June 15, 1923

The House met at three o'clock.

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY COMPANY

MEMORIAL OF PREFERENCE AND COMMON SHAREHOLDERS

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Some little time ago the government received from the preference and common shareholders of the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada a memorial setting forth certain representations of which they desire the government to take cognizance. The reply of the government to this memorial has been forwarded, and I understand it is being distributed this afternoon, or will be distributed to-night. So I beg to lay on the Table of the House a copy of the memorial and the reply thereto.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST READINGS

Bill No. 207 (from the Senate), for the relief of Abraham Brooks.—Mr. Baxter.

Bill No. 208 (from the Senate), for the relief of Jane Edna Near.—Mr. Baxter.

Bill No. 209 (from the Senate), for the relief of Clara Welleena Bristol.—Mr. Duff.

Bill No. 210 (from the Senate), for the relief of Emma Jean Walker.—Mr. Hocken.

Bill No. 211 (from the Senate), for the relief of Ella Maude Gee.—Mr. Church.

Bill No. 212 (from the Senate), for the relief of Enid Louise MacDonald.—Mr. Porter.

Bill No. 213 (from the Senate), for the relief of Mary Theresa MacIsaac.—Mr. German.

LAKE GRAIN RATES

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Trade and Commerce) moved that the House go into committee at the next sitting to consider a certain proposed resolution with respect to freight rates for the carriage of grain by lake and river navigation.

He said: I desire to state that the subject matter of this resolution has been communicated to His Excellency the Governor General, who has been pleased to recommend it to the favourable consideration of the House.

Motion agreed to.

CANADA SHIPPING ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) moved that the House go into committee at the next sitting to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to repeal section 958 of the Canada Shipping Act, as enacted by chapter sixty-four of the statutes of 1908, and to enact in lieu thereof that the Governor in Council may, from time to time, by order in council declare that the foregoing provisions of this Part shall not, for the period specified in such order in council, apply, either throughout Canada or in any specified waters of Canada, to the ships or vessels, or to any specified, ascertained or ascertainable class or number of the ships or vessels, of any foreign country.

He said: I desire to state that the subject matter of this resolution has been communicated to His Excellency the Governor General, who has been pleased to recommend it to the favourable consideration of the House.

Motion agreed to.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAY LINES

Hon. E. M. MACDONALD (For the Minister of Railways) moved that the House go into committee at the next sitting to consider a certain proposed resolution respecting the construction of Canadian National railway lines.

He said: In the absence of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) I desire to state that the subject matter of this resolution has been communicated to His Excellency the Governor General, who has been pleased to recommend it to the favourable consideration of the House.

Motion agreed to.

DAIRY INDUSTRY ACT, 1914, AMENDMENT

Hon. W. R. MOTHERWELL (Minister of Agriculture) moved that the House go into committee at the next sitting to consider a certain proposed resolution in favour of amending the Dairy Industry Act, 1914.

He said: The subject matter of this resolution has been communicated to His Excellency the Governor General, who has been pleased to recommend it to the favourable consideration of the House.

Motion agreed to.

ADULTERATION OF CANADIAN GRAIN

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. R. A. HOEY (Springfield): On June 8th a question was put to the government by the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Garland) with regard to the adulteration of Canadian grain in American ports. I understand from the answer given by the minister on that occasion that an inquiry, or at least a kind of semi-inquiry, was held. The people of western Canada are deeply interested in this matter and I should like to know from the government whether they intend to submit to the House further information in connection with it; and, if not, where such information may be obtained. In other words, is it likely that a report of that inquiry will be published in the immediate future?

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Trade and Commerce): The government have nothing to add to the reply made a few days ago, for the reason that there was only a verbal report from the officers of the department. After the return of the grain commissioners and the inspector from visits to the ports of New York, Baltimore and Philadelphia, they came to Ottawa and made a verbal report of conditions as they had found them. We now have overseas the Chairman of the Board of Grain Commissioners, and the Chief Grain Inspector at Winnipeg. We hope they will return early next month. They will advise the government as to the condition of grain as they find it on its arrival in England shipped from Canadian as well as United States ports. I have only to add that if Canadian shippers persist in putting grain through by way of the United States they run the risk because the Canadian government has no control over grain once it leaves our own boundaries. My hon. friend, I think, will understand that. Let me say to him and to the House what I said to the members of the London Corn Exchange,—that the grain goes through the United States in bond for the protection of the American people, to make certain that it is not sold. If we sold our grain to Liverpool and subsequently Liverpool sold it to France and France came back with a complaint against the inspection of that grain, surely my hon. friend will understand that we cannot follow it so far, once it has gone into another elevator and broken bulk.

Mr. HOEY: The people are anxious to know the extent to which there has been adulteration.

Mr. ROBB: There has been adulteration to a very limited extent; it was limited to one port. I may say that we had no real complaint against the port of New York.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Is it the practice of the minister's department, or of the government generally, to accept verbal reports as a result of inquiries held in the various departments? It seems an extraordinary procedure.

Mr. ROBB: These gentlemen were officers of the department, and every day such officers come into the ministers' offices and advise them of conditions prevailing in their particular branches.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): But this was a special inquiry.

Mr. ROBB: No, it was conducted by officers of the department.

INQUIRY FOR RETURNS

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—CORRESPONDENCE

On the Orders of the Day:

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): I had occasion some two weeks ago to refer to failures to bring down orders of the House included among which was one that was passed on the 12th February —I am sure I have the right date—for the production of correspondence which, in the order as passed, was divided into three different catalogues: A, between the members of the government and officials of the Canadian National Railways; B, between members of parliament and the Canadian National Railways, and between certain dates set out in the order; and C, correspondence specially referring to the removal of the late directors and general manager. The government some time ago commenced to bring down this return by instalments, beginning with the portion referring to "correspondence between members of the government and officials." I think it is quite clear the order meant between members of the government and officers of the government and the company. But in filling the order the government has included all manner of trifling correspondence between one agent here and another agent there until a pile of lumber about a foot thick has been brought down. I use the phrase "pile of lumber" advisedly; I do not think the government could have imagined that any such correspondence was called for by the order. I think what should have been brought down is the correspondence between members of the government and leading officials of the company itself. Indeed, the order did not say between any minor officials or officers of the various companies. Consequently, I wish to say that obviously this was not called for, and I think it is only brought down as a method of delaying what the order really calls for. The B and C catalogues have not been started, although we are now four months and more from the passing of the order. These could have been brought down at once, for they cover correspondence between the government and the company relating to the resignation—removal, really—of the directors, which evidently could not be very lengthy but is of importance. I do not think there is any excuse for four months' delay in bringing that correspondence down, but if there is any excuse the worst possible one is the searching out of correspondence between a station agent and some other minor agent of another company relating to a culvert, as if any such thing was called for by the terms of the order itself. I must ask that the substance of the order, and particularly the two B and C catalogues which could easily be complied with, be complied with now, and that the waste of money along the line at present being pursued be stopped.

Secondly, on May 14th an order was passed for a return showing orders for rolling stock and equipment given since October 4, 1922. This order has not been complied with, and certainly only a comparatively brief return would be necessary. I know of no reason for the delay. There are other orders as well, but I am emphasizing these two at the moment.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: This is the first time I have heard my hon. friend complain of getting too much information.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Of getting too little. I am getting the information blocked.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No. I think the officers have noticed the frequency with which my hon. friend draws attention to any slight omission, and they have tried to avoid anything of the kind happening in this case. However, the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) is not in the House at the moment. I will bring the representations of my hon. friend to his attention as soon as he comes back. What is the date of the last order?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The 14th May. The first one was on motion of my hon. friend to my left (Sir Henry Drayton). It was dated in February; I have not the exact date, but it was close to the 14th.

WAYS AND MEANS

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved that the House go into Committee of Ways and Means.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I desire to make this motion, not with the intention of introducing any new matter, but merely that the committee may have the opportunity of reporting the resolutions agreed upon last evening so I may introduce the bills founded thereon.

Motion agreed to and the House went into Committee of Ways and Means, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

Mr. FIELDING: I move, Mr. Chairman, that the two resolutions concerning bounties and the resolution concerning the customs tariff be reported.

Motion agreed to.

BOUNTY ON PETROLEUM

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Fielding thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 214, respecting payment of bounties on petroleum.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

BOUNTY ON HEMP

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Fielding thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 215, respecting payment of bounties to certain manufacturers of hemp.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

CUSTOMS TARIFF ACT AMENDMENT

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Fielding thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 216, to amend the Customs Tariff, 1907.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

THREE RIVERS HARBOUR

On motion of Hon. Ernest Lapointe, (Minister of Marine and Fisheries), the House went into committee to consider the following proposed resolution, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

Resolved, that it is expedient to bring in a measure to make provision for the improvement and management of the harbour of Three Rivers, in the province of Quebec, and to provide:

1. That the commissioners appointed under this Act shall be incorporated under the name of the "Three Rivers Harbour Commissioners".

2. That boundaries of the harbour be defined; harbour commissioners and a harbour master, a deputy harbour master and other officers be appointed; and rules and regulations, and a tariff of rates and dues be made.

3. That the jurisdiction of the commissioners be defined, as well as their powers as to expropriation of lands and the making of by-laws, the collection of rents, and the borrowing of money.

4. That the commissioners shall expend the moneys collected, after payment of the salary of the harbour master and the necessary expenses of maintenance of the harbour, in improving the harbour and its appurtenances according to plans to be approved by the minister.

5. That regulations as to seizures, penalties, the application of the same and the general administration of the harbour be established.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Will the minister tell us how much the port of Three Rivers has improved as to importance, sailings, and so on? Perhaps he can give us the history of the port; it ought to be very interesting.

Mr. LAPOINTE: There has been a misconception on the part of some hon. members that by this proposed legislation it was sought to create a new commission. The harbour commission of Three Rivers was created by statute as far back as 1882. Some of the provisions of that statute are inadequate, and the main changes now proposed are these: The harbour commissions were formerly composed of many members— representatives of the board of trade, of the city council, and so on. It has been thought that that arrangement is too cumbersome. So the Three Rivers Commission will henceforth be composed of three members as in the case of the other important harbour commissions. The boundaries of the harbour are better defined than they were before. We have followed almost word for word the provisions of the enactment—the latest of its kind—creating a commission for the harbour of Vancouver.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The only change, then, is a better definition of the boundaries and a reduction of the number of commissioners from an unmentioned number to three?

Mr. BUREAU: Five to three.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is there any other change?

Mr. LAPOINTE: There are many other changes. I have said that we have followed the same lines as in the case of the bill for Vancouver.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is the Three Rivers commission the same, generally speaking, as the other commissions? For example, has the harbour been taken over by the Dominion authority, or are the commissioners local commissioners? Is it the municipality

or the Dominion that is financing the harbour?

Mr. BUREAU: The harbour commission of Three Rivers was created by statute in 1882. At that time we had no docks except those of Canada Steamship Lines. Permission was obtained to borrow $82,000, which was advanced by the Minister of Finance. The harbour commission consisted of three men appointed by the government, together with the mayor of the city and the president of the board of trade. In 1892 an amendment to the act creating the harbour commission was adopted; owing to the increase of trade and the general expansion which had taken place, permission was given to the harbour commission to borrow $190,000 for the building of docks. A cement dock was built by the Dominion government and turned over to the commission for administration. The commission administer the whole of the harbour. They make all charges for harbour dues, wharfage, dockage, and so on; they draw up the schedule for fees or tolls to be paid. Exerything they do has to be submitted to the Governor in Council for approval. Their powers are practically those of the other harbour commissions. But, so as to bring about uniformity, I have asked, in accordance with requests made to me, that the lines followed be the same as those laid down in the case of the other large commissions, particularly the Vancouver commission, which is the latest and most modern. There is a change in the limits of the harbour of Three Rivers. The old limits were, west, a prolongation of the divisional line between the parish and the city of Three Rivers across the river, including the south shore, and east a prolongation of a line—

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend need not give the details.

Mr. BUREAU: We have taken the natural boundary lines, making an increase east as well as an increase west. To the north it is the same, being co-extensive with the limits of the city of Three Rivers. The change of the harbour limits is necessary owing to the cropping up of new industries along the water front of the St. Lawrence and the St. Maurice rivers. The object is to enable the exercise of some control as to how these things shall be done, and also to provide for the collection of harbour dues for the raising of a revenue to maintain the docks, and so on. The interest due on the debentures of the harbour commission is regularly paid; there is also a sinking fund into which amounts have regularly been placed, except for a period during the war. Everything has been conducted legally and in due form; it is just to modernize the harbour that we are asking for this legislation.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am sure the House will be glad to assist the hon. member in modernizing Three Rivers if possible.

Mr. BUREAU: It is the harbour we want to modernize.

Mr. MEIGHEN: About when were the present commissioners appointed?

Mr. BUREAU: I do not remember the exact date—since we have come into power. I recommended that the three commissioners appointed by the former government be replaced by the three who now hold office.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I suppose that was the process of modernizing?

Mr. BUREAU: Yes, that was the beginning of the modernizing.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I hope it will not be the beginning of failure to pay interest or to conduct the board on a proper business basis. My hon. friend says that everything had been properly done; the interest has been paid, and so on. I do not know whether that was the reason for the replacing of the former commissioners. What is to be done in the way of improvements?

Mr. BUREAU: There is no programme yet. A coal dock which was built by the Department of Public Works has not been turned over to the commission—it is still under the department—but as the other docks were built they were turned over by the department to the harbour commission. As I say, no definite scheme of improvement has yet been adopted, but I hope something in that line will be done before long.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What salaries are paid the commissioners?

Mr. BUREAU: They are not paid any salaries at all.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They get no remuneration?

Mr. BUREAU: No remuneration.

Mr. LAPOINTE: That is why nobody complained about being dismissed.

Mr. BAXTER: I would like to ask whether paragraph 4 of the resolution intends a change or not. Under it the commissioners are to expend the moneys collected, after payment of the salary of the harbour master and the neces-

sary expenses of maintenance of the harbour, improving the harbour and its appurtenances according to plans to be approved by the minister. There is no provision there for the payment of interest or sinking fund. Will that be in the bill?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes.

Mr. BUREAU: It is in the bill.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Lapointe thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 217, respecting the Three Rivers Harbour Commission.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

On motion of Mr. Lapointe, the bill was read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

On section 3—Interpretation.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I would ask my hon. friend whether this interpretation clause is the standard clause, to be found, for example, in such a bill as the one respecting the Vancouver Harbour Board. Are there any changes made here beyond changes of names?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I think it is the same absolutely.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: If my hon. friend can tell me that is the fact I am quite content to take his word.

Mr. BUREAU: It is the same thing.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Perhaps the clause had better stand. My deputy will be here in a moment.

Section stands.

On section 4—Harbour limits defined.

Mr. BUREAU: This is just as shown on the chart.

Section agreed to.

On section 5—Commissioner.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: There is a change made here apparently. My hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Mr. Bureau) told us I think that the commissioners were not paid any salary.

Mr. BUREAU: No.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: But under this bill it is now proposed to pay them a salary.

Mr. BUREAU: Yes, under the control of the Governor in Council.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: There is an express clause here to the effect that for their services the president and the other commissioners may be paid out of the revenues of the harbour such remuneration as the Governor in Council may determine. I rather understood from my hon. friend that there was to be no change in that regard. Apparently there is to be a change.

Mr. BUREAU: If my hon. friend understood that, I never intended to give such an impression. The harbour of Three Rivers is increasing in importance every day, and the development of the port requires, like the ports of Montreal and Quebec, men who will give their whole time to the work. It would not be fair to ask them to give their full time to this work without remuneration. I would point out that this bill has no retroactive effect, and this provision is made in anticipation of the development of the harbour at Three Rivers and of the St. Maurice region, which is developing very fast. We have not got the accommodation we ought to have now to take care of the traffic. This clause is to provide that when conditions justify it the commissioners shall be paid a salary which will be determined by the Governor in Council.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Of course the bill is not made retroactive. If it was, perhaps somebody would say that it was being done to help the commissioners whose heads are being cut off.

Mr. BUREAU: Leave it to me not to help them.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is happening under this bill is this. The commissioners who have carried on the work properly and made a first-rate financial showing—

Mr. BUREAU: Do not insist too much upon that.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am only taking what my hon. friend from Three Rivers said a few moments ago. He said—

Mr. BUREAU: They were paying the interests and sinking fund except for a period during the war.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I thought everything had gone on all right afterwards. That is doing pretty well to keep things paid up and not to be a charge on the government at all. While that was done under these commissioners who served without salary—

Mr. BUREAU: It is being done now.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Apparently one of the real motives behind this bill is that the three friends whom my hon. friend has put in to modernize the commission are to be paid.

Mr. BUREAU: The three men who are there now do not want the money first. They are all men of great ability. I can tell my hon. friend what their business is. One of them is the managing director of the St. Maurice Lumber Company, which is a subsidiary of the international company which has mills in New Brunswick and in Nova Scotia too, if I am not mistaken. They have a paper mill in Three Rivers, which some of my friends in the House had occasion to visit a short time ago when they were in Three Rivers. It is the largest paper mill, I think, on this side of the line. Another of the gentlemen is a hardware merchant who has made a success of his business; and the other is a wholesale drygoods man. Every one of them can live without a salary as commissioner, but if we are going to pass an act to incorporate a commission we must look ahead to the future development of the port, and I am satisfied, in view of the development of the St. Maurice region, that before many years the harbour of Three Rivers will require a staff of engineers and men who will have to devote their whole time to the interests of the harbour. We have power galore, and more is being developed; we have also a fine water front. There is no reason at all why the port should not develop and take care of all the manufactured products which are made in that district as far up as La Tuque. I would not ask parliament to pass a bill to pay some friends of mine. My hon. friend may rest assured I shall never do that.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I have no doubt from what my hon. friend says that these commissioners can get along very well without the salary. I have no doubt, further, in view of what he says, that it is not a question of salary first with them at all, nor do I think in view again of what he says, that it is a question of money coming afterwards.

Mr. BUREAU: Afterwards?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Afterwards, yes.

Mr. BUREAU: In the future.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: So far as these gentlemen are concerned I am quite sure they do not want any salary.

Mr. BUREAU: Oh, no.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not know why my hon. friend is insisting on it.

[Mr. Bureau.]

Mr. BUREAU: For the future.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Unless it is that, while we now have three first rate commissioners, as my hon. friend tells us, in the near future these gentlemen are to give up their jobs and somebody is to be appointed who wants the salary.

Mr. BUREAU: Oh, no.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That is what my hon. friend says.

Mr. BUREAU: To the pure all things are pure.

Mr. LAPOINTE: This is exactly the same provision as in the statutes concerning the Vancouver Harbour Commission, the Quebec Harbour Commission, and the Montreal Harbour Commission. Why should we strike out this clause because it refers to Three Rivers?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The only reason I was referring to it at all is that, while we were told that no salaries whatever were to be paid to the commissioners, yet it will be possible in this case to render these offices, offices of emolument.

Mr. LAPOINTE: There was no salary formerly, and I do not know whether there will ever be one; it all depends upon the development of the harbour. Why should we make an exception in the case of Three Rivers and strike out that clause in this bill which is in the other statutes?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister says there are salaries in the case of certain other harbour commissioners.

Mr. LAPOINTE: In the case of Montreal, Quebec and Vancouver there are.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What about Hamilton and Toronto?

Mr. LAPOINTE: There is no salary.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No provision for it? It would have been well for the minister to have said that in this case so that the House would know the facts. The truth is that in case of large harbours where the commissioners have to give all their time the House has provided that salaries may be paid; in the case of the smaller harbours it has not. There is no desire on the part of a single individual in this House to discriminate against Three Rivers; but I was a little doubtful whether the government were going to the trouble of introducing a bill to reduce the number of commissioners and for no other purpose. I wondered when the truth was going to come out.

Mr. BUREAU: We want to enlarge the limits of the harbour.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If salaries are paid I do not think there will be any further bill to reduce the number of harbour commissioners.

Mr. BUREAU: You think we will increase them?

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the harbour is on a par with Vancouver and Montreal, and—what is the other one?

Mr. BUREAU: Quebec.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Those are the three that are on a par. There is no objection to these appointments provided they are not made as they were in Hamilton. I certainly would not urge that. I would like to have the opinion of some members of the government as to the value to the country of the changes that were made in Hamilton, for example. I hope there will be no provision to introduce salaries in the Hamilton case. I understand, they took the recommendation of the president of the Liberal Association and because the recommendation was so outrageous, one or two of the men appointed being in his employ, there was such an explosion in the Liberal Association that the president was removed from office. This was all due to the awful character of the recommendation which, of course, coming from the president of the association, the government accepted. That is what was done in Hamilton. I hope the minister will not carry that precedent any further, and, that in cases where he has submitted to patronage exploitation so fully as in the Hamilton case he will not go on and pay salaries there too.

Mr. LAPOINTE: That is an interesting bit of history that I was not acquainted with at all.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister was overseas when the explosion occurred.

Mr. BUREAU: The ex-Minister of Finance did not represent correctly what I said. Talking about the commission as organized under the statutes of 1882, he asked me if the commissioners were paid, and I said, "No." That was the five commissioners. I did not say that they would not be paid hereafter, but I made the statement that this clause was copied from the Vancouver bill. I know there is a future for the harbour of Three Rivers. This is a tidewater port, not an inland port, and there are always two or three ocean vessels there. My hon. friends who visited Three Rivers a short time ago will remember that there were a couple of ocean ships at the dock on that occasion, but with present conditions it is not necessary that the commissioners should devote their whole time to the work. As I said, I hope parliament will, before long, acknowledge the necessity of increasing the facilities in the harbour of Three Rivers on account of the development of the back country. The region of the St. Lawrence alone now produces 1,500 tons a day of pulp and paper, and other paper mills and other industries are going up. I think that part of the country—of course some of my hon. friends may smile at the prediction—will, within a quarter of a century, be the industrial centre of Canada.

Mr. HOCKEN: Yes, we smile.

Mr. BUREAU: I want my prediction to go on Hansard. Nature has provided Three Rivers with a splendid harbour. We have a tidewater port, the finest on the St. Lawrence. And I say, with all due consideration for my Montreal and Quebec
4 p.m. friends, we have no tide. I think Three Rivers is the only tidewater port in the world that has no tide.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. BUREAU: The current never changes, it flows down twelve months in the year. There may be a backing up of six or seven inches in the height of the tide but it always flows the same way. There is depth of water galore, there is power galore, and a splendid field for labour. Some of the younger generation in this House will live to see remarkable developments at Three Rivers. I am afraid the Quebec harbour will be put in the shade as compared with Three Rivers.

Section agreed to.

Mr. LAPOINTE: We might perhaps revert to section 3. I might answer my hon. friend now by saying that the interpretation clause is practically the same as in the Vancouver Act.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Exactly the same except that in the latter case the word "Vancouver" appears?

Section agreed to.

On section 6—Officers etc.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is this the same form as in the Vancouver Act?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Just the same.

Section agreed to.

On section 7—Jurisdiction.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is this the same as Vancouver?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes.

Section agreed to.

On section 8—Powers as to property required for harbour.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is this the same as in the case of Vancouver?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes.

Section agreed to.

On section 9—Motive power, tracks, plant, etc.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I would not think there was any necessity for a marine railway at Three Rivers any more than at Quebec?

Mr. BUREAU: The clause does not necessarily mean a marine railway. It says:

The corporation may own and operate by any motive power, all kinds of tracks, appliances, apparatus, plant and machinery for the purpose of increasing the usefulness of the harbour or facilitating traffic therein.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Are the present rails owned by the commissioners, or by the company?

Mr. BUREAU: There is an agreement between the commission and the Canadian Pacific Railway. I think the commission leases the ground to the company, or the company leases their tracks, I could not tell which it is, I have not looked at the agreement for a long time; but it is either one or the other. The company are obliged to let anyone that comes use the tracks. I am speaking from memory, but I think the tracks are practically public tracks controlled by the commission.

Mr. FORKE: Has this bill been printed?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. FORKE: We have no copies of it.

Mr. BUREAU: I have not a copy—except a typewritten copy.

Mr. LAPOINTE: There are eighteen miles of railway in the harbour of Quebec.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not think the Harbour Commissioners of Quebec run a marine railway. I think they use rather the company power. My recollection is—you can correct me if I am wrong—that those tracks were put down by the railway company, and not by the commission, and the railway company operates them.

Mr. LAPOINTE: They are owned and operated by the commission.

Mr. BUREAU: Not in Three Rivers. In Three Rivers there is an agreement between the railway company and the harbour commissioners.

Mr. FORKE: I object to the bill going through without copies being furnished. What chance have I to say anything about a bill when I do not know anything about it?

Mr. LAPOINTE: If my hon. friend objects, of course I cannot proceed any further.

The CHAIRMAN: The objection should have been raised on the motion to go into committee. Objection can be raised to the clauses in committee, but not to the bill being considered in committee.

Mr. BAXTER: I am not objecting, but I think it puts us at a disadvantage. I am particularly interested in this subject from the standpoint of the city of St. John, which, I hope, some day will put itself in a position to take advantage of the harbour commission legislation. I was anxious to follow this bill for the purpose of seeing how certain problems that would affect St. John might be dealt with. I have not made an objection because I did not wish to hold up the business of the House, but I think it might be arranged that there should be a proper distribution of bills before we are called upon to consider them. I know that in much smaller establishments than this it is impossible to get a bill which is not printed dealt with, except by specially asking unanimous consent to do so. The rule of this House seems to be different, and this House proceeds unless somebody stops it.

The CHAIRMAN: The bill is always distributed among members of the House, except when the resolution is put through the House on the same day as the bill is introduced. We have only two or three of these bills printed this afternoon, or rather we have the proof sheets. This resolution was introduced this afternoon and got its second reading, and the House went into committee. That is the reason the bill is not distributed.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think the Chairman's interpretation is quite correct. It is true a bill of this kind can only follow a resolution, and nothing else can go on, except by unanimous consent. But I do not think it is correct to say that the House is competent to go into committee on a bill until the English and French copies have been distributed. I have never seen it done, and I have not seen unanimous consent asked for it. I think it would be a very grave irregularity, and a bad precedent on the part of anybody at any stage, to put through a bill copies of which hon. members have not in their possession.

Mr. BUREAU: We yield.

Progress reported.

PETROLEUM AND NAPHTHA INSPECTION ACT

On the order:

Committee of the Whole—The following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend the Petroleum and Naphtha Inspection Act, chapter eighty-six of the Revised Statutes, 1906, by providing that the Governor in Council may make special regulations as to the sale of naphtha and its use for illuminating purposes, and that, subject to regulations made by the Governor in Council under authority of section three of the Act, naphtha shall not be sold or offered for sale in Canada for illuminating purposes, except for the uses prescribed in section fourteen thereof.—The Minister of Customs and Excise.

Hon. JACQUES BUREAU (Minister of Customs and Excise): I move that this Order of the Day be discharged. It was put in by error. They thought it was a matter of trade and commerce, but it is not.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is the parliamentary counsel again to be held responsible?

Mr. BUREAU: I do not know. I went tc the parliamentary counsel and talked the matter over with him, and we came to the conclusion that it was not necessary. I do not know who did it. I do not want to throw the blame on anyone. I suppose I must assume the blame, as my name appears at the end of the resolution.

Motion agreed to and order discharged.

INLAND REVENUE ACT AMENDMENT

On the Order:

In Committee of the Whole—The following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend the Inland Revenue Act, chapter fifty-one of the Revised Statutes, 1906, by providing for the inclusion of certain employees as departmental analysts; that the certificate of departmental or provincial analysts shall be accepted as evidence in all prosecutions under the Act; that a penalty be prescribed for deodorizing or clarifying denatured alcohol or specially denatured alcohol; and that a cultivator of tobacco for private use may sell the surplus tobacco grown by him after paying to the nearest officer of Inland Revenue the duty of twenty cents per pound.—The Minister of Customs an Excise.

Hon. JACQUES BUREAU (Minister of Customs and Excise): This is in the same position as the other resolution. The last part is surplusage and should not have been placed there, and that is the only part that would affect the revenue. I move that this resolution be discharged.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think we ought to agree to this, to help to modernize the government.

Mr. BUREAU: Does the hon. member not think it is too modern?

Motion agreed to and order discharged.

CANADA SHIPPING ACT AMENDMENT

Mr. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) moved that the House go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend the Petroleum Shipping Act, chapter one hundred and thirteen of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, and to provide that the minister may pay, out of moneys applicable to the relief of distressed seamen and appropriated by parliament for that purpose, such sums as are deemed necessary for the relief of shipwrecked or destitute seamen who are not entitled to relief under any of the provisions of the Merchant Shipping Acts; also pay any reasonable expenses incurred in any British possession or any foreign country on account of subsistence or transport of such seamen who have been domiciled twelve months in Canada; and to provide further that in the case of passenger steamships registered in Canada, the Governor in Council shall have power to authorize the acceptance of passenger steamboat certificates issued by the Imperial government or by the government of a British possession; and further to provide that, in the case of seagoing ships, the Governor in Council shall have power to authorize the acceptance of survey or inspection made by an exclusive surveyor to an approved society or association for the classification and registry of shipping, in lieu of Canadian government inspection.

He said: Both this resolution and resolution No. 54 are embodied in the one bill, and I ask that they be considered at the same time.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Perhaps the hon. minister would explain the effect of the combination.

Mr. LAPOINTE: There is no effect resulting from the combination. This resolution was placed on the order paper a few weeks ago, and since it was placed there the necessity arose for other amendments of the Shipping Act, and the second resolution had to be placed on the order paper. But everything contained in both resolutions is included in one bill.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is the present law? It seems that a good deal of what is before us is embodied in the present statute.

Mr. LAPOINTE: A good deal of it is. Of course it will be much easier to discuss the provisions of the resolution when the bill is before the committee.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The minister might tell us what is new.

Mr. LAPOINTE: In the first part the only change will be that the responsibility of the government of paying for the transportation and help of distressed seamen will be limited to those serving in ships registered

in Canada. Heretofore we have had cases of seamen sent here at our expense who professed to be Canadians having been domiciled in Canada, whereas in fact they had never served in Canadian ships. We think that this should be confined to Canadian seamen, serving in Canadian ships.

As regards the power given to the Governor in Council to authorize acceptance of passenger steamship certificates issued by the Imperial government or by the government of any British possession, the law as it is, section 569, applies only to steamships not registered in Canada. We want to apply it to steamships registered in Canada as well, for this reason: If boats have had to go into dock in Great Britain and they have had a complete inspection there, we think that certificate of the British Board of Trade should be accepted here and that the ships should not be compelled to incur the cost of a new inspection in Canada.

The law further provides that in the case of sea going ships the Governor in Council shall have power to authorize the acceptance of a certificate of inspection made by an outside surveyor to an approved society or association in lieu of a Canadian government inspection. This is practically for the same purpose. If a ship has had to undergo extensive or important repairs, say, in Great Britain or in New Zealand, and has a certificate to that effect from a society of international repute, like Lloyd's or the Bureau Veritas in France, such certificates should be accepted by our own inspectors in Canada. The ship, of course, must obtain a Canadian certificate, but the certificate it already has will be accepted as a basis for the Canadian certificate without the necessity for an inspection here.

Mr. MacLAREN: Does this resolution propose to give to the Marine department authority to pay the expenses of distressed seamen landed on our shores, in order to take them to their homes?

Mr. LAPOINTE: It applies only to Canadian seamen in distress outside of Canada.

Mr. MacLAREN: Would it not be possible to make an arrangement for the benefit of distressed seamen left in Canadian ports?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Such seamen are taken care of. There is provision for Canadian seamen in distress in Canadian ports.

Mr. MacLAREN: In what way are they dealt with? I have inquired on this point of people who are interested in marine matters, particularly at St. John, and it is stated, in reference to this question, that in the past years the port of St. John has had large numbers of distressed seamen landed there without any provision for their transportation—

Mr. LAPOINTE: For their transportation in Canada?

Mr. MacLAREN:—except where they were furnished with a D.B.S. certificate. I do not know what those letters stand for; perhaps the minister can tell us.

Mr. LAPOINTE: They mean "distressed British seamen."

Mr. MacLAREN: This condition involves the Seamen's Mission, the Navy League and the city of St. John in a lot of trouble and expense to care for these men and secure their transportation to their Canadian destinations. The resolution which is now being discussed I sent to these people for their criticism.

Mr. DUFF: Were these seamen landed in a foreign port, or were they local seamen who were discharged?

Mr. MacLAREN: Let me complete the statement I was making. It is understood that this resolution, if carried into law, will give to the Marine department the authority to send such seamen to their destinations. Is that a correct interpretation of it?

Mr. LAPOINTE: We have been paying, for seamen sent back to Canada, not only their ocean expenses but the cost of their transportation to their Canadian homes. We have done this in many instances. If my hon. friend will send to the department the communication to which he has been referring we shall be pleased to consider it.

Mr. MacLAREN: I shall be pleased to do so. I understood that seamen landing in Canada who live outside of the port in which they are discharged have not been provided with any means of getting to their homes, unless with local financial assistance. That I understood to be the present condition and, if it is, it is rather a tax on the communities who have to care for such men.

Mr. LAPOINTE: My hon. friend is perfectly right in this respect, that the board of trade is reimbursed only for the ocean transportation of the men. But an amount is voted every year to enable the department to help these seamen to any extent it thinks proper. The responsibility, if it is a responsibility, is not limited merely to provision for their sea passage, for in a great number of

cases we have paid to send them to their homes in this country, if they are bona fide Canadians and their residences can be ascertained.

Mr. MacLAREN: Then I understand that the matter is already provided for. It appears that provision is made for the return of seamen landing in Canadian ports to their homes in Canada.

Mr. LAPOINTE: There is an item in the estimates of the Marine department every year to reimburse the board of trade for whatever is spent for the repatriation of seamen. But the vote is not limited to that purpose alone; help can be extended to the men to take them back to their homes.

Mr. MacLAREN: There is evidently some difficulty in reference to this matter because, as I said, I am informed that the Seamen's Mission, which is a philanthropic organization, and the Navy League are called upon to meet these expenses.

Mr. LAPOINTE: My hon. friend will understand that the department tries to have the owners pay, but ultimately in many cases we have to pay the expenses ourselves.

Mr. MacLAREN: Of course, the difficulty is that these men cannot be detained until the dispute is settled. I presume claims can be submitted to the department in these cases?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes.

Mr. MacLAREN: I have received the following communication on the latter portion of the resolution:

> The clause with reference to passenger steamboat certificates seems to meet with approval—

That is to say, the approval of the local marine people.

> —in so far as the Imperial government and the governments of British possessions are concerned; but the further provision authorizing the acceptance of survey or of inspection by an exclusive surveyor to an approved society or association in lieu of Canadian government inspection is not very highly favoured.

There are no specific reasons given for that, simply the general statement.

Mr. LAPOINTE: This change has been urged upon the department for a long time. I may instance a case. Take the Empress boats which ply from Vancouver to the Orient; suppose one of those boats has to go in dock at Hong Kong for an extensive survey and inspection, which is certified, would it be fair to require her to go in dock again when she reaches Vancouver for a similar survey and inspection at considerable cost? I think that really the change is desirable.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Does not the minister think it would be advisable to endeavour to have such work done in Canada rather than in the Orient?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Surely, but there are cases where a boat has to go in dock in a foreign country.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Such cases could be provided for. But I understand shipowners try to get this work done in the Orient because of the cheaper labour there. I do not think the practice should be encouraged.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I cited that as one instance only. It would apply as well to boats going in dock in Great Britain and British possessions.

Mr. NEILL: Mr. Chairman, I should like to mention a matter of another character in connection with this act in the hope that if the minister sees fit to adopt my suggestion he may introduce the necessary amendment. It is a matter in which considerable injustice has been done to shipping masters and mates, I believe more or less inadvertently. It has been brought to a head by a recent ruling of a supreme court judge in the West, and I think his ruling is due to a mistake in the wording of the act.

Section 96 of the Canada Shipping Act provides that steamers "going" from one port to another in Canada or on any coasting voyage shall carry certificated masters. But that section does not provide any penalty for non-observance of this law. The section which does prescribe a penalty is section 120, which provides that "any master or mate engaged in such a vessel which goes on any voyage"—that is the way it is worded, "goes on any voyage," and that is what the decision hangs on—shall be subject to a penalty, and so forth.

Some years later it appears to have been thought advisable to change this section, and in 1908 the act was amended by chapter 65. So far as I can understand it, the intention of the amendment was not only to put a penalty and a responsibility upon the master of the vessel who went from one place to another uncertificated, but also to provide a penalty for the owners. I think that was the intention of the amendment to the act, but unfortunately it was worded somewhat differently, and instead of using the words "going from one place to another," the amendment reads "any ship trading" from one point to another or on inland waters, as the case may be.

A test case was taken before the courts in Vancouver last year, when the Merchant Seamen's Guild prosecuted a man who was taking a boat on the coast without any certificate whatever. But it appeared that the boat contained only goods belonging to the owner of the vessel, and the decision went against the guild. An appeal was taken to the supreme court, but the judge there also decided against the guild on the ground that the boat in question was not "trading" within the meaning of the act. It was perfectly clear that they had been engaged in going from one port to another, but they had not been engaged in trading in the opinion of the judge because they were carrying only the goods of the owner. Now, it is easy for this House to see that the danger of a boat being in charge of an uncertificated man is equally great whether the goods on that boat belong to its owner or to somebody else. It is an absurdity to say that it is correct and safe for a man uncertificated to be in charge of a boat if the goods belong to the owner of the boat, but that it is all wrong and dangerous if the goods belong to someone else. I think that only needs to be stated to show its absurdity. There is also the sense of responsibility on the part of the master or mate to be taken into account. A certificated master or mate who takes a chance and runs his boat on the rocks or has a collision loses his certificate and therefore his livelihood; but an uncertificated man has no such scruples, he can afford to take a chance and if he does wreck his boat he can go out and get another if somebody is foolish enough to employ him.

There is no question of cost because I am informed that a considerable number of these certificated men are willing to work for the wages given to the uncertificated men. How the former came to be ousted from their positions is that during the war they went on ships engaged in the war and when they came back they found their old positions taken by uncertificated men perhaps unavoidably because no others could be obtained at the time. But those conditions no longer exist and it is perfectly just and proper that these certificated men should now be restored to their former positions both for their own benefit and for the safety of the public.

I may quote one sentence regarding the decision of the judge. It is as follows:

> The new section says "trading." His Lordship held that parliament must have had some reason for making the change, and that the word "trading" was deliberately substituted for "going".

The learned judge evidently was never in this parliament, or he would have known that we often do things without any particular reason, and that words drawn up by someone somewhat unfamiliar with the circumstances sometimes slip into our legislation. Besides, for some ten years this section has never been called in question. It was taken to mean that trading did cover the conditions I have mentioned. But now that this judge has ruled in the opposite direction, I submit it is desirable to go back to the old rendering of section 120 dealing with the point, so the word "trading" will be altered to mean as in the original act, namely, a boat going from one port to another. I have the details of the particular case before me, and I shall be glad to furnish them to the minister's officers if they wish to go into it.

Mr. LAPOINTE: My hon. friend is making a case which appears very strong and which favourably impresses me, at any rate. But as I told him some time ago, it is the intention of the department and of the government to revise the whole Shipping Act next session if at all possible. The object of the present amendment is merely to deal with questions of procedure and to harmonize the law in some points with the board of trade regulations in England. No important changes are made. I would ask my hon. friend to leave the matter for the present. Speaking from the first view I have of it, I think there is no reason for making the differentiation that he has pointed out; I think the word "going" would be a better word there than the word "trading." However, I promise him that the matter will engage my consideration.

Resolution agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: The next resolution is as follows:

> Resolved, that it is expedient to amend the Canada Shipping Act, chapter one hundred and thirteen of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, by providing:—
>
> 1. That no registrar shall register any ship purchased or otherwise acquired from a foreign subject or corporation where any bill of sale or other document under or by virtue of which the ship became vested in the applicant for registry contains any provision express, implied or constructive, restricting the use of the vessel or imputing any measure of continued control thereof by the government of a foreign country.
>
> 2. That where in the opinion of the minister any person who applies to be registered as owner of a ship has not sufficient assets in Canada, other than the ship itself, to reimburse His Majesty for any expenses His Majesty may subsequently incur in connection with such ship, her master or a member of her crew, the minister may prohibit a registrar from registering such person as owner until security for such expenses, in such form and such amount as the minister may decide, shall have been furnished.
>
> 3. That the Governor in Council may make regulations prescribing the manner in which grain cargoes shall be loaded at ports in Canada on ships bound to ports outside of Canada not within the limits of inland navigation, and for the imposition of penalties for breach of any such regulations.

4. That the Governor in Council may make regulations prescribing the manner in which the port warden shall perform his duties, and giving him such additional duties as he may from time to time see fit.

5. That annual returns shall be made by surveyors, and that provision be made for calculating tonnage.

Mr. CARROLL: Some ships have been bought in the United States by Canadians during the last year, and the department has refused in some cases to give register on the ground that a condition was imposed on the registration by a foreign government. Will ships that have already been bought be debarred from registry by this act, or has the department made a special ruling in respect to them?

Mr. LAPOINTE: We had practically made a ruling, but upon consultation with the Department of Justice we have come to the conclusion that the law was not absolutely clear in that respect, and that is why we are now amending it. We are now making it certain that the registrar shall have the right to refuse the registry of such ships under such conditions. But I think the ships which have been acquired prior to the passing of this law will have to be accepted as to registry.

Resolutions reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Lapointe thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 218, to amend the Canada Shipping Act.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

On motion of Mr. Lapointe the bill was read the second time and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

On clause 1—Short title.

Mr. CALDWELL: Has this bill been printed, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN: The printer's proof is ready, but the bill has not been distributed. The resolution has been introduced only this afternoon.

Mr. CALDWELL: I have no objection. The bill follows the lines of the resolution?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Exactly.

Section agreed to.

On section 4—Security to be given by applicant if assets in Canada not sufficient.

Mr. BAXTER: I would like some information about this clause. One would think that the ship itself would be fairly good security. If the minister would state what difficulties have arisen we would be better able to appreciate the necessity for this legislation.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It is to cover the case where a company is incorporated solely for the purpose of owning and operating a single ship, and where they have no other visible assets in Canada. It is to ensure that any expenses incurred by the government in connection with such ship—the removal of obstructions in navigable waters, and so on—shall be reimbursed. In such cases we require a bond so that we may be protected.

Mr. BAXTER: Have such cases actually arisen?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Oh, yes. That is why we are asking for this legislation.

Mr. BAXTER: I know of cases in St. John—for instance, what is popularly called the Battle Line—where ships which apparently operate under one line are separately owned by companies incorporated in each case to operate a single ship. That line operated at first with great success, but latterly with less. I fancy, however, that nothing of this character ever occurred with respect to that line. I only cite this because it is such a common way of dealing with vessels. If you have a company incorporated it is certainly all right, but it seems rather a strange thing to require a bond that will have to run as long as the life of the ship that is being built. There is no way of getting rid of it. The liability will always be there. The facts will continue just the same until the ship is eventually sold or broken up. I do not know what kind of bond you could get unless you get some indemnity company or some individuals belonging to the corporation which owns the ship to give a bond and try to get some indemnity themselves, perhaps by security on the ships. I would have thought that ordinarily speaking,—I may be wrong but I think I am right—if you have a preferred lien on the vessel it would seem enough without putting the owners to the possible expense of getting some company to identify them.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The trouble in many cases is that the ship itself is lost. Where seamen are in distress it is very often because the ship is lost, and in that case we have nothing to reimburse the department. We have been confronted with cases of that kind in the past.

Mr. CALDWELL: Have you any method of getting a claim on the insurance of the vessel lost?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I think it is very proper that the government should take power to assume the responsibility of return-

ing to Canada any. Canadian seamen shipwrecked abroad. I have always thought, however, that possibly the government should assume that responsibility entirely and not have recourse against the ship. I think there is some fund to which ships contribute; I forget what it is called, but I think it always shows a surplus.

Mr. BAXTER: The Sick Mariners' Fund.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): That fund always shows a surplus I believe, and I would suggest to the minister the propriety,—I do not ask him to amend his bill—of taking out of that fund all sums necessary for the subsistence and transportation to their homes of Canadian seamen wrecked abroad. It is sometimes very difficult to collect these claims against the ship for the reason the minister mentions. The ship may have been lost and the owners of the ship have nothing coming to them whatever. All their assets are gone. It would not amount to a great deal in the run of a year if the government assumed the whole responsibility, and I would ask the minister to consider this suggestion.

Section agreed to.

On section 7—Regulations as to loading of grain cargo.

Mr. COOTE: I want to protest against carrying clauses that we have not seen and of which we do not know the wording. We have not the printed bill before us, and the Chairman will not take the trouble to read the clauses as they are called.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chairman does not take the trouble to read the clause. The marginal notes are sufficient in committee.

Mr. COOTE: Might I ask, Mr. Chairman, if it is in order for us to put this bill through when the bill has not been printed and is not in the hands of hon. members?

The CHAIRMAN: The bill is now in committee. A motion was made to that effect and was carried.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I might explain that this clause is to enable us to adopt the British Board of Trade regulations respecting the loading of grain cargoes. The law as it is now is rather vague in that regard. We want to have the right to impose compulsory regulations, and the intention of the department is to accept the British regulations.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported.

[Mr. A. K. Maclean.]

BIOLOGICAL BOARD ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) moved the second reading of Bill No. 206 to amend the Biological Board Act.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

On section 1—Constitution of Board.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): What universities are represented on this board now?

Mr. LAPOINTE: The University of New Brunswick, University of Manitoba, Laval, Toronto, Dalhousie, Queen's and McGill.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): What other universities will possibly be represented on the board?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Any university which carries on biological research and applies for representation. The minister appoints the scientists these universities recommend.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Who appointed them before?

Mr. LAPOINTE: They were appointed in just the same way. The only change brought about by this bill is that there will be three additional members appointed by the government. One will be an officer of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and the two others will be representatives of the fisheries industry, probably one in the East and one in the West. The object is to have these men work with the scientists and impress upon them what are the most immediate needs of the industry. I may say that the work of these gentlemen is rather of a voluntary nature. They do not receive any salary. They are all scientists and the only thing we pay is their expenses.

Mr. MEIGHEN: On a per diem basis?

Mr. LAPOINTE: No, their actual expenses.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): The university representatives are generally recommended or suggested by the university.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): In the case of Queen's university the representative is the man engaged in biological work.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It is Professor MacClement.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

MILITIA PENSION ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou, Acting Minister of National Defence) moved that the House go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, (1) that is is expedient to amend the provisions of the Militia Pension Act by providing that the period of service entitling officers, retired compulsorily, to pension, shall be twenty years; and that any officer so retired, who served on active service during the Great War and was appointed to the Force on or after the 1st January, 1919, and prior to 31st December, 1921, and since such appointment has served continuously in the Force for not less than ten years, shall be entitled to pension as provided in section four of the said act.

2. That the period of service required of every militiaman to entitle him to pension shall be twenty years, or fifteen years if incapacitated for duty by infirmity of mind or body, and he shall be subject to return to service if he ceases to be incapacitated, and if he has completed fifteen but less than twenty years service, his pension shall be an annual sum equal to one-fiftieth of his annual pay and allowances for every completed year of service.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Explain.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): The purpose of this resolution is to bring the situation in regard to militia pensions back to where it was previous to the legislation of 1919. Under the original provisions of the Militia Pension Act, which has been in force in this country for a great number of years, an officer could be compulsorily retired at the end of twenty years, and on retirement, if his record was good, he was entitled to receive a certain amount of pension. At the end of twenty-five years he could retire voluntarily and receive a pension. Previous to 1919, so far as the officers were concerned, they contributed every year a certain percentage out of their salary to the pension fund, and the fund was self sustaining. Non-commissioned officers and men made no contribution to the fund but were entitled to receive a pension after twenty years' service with good conduct. In 1919, after the war, an amendment was made which provided for the reduction of the period of service, as regards the officers, from twenty years to ten, and a similar reduction in the time of service was made in the case of the men. The result of the change has been a very large increase in the amount paid in pensions. Thus in the year 1919-20 the amount of pensions paid to officers and men amounted to only $225,000 whereas, as a result of the amendment shortening the period of service, the amount so paid in 1922-23 reached the total of $550,000—pension payments were actually doubled. The object of the amendment of 1919 was to look after quite a number of competent officers who had seen service during the war but who afterwards came into the department and were attached to the permanent force. Since that time there has been quite a retirement of officers, which accounts for the large increase in the amount of pensions. Altogether 369 officers and warrant officers have been retired since July 7, 1919, and in the case of non-commissioned officers and men the retirements number 295. The result has been that the cost of pensions has increased very materially. There is no further reason why the short period of service should be continued any longer. It is the view of the officers of the department that we should revert to the twenty-year period, to qualify for a pension. As regards those officers who came in between 1919 and last year, who were veterans of the war and enlisted on the faith of the ten years' service, it is provided that the ten-year provision should still apply to them. In all other respects it is proposed to revert to the twenty-year period as regards all the officers and men connected with the department. There have been a large number of withdrawals by non-commissioned officers and men who have served less than twenty years. The applications for withdrawal have become so numerous that it was felt it would not be wise to continue the pension at great cost to the country for mere service in the ranks for a period of ten years without any contribution to the fund on the part of the men.

Motion agreed to and the House went into committee, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

On clause 2.

Mr. MacLAREN: What percentage of pay is deducted per year for the fund?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): One fiftieth.

Mr. MacLAREN: In the case of both officers and men?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I have not at hand the exact amount contributed but I would be glad to get the information for my hon. friend at a later stage.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I think the minister should consider the case of non-commissioned officers who have to revert to junior rank owing to the reduction of the forces, and the fact that on a further reduction some of them are let out. This has made quite a difference in the pension to which they are entitled. I do not think the number involved is very large, so that it would not cost much to deal more generously with these men. I would like the minister to look up the communications in regard to this matter and treat with fairness

5 p.m.

the men in question. And treat them fairly. The reduction of the forces has made quite a difference, and in some cases they are dropping out, because they would not continue in the very junior rank proposed.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I will look into the matter. The whole thing is dealt with by statute.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I wish to take this opportunity to refer to a matter connected with the militia, but not connected with this bill—if I do not take it up now I shall not have another opportunity. My information is that the local militia—perhaps not all but many of them—have been ordered to report at Petawawa, and they are required to leave for Petawawa on the 24th of this month. The provincial election is to be held the next day, and this order simply means the disfranchisement of all those members of the local militia, if the order is respected. I ask the government to see that the date is postponed till the 25th.

Mr. POWER: Is that not covered by the advanced poll?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, I think not.

Mr. ARTHURS: I have the very same complaint.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): This is the first time the matter has been called to my attention. I was not aware of the date the militia was going to Petawawa. The whole matter was dealt with by the officers in charge. I shall take the matter up with them. It seems to me these men should have the opportunity of voting, and I am glad the hon. leader of the Opposition has brought the matter to my attention.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I know the difficulty of making an immediate commitment, but this difficulty seems so manifest, I think it would be a good thing if the minister would take the matter up at once, so that it could be made known that arrangements will be made so that these men can vote. I feel sure that they cannot vote, under the advanced polling provision, or I would not have received the message I have. If the minister would do this, it would still the agitation in the country.

Mr. STEWART (Hamilton): There are a great many of these men in my constituency, and they would not like to be deprived of the privilege of voting. I hope some arrangement will be made whereby they can vote. It would be too bad if they were deprived of this privilege. I hope the minister will do all he can in the matter.

[Mr. A. E. Ross.]

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): This order does not apply, of course, to the infantry, because they go into camp elsewhere. I sympathize with the hon. gentlemen who have spoken on this matter, and I will communicate with the officer in charge and see if the matter cannot be arranged.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Could the hon. member not report to the House after eight o'clock?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Yes, I will let my hon. friend know what can be done.

Mr. MACLEAN (Prince): We had a similar request regarding the calling out of the militia in Prince Edward Island. The season is exceptionally late in that province and the seeding has been delayed. A request came from the farmers and others that the date of the calling out of the militia be changed from the 18th of June to the 25th. A large number of farmers' sons have been called out, and the farmers feel it is a hardship to be called out on the 18th. I brought the matter to the attention of the minister on a previous occasion, and I would like to know if anything definite has been done.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I shall also take that matter up with the chief of staff, and see if a remedy can be found. I will let the hon. member know after dinner.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Macdonald (Pictou) thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 219 to amend the Militia Pension Act.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

On motion of Mr. Macdonald (Pictou), the bill was read the second time and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN: The bill has not been distributed, as we simply have the proofs. The resolution went through this afternoon. Is there any objection to proceeding?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I understand it, and I have no objection whatever of the bill going through. I do not like however putting bills through without hon. members having copies in their possession.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): If there is any objection I will move that the committee report progress.

On section 1—Proviso as to officers who have served after the war and have been on forces for not less than ten years since appointment.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: As we have not the bill before us, perhaps the Chairman will read the clauses, so we will know what they contain.

Mr. ARTHURS: What is the object of the clause?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): It is to provide for officers in other classes.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

PUBLIC SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved the second reading of Bill No. 191 to amend the Public Service Retirement Act.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

On section 1—Operation of act extended for one year.

Mr. FIELDING: This bill simply extends for one year the temporary superannuation act commonly known as the Calder Act. When the matter was before the House on a previous occasion the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) asked for some information regarding the number of persons retired. I sent a memorandum to the right hon. gentleman, and I have not a copy with me.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

INSURANCE ACT, 1917, AMENDMENT

House again in committee on Bill No. 184 to amend the Insurance Act, 1917, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN: The committee has passed sections 1 and 2. Section 3 is under consideration.

On section 3, subsection (1)—Conditions of license for automobile insurance.

Mr. FIELDING: The hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Boys) was quite interested in this bill, but the Superintendent of Insurance has since discussed the matter with him, and I think that if he were here he would offer no objection. What he was particularly interested in was the question as to whether every applicant should not be given a copy of the application at the time the transaction takes place. According to the present custom a copy of the application is attached to the policy. If the change suggested by my hon. friend were a desirable one it would probably apply properly to all insurance policies. However, if the matter is worth very careful consideration, when we are having a general consolidation of the insurance acts there may be something in the hon. gentleman's proposal. I do not say that he is a consenting party to this section of the bill, but I do not think he would object if he were here, the Superintendent of Insurance having explained the matter to him.

Mr. BAXTER: I would call the minister's attention to a provision that seems to be usual in modern insurance acts and which I do not think has been included in this bill, although I may observe that I ran over the bill hastily, my attention having been called to it only to-day. I have looked up the Insurance Act of New Brunswick and I know that it is the same in effect, and I think the wording is also the same, as in many of the western provinces. As I read this bill, while I think it is intended to a certain extent to help the insured, yet there are some difficulties that may arise. At least there are some forms of protection given by the ordinary fire insurance acts that do not seem to be extended to the insured in this case. Let me quote from the New Brunswick statute:

> In any one of the following cases:
>
> (a) Where, by reason of necessity, accident or mistake, the conditions of any contract of fire insurance on property in this province as to the proof to be given to the insurer after the occurrence of a fire, have not been strictly complied with; or
>
> (b) Where, after a statement or proof of loss has been given in good faith by or on behalf of the assured in pursuance of any proviso or condition of such contract, the insurer, through its agent or otherwise, objects to the loss upon other grounds than for imperfect compliance with such conditions or does not, within a reasonable time after receiving such statement or proof, notify the assured in writing that such statement or proof is objected to, and what are the particulars in which the same is alleged to be defective, and so from time to time; or

And this is the important one:

> (c) Where, for any other reason, the court or judge before whom a question relating to such insurance is tried or inquired into, considers it inequitable that the insurance should be deemed void or forfeited by reason of imperfect compliance with such conditions. no objection to the sufficiency of such statement or proof or amended or supplemental statements or proof (as the case may be) shall, in any such cases, be allowed as a discharge of the liability of the company on such contract of insurance wherever entered into.

It is a little difficult to follow these sections as one reads them, but the provisions they contain have been given effect to, and amplified if anything in the interpretation of them by the Supreme Court of Canada. I do not want to delay the bill, but I should like the Superintendent of Insurance to consider the sections I have read, which pro-

bably have not been called to his attention. He might give some thought to the expediency of including them in this bill and so putting the insurance of automobiles on a parity with insurance in other cases.

Mr. FIELDING: I should not care to answer my hon. friend at once; it would be necessary for me to consult the Superintendent of Insurance about the matter. I suggest that the bill be allowed to pass; before the third reading is moved I will have the matter inquired into and either have the Superintendent of Insurance consult my hon. friend, or in some other way see that what is suggested be given due attention.

Mr. BAXTER: That will be quite satisfactory, so far as I am concerned.

Subsection agreed to.

On subsection 1 (f)—No liability if drivers under age limit, under 16 years, or intoxicated.

Mr. BAXTER: Is not that perhaps just a little severe? If the intoxicated person were the owner of the automobile it would be quite fair, but he cannot be sure of the sobriety of his chauffeur under all possible circumstances. I would suggest the propriety of omitting the words "or by an intoxicated person."

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: In the absence of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), perhaps the objection of my hon. friend could be met on the third reading.

Mr. BAXTER: I am quite willing.

Subsection 1 (f) agreed to.

On subsection 1 (g)—No liability unless stated in policy, for loss or damage by earthquake, etc.

Mr. BAXTER: These, I think, follow the statutory provisions.

Subsection 1 (g) agreed to.

On subsection 1 (j)—Accidents to other persons or property. Notice to company with full particulars.

Mr. BAXTER: We will all agree that the insured ought to give the company the benefit of all information he has or can reasonably obtain, but this part of the section:

—and that every writ, letter, document or advice received by the insured from or on behalf of any claimant shall be immediately forwarded to the company.

I think goes too far. This is something by which the insurance company may escape liability if a single scrap of paper received by the insured has not been transmitted by him not only with due diligence but immediately, I can foresee the danger of an argument of that kind being made for the purpose of defeating a fair claim. I want to see reasonable protection afforded to the company, but I also want to see that the insured is reasonably protected. I think the word "promptly" as in the earlier part of this subsection, or some other word that would not require such acute action as implied by "immediately," would more likely result in fairness in the end.

Mr. FIELDING: I should not like to change the word without consulting the superintendent, Mr. Chairman, although I might suggest "forthwith." I will consult him before the third reading, and have his attention drawn to this point also.

Mr. BAXTER: I am quite content.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think this is in a little different position to the other objections raised by my hon. friend from St. John and there does not seem to be much necessity for consultation with the superintendent. This is not technical, it is perfectly clear. I would suggest that the word "promptly" would meet the case, and then perhaps my hon. friend will not have to open the bill again.

Mr FIELDING: If that will settle the matter and the bill can be disposed of, I will accept the word "promptly" and take a chance. Then the bill will go through without any further discussion?

Mr. BAXTER: I will not bother about the words "or by an intoxicated person" which I called attention to under subsection one (*f*), but when the minister was out I spoke of the addition of three clauses which I think are very important.

Mr. FIELDING: This bill has, I think, been the subject of some conferences between representatives of insurance companies and the department, and it is just possible they may attach some importance to those clauses. I think on the whole I would let the bill remain in committee, and perhaps later in the evening I may have an opportunity to consult the superintendent.

Mr. BAXTER: I quite see the trouble, in fact I suspected it. I am not attributing any improper motives, but I suspected the bill was the production of the insurance companies, modified perhaps by such views as the officers of the department might have. The viewpoint of the people insured needs to be considered, and it is only to this end that I suggest these

amendments. We have a pretty well settled jurisprudence in all the provinces respecting fire insurance, and where this bill substantially departs from, or fails to comprehend things that are useful in that jurisprudence, I think that in the interests of people insuring those clauses should be inserted. I hope the minister will talk it over with the superintendent, and perhaps it would be well for him not to bring the bill forward again to-night

Mr. FIELDING: I have no doubt the superintendent has conferred with the insurance companies or their representatives, but I should not like this to convey the implication that only the interests of the insurance companies have been considered. I am quite sure that the Superintendent of Insurance represents the public in the broadest sense and would not recommend a bill that did not, in his judgment, take due account of the public interest. However, I prefer that the bill remain in committee until Monday, and in the meantime I will have the superintendent consider what has been said here.

Mr. BAXTER: I do not want my hon. friend to think that I am criticizing the Superintendent of Insurance as not having looked after the public interests. He has done so probably as far as he knows, but if half a dozen other people look at the bill there might be half a dozen different points of view presented, and some members here may think of points which did not occur to the superintendent. It is only to assist him to put the popular view in the bill that I am sugesting these amendments.

Mr. FIELDING: Well, I move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Progress reported.

DRY DOCK SUBSIDIES ACT 1910 AMENDMENT

Hon. J. H. KING (Kootenay, Minister of Public Works) moved that the House go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

That it is expedient to amend the Dry-dock Subsidies Act, 1910, and amending acts, and to provide that when the amount expended for the work and materials upon a dock of the first or second class shall have equalled seventy-five per cent of the cost thereof, and the Chief Engineer of the Department of Public Works shall have certified thereto, half yearly payments at the rate of four and one-half per cent per annum may be made on ninety per cent of the cost of the work done and materials provided at the time of such payment.

Motion agreed to, and the House went into committee, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. King (Kootenay) thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 220, to amend the Dry Dock Subsidies Act, 1910.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time

On motion of Mr. King (Kootenay) the bill was read the second time and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

On section 2—Advances during construction on first class docks.

Mr. COOTE: Will the minister explain what the changes are?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The amendment deals with those sections which have to do with the payment of progress subsidy during the construction. Previous to 1917 subsidies were not paid until the dock was completed. In 1917 there was an amendment to the act which provided that in the case of first class docks, whether floating or graving docks, process subsidy might be paid during the construction, and provision was made that when it had been established to the satisfaction of the minister that not less than $1,000,000 had been spent on the work and the material used in the construction of the dock, a subsidy of 4½ per cent might be paid on 75 per cent of the cost of the work done and material provided at the time of such payment. In 1919 an amendment to the act made similar provision in the case of second class dry docks and floating docks when not less than $500,000 had been expended. This left a percentage of 25 per cent of the cost of the work done and materials provided, as a drawback or increasing guarantee as the work proceeded to its ultimate completion.

The present amendment provides that when either a graving or floating dock of the first or second class is three-quarters or 75 per cent, completed, subsidy at the rate of 4½ per cent may be paid on 90 per cent of the cost of work done and materials provided, thus decreasing the 25 per cent drawback to ten per cent, which is ample for a work which is three-quarters done. In ordinary contracts ten per cent is all that is requested as security in the first place, and in the case of larger works running into millions of dollars, five per cent is all that it has been the practice to ask. Then as the work proceeded under these contracts, it has been the practice to return portions of the security and drawback.

To give a simple illustration of how this works out, assume the cost of the dock to be

$1,000. When the dock is three-quarters completed, or $750 has been spent, the largest progress subsidy the contractors could get would be 4½ per cent on three-quarters of $750. That leaves $187.50 worth of work on which no subsidy is allowed as the department's guarantee. It is considered that after the three-quarters completion stage has been reached, 25 per cent is too large a drawback to retain and it is proposed to pay a subsidy on 90 per cent of the work done. To illustrate: When $900 worth of work has been done under the amendment now proposed, subsidy may be paid on $810, which still leaves $90 value of work done as a guarantee for the performance of the remaining $100 worth of work to complete the dock, when the entire subsidy would be payable.

I think the amendment is a fair one. It does not increase the subsidy or the liability at all, but merely increases the amount of subsidy that may be paid as the dock nears completion, increasing the amount from 75 to 90 per cent of the work done.

Mr. COOTE: I just want to draw the attention of the minister to a case that was brought to light in this House last year, that of the construction of two ships at Prince Rupert. Payments had been made as the work on these boats progressed, and then when the contractors failed to complete their contract it was found that it cost a good deal more than the difference between what they had been paid and the amount of their contract for the government to have the ships completed. I do not think the minister has given us a very good reason for making this change. The amount which he is going to retain under this amendment seems to me very small, and I would like the minister to state whether some concrete case has come before his department which has led him to think this change is necessary or advisable, having in mind the conditions which were brought to light last year in regard to the construction of these ships at Prince Rupert. In that case, if I remember rightly, the department had a bond to cover default on the part of the contracting parties, but the department never collected that amount from the bond company. Would the minister tell us whether some concrete case has come before his department which has made him think it is necessary or wise to make this change?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I might point out that the amendment proposed would apply to only the two dry docks which are now being built, one at St. John, New Brunswick, and the other at Vancouver. The St. John dry dock has reached a stage of over three-fourths completion, and there was a request from the promoters of that work that this amendment should be made. We have canvassed the situation very carefully. The cost of the dock for subsidy purposes was $5,500,000. In December of 1922 the engineers certified that $4,049,980 worth of work had been done, leaving a balance at that time of $1,450,000 to complete. Since that I am advised that $750,000 worth of work has been done, leaving only a balance of $700,000 to complete the dock. The total bond issue authorized under the subsidy agreement on completion of the dock is $3,826,272. Bonds have been issued to date to the amount of $2,113,422 leaving a balance of $1,712,000.

My hon. friend will appreciate that this work now is very considerably over three-fourths completed. As far as the department is concerned we have canvassed the situation very carefully and we feel satisfied that by retaining ten per cent and allowing them to issue up to ninety per cent the department will be fully protected. The case at Prince Rupert to which my hon. friend refers is not in line with the building that is going on at St. John. In the case to which he refers these were force account contracts, as I understand it, and there was great difficulty and eventually failure to complete. The work at St. John, on the other hand, is going on satisfactorily and it is felt that there will be no danger in allowing them to issue bonds up to 90 per cent.

Mr. COOTE: Just one word more. I expect that in the case of the construction of the ships at Prince Rupert to which I referred the Department of Marine and Fisheries thought they were quite safe in advancing the percentage that they did, but on account of poor service, poor inspection, it seems to me in that department, there was a considerable loss sustained by the treasury of this country. I cannot but feel that the minister in this case is making a mistake in changing the regulations to the extent he proposes here.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: If the cases were the same, if the principle of the subsidy was the same as in the case of these unfortunate boats that were being built, the hon. member would be absolutely right, but it is not the same. We are not putting up money here at all. All we do is to put up 4½ per cent of the money that has been put into the undertaking; in other words, we are not risking capital one way or the other in this subsidy. In the other case my hon. friend is quite right.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I might say that in addition to the 10 per cent retained, the

government have also cash security of $72,372 which the company has put up since the inception of the work.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

IMMIGRATION ACT AMENDMENT

CONCURRENCE AMENDMENTS MADE BY THE SENATE

Hon. CHARLES STEWART (Argenteuil, Acting Minister of Immigration and Colonization) moved concurrence in amendments made by the Senate to Bill No. 136, to amend the Immigration Act.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: May I ask the minister to tell us what changes are made by these amendments?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The bill itself was an amendment to the Immigration Act. There was considerable discussion in the House of Commons over the amendment made to section 41. We repealed section 41 of the existing act and substituted a new section 41. When the bill went to the Senate the new section 41 was struck out. I may say that the new section was inserted in the amended bill for the purpose of removing some objectionable features contained in the old section 41 with respect to the powers the minister had in connection with deportation and the class of citizens he might deport.

The other amendment made by the Senate is to section 8 of the bill. They have amended subclause (6) by inserting after the word "master" in line 20 of page 3 of the bill the words "or responsible agent or owner in Canada of the vessel." So that it will read:

(6) In case any officer, seaman or other member of the crew, or other person employed on any vessel deserts the vessel while in any Canadian port, such vessel shall not be granted clearance until the master or responsible agent or owner in Canada of the vessel has deposited with the officer-in-charge such sum.

And so forth.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: There could be no objection to that.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Then in line 26, "the amount of such deposit shall be returned to the master," they strike out the words "to the master." So that it will read "the amount of such deposit shall be returned less any expenses for detention" and so forth. Those are the only amendments.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think it would have been better to have left it "shall be returned to the master or responsible agent or owner in Canada of the vessel." but I do not suppose it is worth while wasting time on that.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I assume inasmuch as the distinction is clearly defined in a previous line—

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I take it that is quite right.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I may say, Mr. Speaker, that section 41 has been a contentious section. Personally I am not offering any objection to the amendments from the Senate.

Mr. FORKE: Section 41 is struck out altogether?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes, we revert to the old section 41.

Mr. NEILL: I would ask the minister if he is not disposed to press his amended section 41 on the Senate. This is a very important amendment to this act made by this House after a great deal of consideration. Is the minister going to take back-water from the Senate without any consideration at all?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I rather expected, but perhaps it is not fair to say so, that we would meet with some amendments to this section in the Senate. Section 41 is practically the whole amended bill, and I want to point out to hon. members that if we lose the new section 41 we lose the force of all the amendments contained in the bill. But if we insist on section 41 standing in the bill and it goes back to the Senate, we shall probably lose the whole bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? Carried.

Mr. COOTE: I would urge upon the minister that he might at least let this stand until after eight o'clock. I think a lot of hon. members are interested in this bill, but they are not in the House at the moment not expecting that it would come up this afternoon. I do not think it is right to have the Senate amendments concurred in without further consideration.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman is rather late in raising objection. The motion was declared carried.

Motion agreed to; amendments read the second time and concurred in.

DOMINION LANDS ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. CHARLES STEWART (Argenteuil, Minister of the Interior) moved that the House go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend the Dominion Lands Act, chapter twenty of the statutes, of 1908, and to provide that the original valuation of the homestead inspector may be revised, if necessary; that authority be given for the granting of second homesteads to settlers within a definite district covering the southern portions of the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta; that further provisions regarding the issue of patents in the event of the death or insanity of the entrant, and respecting sections reserved for school lands, and permits to cut timber on Dominion lands, be enacted; and that the Governor in Council may make grants not exceeding in any case the sum of two hundred and forty dollars in cash in satisfaction of claims of halfbreeds arising out of the extinguishment of the Indian title.

Motion agreed to, and the House went into committee, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Will the minister give us a little light on this matter?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): It is proposed to make several changes in the Dominion Lands Act. One of them relates to inspectional work as to which a decision has been rendered by the court. Probably I had better take a concrete case. For example, where a homestead has been abandoned after certain improvements have been made on it, the new entrant makes application and fixes the value that, in his opinion, should properly be paid for the improvements of the previous entrant. We make an inspection and that inspection is disputed. That is to say, the homestead inspector fixes a value beyond what the second entrant thinks is the real value. It has been held by the court that we have not the power to ask for a subsequent inspection by another inspector, and I am simply taking the power to have our inspection confirmed or rejected by another homestead inspector.

Under an amendment to section 11 of the act it is provided that a second homestead may be granted to a man who has failed. It is pretty clearly set out in the section itself that he has failed in the district south of township 31, in the area that is known as the pre-emption area and if he produces a certificate from the provincial government that in their opinion it is wise to allow him another chance, the opportunity is given him to take a new homestead, 160 acres in extent, in some of the homestead areas in other parts of the province.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Is there any arrangement made regarding the liabilities of the man? I understood there was some dispute between the department and the provincial government regarding his former liabilities.

At six o'clock the Speaker resumed the chair and the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 193 (from the Senate), for the relief of Lillian Beryl Brayman—Mr. Ryckman.

Bill No. 194 (from the Senate), for the relief of Roland Bergeron.—Mr. Carruthers.

Bill No. 195 (from the Senate), for the relief of Florence Cohn.—Mr. Church.

Bill No. 196 (from the Senate), for the relief of Cecilia Maria Taylor.—Mr. Guthrie.

Bill No. 197 (from the Senate), for the relief of William August Kruger.—Mr. Garland (Carleton).

Bill No. 198 (from the Senate), for the relief of Thomas Benjamin Brown.—Mr. Carruthers.

Bill No. 199 (from the Senate), for the relief of Elva Burnside.—Mr. McKay.

Bill No. 200 (from the Senate), for the relief of Alfred Thomas Candy.—Mr. Duff.

WOODMEN OF THE WORLD

CONCURRENCE IN SENATE AMENDMENTS

On motion of Mr. Gordon, amendments made by the Senate to Bill No. 105 respecting the Canadian Order of Woodmen of the World were read the second time and concurred in.

DOMINION LANDS ACT AMENDMENT

House again in committee on the following proposed resolution, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend The Dominion Lands Act, chapter twenty of the statutes of 1908, and to provide that the original valuation of the homestead inspector may be revised, if necessary; that authority be given for the granting of second homesteads to settlers within a definite district covering the southern portions of the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta; that further provisions regarding the issue of patents in the event of the death or insanity of the entrant, and respecting sections reserved for school lands, and permits to cut timber on Dominion lands, be enacted; and that the Governor in Council may make grants not exceeding in any case the sum of two hundred and forty dollars in cash in satisfaction of claims of halfbreeds arising out of the extinguishment of the Indian title.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I understood that there was apparently some difficulty between the Dominion and the provincial authorities in regard to the proposal to cancel the debts

of these people or to put them through the bankruptcy court before they moved to the homesteads, so that they might be able to retain those homesteads notwithstanding that their assets before might not have been sufficient to meet their liabilities.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): There was a possible difficulty in this connection but we decided not to press to a conclusion our contention in the matter, feeling that after all the province was as much interested in these lands as were the Dominion authorities. We therefore leave it entirely to their discretion as to whom they will recomend for a second homestead. All we say is that the regulations shall apply to that portion of the pre-emption area south of township 31.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Have any regulations been made to protect homesteads from seizure in case these people's former liabilities have not been met?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): There are just the ordinary homestead regulations.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Stewart (Argenteuil) thereupon moved for leave to introduce bill No. 222 to amend the Dominion Lands Act.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first and second time, and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

Mr. FORKE: Has this bill been printed?

The CHAIRMAN: It has not been distributed.

Mr. FORKE: So far as the West is concerned the bill is of importance and hon. members desire to have it before them before it is discussed.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I move that the committee rise and report progress.

Progress reported.

NATURALIZATION ACTS, 1914 and 1920, AMENDMENT

House again in committee on Bill No. 85 to amend the Naturalization Acts, 1914 and 1920, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN: The committee has under consideration section 4.

On section 4—Repeal.

Hon. A. B. COPP (Secretary of State): When the bill was before the committee a week or two ago there was some objection to section 4 with regard to changes in connection with the administration of the act. Section 4, as originally submitted to the committee, had for its purpose a change in the method of making application for naturalization before judges. It proposed, instead, to have such application made direct to the Secretary of State. There was considerable opposition with respect to this point at that time. I have given the matter careful consideration in the hope of being able to devise some other system which would expedite the administration of the act, and at the same time surround it with every possible safeguard. I have not been able to do so, and to save the time of the House I have decided to withdraw those sections of the bill regarding administration and leave the act as it stood originally. I therefore desire, Mr. Chairman, to amend section 4 by striking out all the words before the word "and" in the twenty-first line and deleting the word "are" in the twenty-second line and inserting between the figures 1920 and the word "repealed" the following: "10 and 11 George V, Chap. 59 is hereby." Section 4 will then be in this form:

Section 7 of the Naturalization Act 1920, 10 and 11 George V, chapter 59 is hereby repealed.

That refers entirely to the amendment passed in 1920 requiring ten years' residence prior to naturalization. The change I am now suggesting simply makes the law as it was up to 1920, which required only five years' residence for naturalization.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I rather regret that the minister has seen fit to amend this section. I find it very hard to blame him, because there certainly was opposition from every section of the House, and I think it arose first from his own benches, the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Martell) challenging the section on the ground that it would take away business from the lawyers and encourage more red tape in the department. I believe, however, that many hon. members opposed the section not knowing just how it affected us in some of the newer districts in the West, and possibly in northern Ontario as well. In these new districts the settlers, who are largely foreign-speaking people, find it a very considerable hardship to go before a judge at some place involving a four or five days' absence from home, to say nothing of the travelling expenses incidental thereto and lawyers' fees, because, although it is not absolutely necessary for them to engage a lawyer, they do not understand our institutions very well and very few of them care to appear in court and speak on their own behalf. I am inclined to think that a good deal of the opposition to this section came from men of the legal fraternity because it

meant a loss of business, and I was very sorry to see that attitude on their part.

I have in mind the case of a man in my own constituency, a very fine type of citizen, who appeared before the judge in April last at considerable expense, for he had to be away from home about five days. For some reason or other the judge deferred action at that time. In October last the man was notified to appear again, but this was impossible as he was just in the middle of his threshing, and his non-appearance meant the cancellation of his application. Now, he has to begin all over again and incur further travelling expenses and court fees. That man thinks an injustice has been done him. When I saw him last he pointed out to me that some of his neighbours had settled down quite peaceably and contentedly and were not particularly anxious whether they took on the responsibilities of citizenship or not. He reminded me what this meant in case of another war—that his neighbours would not be citizens, even though they had been in the country twenty years, and their boys might not be conscripted, while his would be. He was prepared to accept the responsibilities of citizenship, but the government of the country apparently put various stumbling blocks in his way.

After all, a judge's examination in these cases does not amount to a great deal. He asks a few questions of the applicant, but he has no opportunity of knowing whether the man is a desirable citizen or not; whereas under the other system the examination was left largely to the mounted police, and I think they undoubtedly did get a good deal of valuable information. I think a valuable service could be done both to the country and to applicants for naturalization by leaving the examination to the mounted police, and I hope at some future time the minister will see fit to introduce an amendment to this end.

Mr. BAXTER: As I understand the minister, the amendment is simply a restoration of the qualifications as they were before the change, with the adoption of the provisions of the Imperial Act?

Mr. COPP: Five years' residence.

Mr. BAXTER: I congratulate the minister upon the decision he has come to. I thought, and still think, that something might be done between now and another session to get rid of the difficulty which has been spoken of by my hon. friend (Mr. Campbell) and yet not give us the mounted police in the Maritime provinces and the other settled parts of the Dominion. I believe this can be done in a better way than was originally proposed under this bill.

Mr. STEWART (Humboldt): In the light of the conditions that have been explained to him by the hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. Campbell) does the minister propose to take any steps to make it easier for those who desire to obtain citizenship by arranging for the judge to meet them in centres more convenient than the judicial centre of the district?

Mr. COPP: I realize as fully as anyone in this House that it does seem inadvisable to leave it to one individual to say whether an applicant may become naturalized or not, and in the amendments I introduced I was only trying to get an easy method, surrounded with all the safeguards possible, to enable men to become naturalized. As I have withdrawn the sections regarding administration, I propose to have my department take up the question with the various judges to see if we cannot get more hearty co-operation in dealing with applications for naturalization. I hope as a result we will have a little more activity and assistance in this regard. We hope during the recess to be able to work out some scheme to facilitate naturalization, surrounded at all times, of course, by all the necessary safeguards.

Mr. FORTIER: As I understand the minister, we now revert to the old law. I certainly think that a judge is in the best position to decide whether or not an applicant is fit for naturalization and should have power to issue the certificate. I am not in favour of the former amendments by virtue of which the judge only has power to make an investigation. I really think that naturalization should be completely in the hands of the judge or of the Secretary of State. As a practising lawyer, I do not think that naturalization can be regarded as a judicial proceeding, and where the application is not contested I am of opinion that a lawyer would not be entitled to charge any fee for the preparation of the papers. In my view the bill as it was first presented, providing that application should be made directly to the Secretary of State, was certainly preferable to the former procedure, and I am sorry the minister has seen fit to withdraw those sections. I hope after he has had an opportunity to study the matter further he will during next session introduce another bill embodying the provisions which are now withdrawn.

Mr. MILLAR: I am glad to hear the minister say that he proposes to take this matter up with the judges. I would ask him not to overlook the great convenience which would accrue to applicants for naturalization if he could arrange for special sittings to be held at various places easy of access. This has been done in the past by some judges, but others have not been willing to go among these people. Frequently one will find a community of thirty or forty people living at quite a distance from the centre of the judicial district, and if it could be arranged for a judge to hold special sittings, and to simplify the process as much as possible without sacrificing any of the necessary safeguards, and so enable these people to dispense with legal assistance,—which it seems to me is unnecessary in most cases—they would be encouraged to apply for naturalization, and the responsibilities of citizenship would have a good effect in the community.

Mr. FORTIER: Concerning expenses, in the province of Quebec, at all events, an applicant for naturalization must pay fees to the clerk of the court for lodging his petition and copies of his application. Although these fees are not very heavy, I do not think the applicant for naturalization should have to incur them.

Mr. COPP: In answer to my hon. friend (Mr. Millar), I realize that the greatest difficulties surrounding the administration of the Naturalization Act occur in the western provinces, and as I do not know where the judges hold their regular sittings, if hon. members from the West will be good enough to communicate with me and suggest where special sittings should be held at intervals, I shall be glad to convey the information to the judges of the various districts and see if such sittings can be arranged.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): With regard to the status of those who have applied in the past for naturalization but were refused because they were of alien enemy birth, I have in mind a particular case of a gentleman whose father emigrated from Germany to the United States in 1885. In the winter of 1909 his young son came to Canada and bought land, and in 1910 took up residence. He was only four years old when he accompanied his father from Germany and he lived in Chicago up to the time of migrating to this country. In 1914 he applied for naturalization and was rejected. He applied again in the spring of 1919, appeared before Judge Simmons, who accepted the application and forwarded it to Ottawa, but the Secretary of State at that time did not find it within his discretion to grant naturalization. This applicant—I can speak for him personally—is a splendid type of citizen. He is anxious to become naturalized, but cannot undergo the expense of a third application. I have two or three cases of this kind. If a man wishes to become a Canadian citizen, but cannot afford the expense, is there any provision made in this bill to permit of his naturalization without further application?

Mr. COPP: There is no provision in the bill now before the committee. If I followed my hon. friend correctly, this man was refused naturalization because the act then required ten years' residence?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Yes.

Mr. COPP: I am repealing that section of the act and making the qualification five years. Whether or not the former application would be available at the present time I cannot say without giving the matter consideration. It might be possible for the judge before whom the man went to now certify to the applicant's qualifications, but I will look into the matter. Maybe under the regulations we can do something.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I would strongly recommend the minister to consider that suggestion very favourably because a wholly unnecessary hardship is being worked on these men who reside a long distance from the judges.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

SECRETARY OF STATE

Main Estimates, 1923-24 — miscellaneous — Public Archives, $73,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: We have just passed item 26 in the Main Estimates for salaries for the Department of Public Archives. What is this for?

Hon. A. B. COPP (Secretary of State): This vote is to cover the expenses in connection with the archives in London and Paris. The item my hon. friend refers to was for civil government salaries in Ottawa.

Item agreed to.

Further Supplementary Estimates, 1922-23—Archives —further amount required to pay Francis Edwards, The Museum Book Store and A. H. Brook for manuscript plans and paintings, $3,600.

Mr. CAMPBELL: This is a new vote altogether. Is it an addition to item 332 for

public archives, the one we have just passed? Is this a still further increase in that vote, which already shows an increase over last year of $2,430?

Mr. COPP: The increase of $2,430 is accounted for by the regular statutory increases. The item we are discussing now is a further supplementary estimate for the year ending March 31, 1923.

Item agreed to.

Main Estimates, 1923-24—civil government—Civil Service Commission—salaries, $188,305; contingencies, $80,000.

Mr. MILLAR: Would the minister explain the increase in this item?

Mr. COPP: There has been a reduction in the number of employees and the increase in salaries is accounted for entirely by the statutory increases and reclassification. My hon. friend will see that the contingencies vote has been reduced from $130,000 to $80,000 or, a reduction of $50,000. The net decrease in the whole appropriation amounts to $44,090. The salary increases are entirely statutory.

Mr. LUCAS: How many employees are there under the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. COPP: Last year there were 134 employees. They are being reduced to 127.

Mr. MacLAREN: What sum was expended out of the $130,000 voted for contingencies last year?

Mr. COPP: I cannot tell my hon. friend. The Secretary of the Commission is attending a meeting upstairs and I have not got that information here. The amount has been reduced from $130,000 last year to $80,000 this year.

Mr. MacLAREN: That does not necessarily mean a reduction unless the large part of the $130,000 was expended?

Mr. COPP: I will have to ask my hon. friend to wait until I can get the information. I do not happen to have it before me.

Mr. FORKE: Does this vote include the staff of the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. COPP: Everything.

Mr. FORKE: It does not include the salaries of the commissioners?

Mr. COPP: Oh, no, not the salaries of the commissioners, just the staff.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The staff and contingencies.

[Mr. Campbell.]

Mr. CAMPBELL: There is a very considerable reduction in the amount required to meet the cost of holding examinations. Does that mean that there are not so many examinations being held, or has there been some change in the system?

Mr. COPP: As I understand the situation, examinations were held very frequently during the first few years of the operations of the Civil Service Commission. Now, pretty lengthy lists of eligible candidates are on file and there is not the same necessity for holding examinations that there was formerly. That is the information I have received.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I wonder if the minister could tell us what procedure is followed in regard to these examinations. I have been given to understand that a man is sometimes appointed as a temporary employee and that he will remain in the office for six months during which time he becomes thoroughly familiar with the details of the work. At the end of the six months an examination will be called for and other men who, perhaps, have had just as much experience in clerical work as this particular man, are not in a position to compete with him because there are technical details connected with the work of the office with which he is more familiar, and this gives him an unfair advantage. The assumption, of course, is that if the commission want to retain a man in such a position all they have to do is to appoint him temporarily and then it will be comparatively easy for him to pass the examination over the heads of other men who are just as competent as he is in other respects. I wonder if the minister could tell us what the exact procedure is in such cases?

Mr. COPP: I am afraid it will not be possible for me to describe in any detailed way the operations of the commission. If my hon. friend requires information of that character I will secure the attendance of the secretary who is engaged before a committee upstairs. In the case of a temporary position, a temporary appointment is made. When it is desired to fill the position permanently public notice is given that an examination will be held at certain centres and candidates are required to appear there and present themselves for examination. The temporary employee, of course, has the same privilege of appearing there as other applicants have. If the experience this employee has gained while holding the position temporarily gives him an advantage I suppose he would be entitled to it with this one exception: I have no doubt

the Civil Service Commission would see to it, as far as they could, that no particular person enjoyed an advantage over his competitors. I am only speaking in a very general way, because I could not for a moment attempt to describe in detail the administration of the act.

Mr. FORKE: I understand we are to have a report from the parliamentary committee that is inquiring into the Civil Service, and we will therefore have an opportunity of discussing such matters as this when that report has been submitted to the House.

Mr. CAMPBELL: We will have an opportunity of discussing the report, but we would not have an opportunity of questioning the staff of the commission. I have no desire to delay the passage of these estimates, but if the minister could secure the presence of the secretary of the commission and let us find out just what procedure is followed under the circumstances to which I have referred it would help us a good deal.

Mr. COPP: I have sent for the secretary.

Item agreed to.

FINANCE DEPARTMENT

Finance Department, charges of management, $1,085,550.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: There is just one thing I would like to bring to the attention of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance. I have gone through the statement and I think there is a clerical error in connection with the appointment of Walter Duncan.

9 p.m. I think the addition is $500 too much. He is apponted at a salary of $2,550 and the same item provides for "a further sum of $2,500," which would make a total of $5,050, while the vote is for $5,550.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): I think that is correct. Mr. Duncan was formerly connected with the Justice department, where his chief duty lay. He is now assigned to the Finance department and we are accordingly asking for this vote. We might carry the vote subject to the correction.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Subject to $500 being taken off?

Item agreed to.

Auditor General's Office—salaries including Auditor General at $1,000 additional to 7-8 Edward VII, chap. 6, $257,790; contingencies $54,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I desire to ask the minister whether we can hope for some action in connection with the Auditor General's office this year? It is a matter I have discussed often not only publicly but with my hon. friend, and if he can hold out some hope of having the office put in something like working order, I would be glad to hear it.

Mr. FIELDING: It is my intention to propose to the House in a day or two a measure designed to create an audit board. I do not mean a board for the ordinary purposes of audit, but I propose that a board of audit shall be constituted, to inquire into the whole system of audit, not to audit any particular account, but to review our whole system of audit, and to see what suggestions can be offered in the direction my hon. friend has suggested for a general improvement in the system. I intend to put a resolution of that kind on the order paper within a day or two, and I am quite sure my hon. friend will find it satisfactory.

Mr. LUCAS: Is the increase in this vote just the regular statutory increase?

Mr. FIELDING: I think there is no special vote that I can recall.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The numbers are just the same. It is 170 each year. There is no change in the employees.

Mr. FIELDING: There is nothing but the statutory increase. There is no special vote.

Item agreed to.

Insurance—	
Salaries, including Superintendent of Insurance, $1,000 additional to salary authorized by 7-8 Edward VII, chap. 69..	$67,745
	$128,745

Mr. CAMPBELL: Could the minister give us the reasons for the increase in this vote?

Mr. FIELDING: The increase of $6,360 is explained as follows:

Statutory increases..		$2,040
Reclassification..		480
New positions..	$7,860	
Old positions dropped	4,020	
		3,840
Total..		$6,360

The expenses of that office, of course, it is understood, are all paid, chargeable upon the insurance companies.

Item agreed to.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

Department of External Affairs—salaries, $77,740.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Who is in charge now of External Affairs?

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Price Minister): Does my hon. friend mean as Secretary for External Affairs or Under-Secretary?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Under-Secretary.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Sir Joseph Pope.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Mr. Christie has left the service. Who is taking Mr. Christie's work?

Mr. MACKENIE KING: Mr. Christie has resigned. His position has not been filled.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is the intention of the government in that regard?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: To have the position filled in due course.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Does the department still continue the passport system? The system of issuing passports, or not permitting anybody to leave the country without a passport, was built up during the war. Is it the intention to discontinue that system at an early date?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: As far as I am aware, the passport system is not utilized to anything like the extent it was used formerly. During the war there were, of course, numerous regulations governing the conditions affecting passports, but these have gradually been modified However, it is always more or less of an advantage to anyone visiting a foreign country to have a passport, and persons going from Canada abroad usually apply for passports. As far as persons coming into Canada are concerned, I do not think there is any special requirement of that kind.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I understand that at the present time a person cannot go to England without having a passport. If he does he is liable to be held up on the steamship. A case occurred last year of a lady in western Canada who had booked her passage on a steamship and made all arrangements to leave for the Old Country; she was not aware at the time that she was obliged to have a passport, but some question arose as to her husband's naturalization which caused her a great deal of trouble. She had to go out of her way and come to Ottawa. It cost her a great deal of money, and she nearly missed her boat. After she reached England she wrote to me stating that not more than one third of the people on the steamship were provided with passports. The purser asked some of the passengers for their passports, but others were not asked for them. Nevertheless, the regulations of the department here were that no one could leave without a passport. It seems to me that the regulation ought to be either rigidly enforced or else done away with altogether.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am informed the passport regulation is still enforced as regards persons going from Canada to Great Britain.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Does the Prime Minister think it is necessary to continue it? It looks to me like an unnecessary trouble to compel people travelling to England to secure a passport. Before the war it was not considered necessary, and it should not be necessary now.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The matter does not rest with our government. It is by request of the Colonial Office that that system is maintained. I presume there have been difficulties in the ports of Great Britain, and they have thought it necessary to continue the passport system. What the hon. gentleman suggests is very much to the point. It might be well for us to make representations as to the necessity of continuing the passport system.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: What is the scope of the work of the Department of External Affairs?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It is pretty well world-wide in scope. It has to do with matters pertaining to the different countries. Any communications that come from foreign governments or that relate to matters affecting other countries, come by way of the Department of External Affairs; the communications come through that channel and are distributed to the different governmental departments affected. Similarly replies that are being sent affecting trade and commerce, or any other business of the departments, when they are in the nature of official communications requiring records, are all sent to the Department of External Affairs. It is impossible to indicate what subjects may come in then. There is an infinite variety of questions. Practically all of the despatches that come to the Governor General's office, except those that are directed to the Prime Minister, are sent through the Department of External Affairs to the different governments concerned.

Item agreed to.

AGRICULTURE

Agriculture—administration and enforcement of the Destructive Insect and Pest Act—to confirm as permanent the appointment of Assistant Entomologist, C. B. Hutchings and provide statutory increases from April 1, 1919, to March 31, 1923, $600.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is the idea of confirming the appointment here?

Hon. W. R. MOTHERWELL (Minister of Agriculture): This appointment was made some years ago, but through an oversight,

some order in council not having been passed, it was never made permanent, and consequently this official lost the advantage of the salary increases provided in his classification. This is to make the appointment permanent, and also to provide for the amount he would have got had his appointment been made permanent at the time it was intended so to make it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: When did the minister make the discovery?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: We made provision for such cases last year in a lump sum, but through some technical objection it was not made applicable to this particular case.

Item agreed to.

Health of animals—to confirm as permanent the appointment of Veterinary Inspectors O. Hall and W. F. McDougall, and provide statutory increases from April 1, 1919, to March 31, 1923, $1,410.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: These are similar cases.

Mr. TOLMIE: What are the particulars?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The explanation is the same as I gave in the other case. Apparently these men had been put on temporarily and were eligible for the permanent list, but through an oversight the appointments were not made permanent. I have not the details by me. The case came before me last year and we proposed to dispose of it by voting a lump sum; but the Auditor General objected to that course. There was therefore nothing to do but bring the matter before the House.

Mr. TOLMIE: This is a case of long standing?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes.

Item agreed to.

Further amount required for tuberculosis eradication work, $100,000.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: This is to take care of accounts that came in after the vote for the testing of herds was exhausted.

Mr. TOLMIE: Will this amount nearly meet the situation?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I am afraid we shall have to be heard from again.

Mr. TOLMIE: How much does the minister estimate he will require? We might as well know now.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: We shall have another supplementary vote in a few days.

Mr. TOLMIE: Is it the intention of the government to bring down further supplementaries for tuberculosis?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I have recommended it to my colleagues, but I do not know what they will do.

Mr. CALDWELL: I hope it will be considered favourably, because this is one of the most important works of the Department of Agriculture. This work and the testing of dairy cattle for the contents of butter fat are matters of great importance, and if we are going to put the dairy industry on a sound basis in Canada these two branches of agricultural activities cannot be neglected.

Item agreed to.

FINANCE

Expenses of Canadian Delegation to the League of Nations—further amount required, $971.12.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What does this bring the total to?

Mr. FIELDING: The appropriation was $15,000. This is to provide for excess.

Item agreed to.

Expenses in connection with the negotiation of treaties and cattle embargo conference, $8,264.83

Mr. TOLMIE: What are the particulars?

Mr. FIELDING: No provision was specially made in the estimates. The accounts have been paid from civil government contingencies, and the total involved will be transferred when this vote becomes available. The sums charged to the item are: "For Mr. Fielding, $1,434; Mr. Russell, of the Department of Finance, $1,797.37; Mr. Veits, $2,033.46." The expenses of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries are charged to the contingencies of his own department, I understand; they are not covered by this item.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What method does the minister adopt for apportioning the expenses of negotiating treaties as against the expenses in connection with the League of Nations?

Mr. FIELDING: The work in connection with the League of Nations having been concluded we proceeded to London and later to Paris. There was a line of demarcation between the two.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: But does the minister charge all his travelling expenses to the league or all to the treaties, or does he divide them on a pro rata basis?

Mr. FIELDING: The expenses in connection with the League of Nations were com-

puted up to the time the League of Nations ended; then we went to London and to Paris. When the League of Nations ended we ceased charging any expenses to the League of Nations; then in London and in Paris the work in connection with the cattle embargo and the negotiation of treaties began.

Item agreed to.

Miscellaneous—Merchants Bank Inquiry, legal and incidental expenses—further amount required, $3,195.24.

Mr. STEWART (Humboldt): What is the total cost of this investigation?

Mr. FIELDING: I am advised that $15,695.24 is the correct sum.

Mr. KELLNER: Has this to do with the prosecution of some of the officers of the Merchants Bank?

Mr. FIELDING: Yes.

Mr. KELLNER: Was the action brought under the Bank Act or under the Criminal Code?

Mr. FIELDING: The Minister of Justice says it was under the Criminal Code, but it is the Criminal Code as applied to the Bank Act. The Bank Act fixes the obligations to make returns and the prosecution was for making returns not in conformity with the act.

Item agreed to.

Miscellaneous—to provide for Canada's contribution towards the maintenance of the permanent Secretariat of the League of Nations—additional amount required, $45,140 47.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON I am a good deal disappointed in seeing this item in the estimates at all. Last year we had a discussion on the matter and I remember pointing out that Canada, having regard to population and like considerations, was very much smaller than other countries that were paying less than she was, very much smaller certainly than those paying an equal amount, and that something ought to be done towards getting a reduction. Sir George Foster did take steps to that end the last time he was there, but now we find that instead of reductions we are getting an increase. Why is that? We are paying far too much.

Mr. FIELDING: The matter is entirely covered by a paragraph which I may be permitted to read from the report of the delegates:

Under the provisions of the Covenant, the expenses of the league were allocated between the various countries in the proportion established for the International Bureau of the Universal Postal Union. This arrangement required Canada to pay the same sum —about $200,000—as was required of one of the great nations, Great Britain for example. That the scale of payments so determined operated unfairly to a number of the smaller nations was recognized. At the Second Assembly a committee appointed to deal with the matter proposed another scale of distribution, under which Canada's proportion would be reduced to about $150,000. This distribution, however, did not come into operation for the reason that it failed to receive the endorsement of the required number of members of the league. The original scale of distribution therefore remains in operation as respects the present year.

That is, the year now passed.

The whole question was further considered at the latest Assembly and a rearrangement was agreed upon to take effect next year. The amount required from Canada will be $183,668.03.

This vote is to pay the balance due from last year. If we are a member of a society we must conform to its established rules. The League of Nations established this distribution of expenses, and I do not see how we can change it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not know, of course, what was done, but I have a very distinct recollection of my hon. friend's attitude in the matter, or if not his personal attitude, the attitude of his party; and that attitude was that we were paying upon an unfair basis. As I recollect the matter, Sir George Foster a year ago had been successful in getting the thing referred to a committee and in securing a recommendation for a lower scale. We thought last year the vote was too high; my hon. friends opposite thought it was too high. But instead of getting any relief, we seem to be practically back to the postal convention.

Mr. FIELDING: No.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Very nearly, if my hon. friend will allow me. Why is it that ordinary considerations such as population and so on are not taken into account in connection with our assessment?

Mr. FIELDING: The hon. gentleman is in part correct when he says it was proposed that there should be a reduction. I may say, though, that I have no recollection of making any such comment as he suggests; I must have stated the situation as it really stood. But it is a fact there was a suggestion for a readjustment of the grant which would reduce Canada's proportion. That recommendation never took effect. It was a mere committee report; the various stages necessary to make it effective were not taken, so the old arrangement remained for the past year, and this is to make good the deficiency. Then a new arrangement was made which will take effect for the coming year, the amount involved being as I have stated. In a matter

of this kind it is not possible for any particular section of the league to impress its own view. The matter was discussed and dealt with by a committee; they made this distribution, and Canada's proportion, while less than the earlier sum, is still a very considerable amount. I do not know what we can do to alter it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What amount did my hon. friend and his associates suggest as a proper assessment for Canada?

Mr. FIELDING: I have no recollection of ever having designated any particular sum.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What basis did he urge as the proper basis of assessment?

Mr. FIELDING: The original basis was the postal union. Then another distribution was made by the committee; as to how they reached it, I could not tell my hon. friend. The result was a recommendation for the reduction of our share to about $150,000. It was in the expectation that that arrangement would be confirmed that the vote was taken last year. The arrangement, however, never got beyond the stage of a recommendation; the old arrangement remained, and we owe the difference between the amount of the original appropriation and the amount voted last year.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Was Canada represented on that committee?

Mr. FIELDING: If I am not mistaken, the High Commissioner for Canada was a member of it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What basis was suggested by the High Commissioner as a proper basis upon which Canada should be called upon to pay?

Mr. FIELDING: I could not tell what the High Commissioner proposed in the matter. The conclusions are all set forth in the reports; this is simply the net result. It is shown that we have to pay that balance for last year and that our appropriation for the new year will be $183,668.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The matter is left in an exceedingly unsatisfactory condition. We pay entirely more than we should pay. Last year when this matter was being discussed, the question of getting a reduction of our share was one of the points considered. To-day we are told that notwithstanding the report of the committee that have considered the question, it has been determined that we are not to get any relief. We do not even know how that result has been arrived at; we do not know upon what basis our representatives thought Canada should be assessed. We do not know what sum was represented to the councillors of the league as a fair and proper sum for Canada to pay. I think the least the Prime Minister can do is to see that we get a report from the High Commissioner, who apparently has had to do with the determining of this important question. Can the minister tell me what Australia is called upon to pay under this year's arrangement?

Mr. FIELDING: I may say that I have no intention of throwing the responsibility of this matter on the High Commissioner. My hon. friend asked as to Canada's being represented on the committee which was charged with the consideration of this matter; the High Commissioner was on that committee, but for the conclusions reached we must all share the responsibility. As to what Australia pays, I have not the information at hand, but the detailed reports of the proceedings, which are very voluminous, would likely give that information.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am not insinuating that the minister is trying to get rid of the slightest responsibility; I am simply trying to get at the facts. He says the only gentleman who represented Canada on that committee was the High Commissioner, and that is why I used his name. But surely we are entitled to know where we stand in this matter, when it is admitted by everybody that Canada has been suffering an injustice.

Mr. FIELDING: I could get for my hon. friend a list of the contributions assigned to all members of the league. The reports are in the library; anyone can get them, but I shall be happy to get them for my hon. friend if he wishes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think we should have more than that. We should have a statement of the position taken before the committee by Canada's representative on this highly important question.

Mr. FIELDING: I do not think it is a case where Canada should have a particular case of her own. If Canada is to be a member of the League of Nations and share in all the glory connected with it, she must pay her share according to the conclusion reached by the proper officers of the league.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Now, just look at that for a minute—"according to the conclusion reached by the proper officers of the league."

Mr. FIELDING: Of the league itself.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Who are the proper officers.. To whom was the thing referred? It was referred to a committee of the members of the league with a view to doing justice to the smaller nations, to the weaker nations financially. Why, there are nations with populations much greater than Canada's paying less than Canada does. Surely we are entitled to know upon what basis we are assessed, what position was taken by the representatives of Canada upon that committee, what case was urged for Canada then. That is all I am asking.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: An item for $150,000 was placed in the estimates for 1922-23 to pay Canada's proportion of the expenses of upkeep of the permanent secretariat of the League of Nations. This was a reduction of $50,000 over the vote of 1921-22. The reduction was made in anticipation of reallocation of the expenses of the league proposed at the last assembly, under which Canada's contribution was fixed at 775,571 gold francs, or 149,649.02 United States dollars, instead of 1,011,335 gold francs, equivalent to 195,140.47 American dollars, on the universal postal union basis. The proposed new scale, however, could not be operative unless ratified by the governments of all the states represented upon the council and also by a majority of the members of the league. A communication has been received from the Secretary General of the league pointing out that as the French government has officially informed him that they do not intend to submit to the Chamber for ratification the resolutions of the assembly which would make operative the new scale, he has no choice but to ask for Canada's contribution on the old basis. Accordingly a vote is now asked for to enable the total of Canada's share of expenses above referred to amounting to $195,-140.47, to be paid.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is the date of that notification?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING It was received some months ago.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The position indicated by that notification is not what was told us by the Minister of Finance.

Mr. FIELDING: Wherein does it differ?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The minister said we would have to accept what was fixed by the officers of the league. Apparently the league has nothing to do with it; we do not get the reduction because France will not consent.

[Sir Henry Drayton.]

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The Secretary General of the league sent this communication, and he sent it as the official representing the league.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Did I hear the Prime Minister aright, Mr. Chairman? Is it a fact that the readjustment as recommended on a basis of equality will not go into effect simply because one country, France, says it cannot go through? Is that the position.

Mr. FIELDING: No, that is hardly the position. The basis upon which this allocation was made can no doubt be ascertained from the detailed reports; if my hon. friend wishes the information we shall be happy to bring it down. As I have said, all that is set forth here is the conclusion. It has turned out that the change contemplated last year was never put into effect; therefore we had to revert to the old arrangement, and we make an appropriation to conform to that. Then we ask for the coming year the appropriation which the League of Nations has assigned to us—not merely the officers of the league, but the league itself.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: In answering the question I put to the Prime Minister, the Minister of Finance has entirely missed my point. I put a very plain question to the Prime Minister, and it was this: Is it a fact that the reason the rearrangement did not go through was because it was objected to by France?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The arrangement could only become operative provided it was ratified by all the states represented upon the council and also by a majority of the members of the league. A communication has been received from the Secretary General of the League of Nations pointing out that as the French government has officially notified him that they do not intend to submit to the Chamber for ratification the resolution of the assembly which would make operative the new schedule, he has no choice but to ask for contributions on the old basis.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then I was correct.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Quite correct as to France not accepting the new schedule.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am taking whatever information I can get, and I assume that the report is correct. Now I ask my hon. friend whether, having that before them, the Canadian representatives took that question up with the government of France.

Mr. FIELDING: I have no doubt that the Canadian representative on the committee discussed the whole question not only with the representative of France but with other representatives as well, and a conclusion was reached to which Canada I think is in honour bound to respond.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: There is a distinction there. Apparently the excuse given —I will not say excuse, for that may be looked upon as an objectionable word—the only reason given by the Secretariat for withholding from Canada the relief she was entitled to, as everyone thought over here, and as the committee that was dealing with the question also thought, was that France did not agree to it. I would have thought that the matter would be taken up with France under those circumstances. Did not my hon. friend discuss it when he was over in France negotiating the French treaty?

Mr. FIELDING: Not in connection with the French treaty, most certainly not.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Are we to get the information asked?

Mr. FIELDING: What information? The amount payable by the other countries?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: No. What I am asking is this: Here we have a complete turnround from what was done last year. What I want to find out, and I think the House has a right to know it, is what basis was submitted in Canada's presentation to the committee that dealt with the matter this year as the proper basis of assessment? What was the claim that was made by Canada's representative at this last gathering as to the amount Canada should pay?

Mr. FIELDING: I do not agree with my hon. friend that we should set up any special claim for Canada as to what should be our contribution and have a fight over the question. That is not my conception of the duty of the delegates of Canada at all. What information we have as to the distribution we would be able to supply.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: We have heard about the expenses of the league. Are we to have an opportunity of hearing what the league is doing, and of discussing the character and policies of the league? I do not know what the Prime Minister has in mind with regard to this.

Mr. FIELDING: There is no reason why at any time on the usual motion for Supply my hon. friend should not discuss the League of Nations if he wishes.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: It seems to me that at some time this ought to be done. There are a number of very important matters concerning the league, which is regarded as the nearest approach we have to a central body for negotiating world relationships, and it seems to me that we ought not to pass over these items as a matter of form, but rather that we should consider very carefully the work of the league. If this is the proper place to do it, I for one should like to hear some report and to offer some observations regarding the league.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Now is the time, then.

Mr. FIELDING: There is no objection at all to my hon. friend's discussing it.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: In view of the very important questions which are confronting us all over the world to-day a matter of this kind ought to be given the most serious consideration by this House. I regret there is such a small number in the House at this hour that we cannot have a very full discussion of this question, which is much more important than many of the questions which have taken up a considerable portion of the time of the House.

I noticed the other day that a very severe criticism was passed on the league by a member of—shall I say?—an irresponsible Canadian body:

> The League of Nations is a pretentious framework. It has a great aristocratic and costly Secretariat; it has an army of officials; it has all the accessories of clerks and subordinates; but it has neither physical nor pecuniary nor moral force. It has no physical force, because it has no army or navy to enforce its decrees; it has no pecuniary force, because it has no amassed treasure and exists only upon the subscriptions of the nations which belong to it; it has no moral force, although it may cajole or threaten inferior nations, because of the more important nations each seeks its own aggrandizement, and wants to seize upon any territories weakly defended, and there is no regard for the rights or interests of any other power.

I should not like to endorse that statement, but I would suggest that if Canadians of standing are prepared to make such statements with regard to the League of Nations we should very carefully scrutinize its operations before deciding to continue our membership therein.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Who is that statement by?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: That statement was made by a member of an irresponsible Canadian body. Possibly we had better not discuss the place where it was made.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What is the name?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Is it necessary for me to give it?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do not think my hon. friend ought to quote a statement as coming from a member of any body and withhold from the House the name. The entire value of the statement attaches to the source from which it emanates.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I think I shall have to leave the statement as it is.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Does my hon. friend wish us to discuss a statement from a source that he is unwilling to give to the House?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I think I shall have to let it stand as it is.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am afraid my hon. friend will have to reason by himself then.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I say I should not like to have to endorse that statement, but I do repeat that when such statements are made by prominent people in Canada it is well that we should carefully scrutinize the work which the league is carrying on. There is not the slightest doubt I think in the minds of anyone that the world demands at the present time some organization such as a league of peoples. We have been told that the League of Nations ensures against war, that it helps to create an international mind, that it is somewhat of an approach to the parliament of man, and so on. On the other hand I think we must recognize that the criticism is correct that, after all, this league is not truly international in character so long as all nations are not freely admitted, that its constitution is inflexible so long as that constitution cannot be readily amended, that the League of Nations is undemocratic, as the assembly is undemocratically chosen, and the council is not responsible to the assembly. Further than that, a league such as this or any organization of this character must be judged not so much by the constitution itself as by the character of those who are members of it and who are carrying forward its work, and we must remember that the men who are responsible for the Peace Treaty of Versailles are the men who were responsible for the League of Nations. I think perhaps no one can read that pen picture which Mr. Keynes gives us of the older men responsible for the war as they sat in that magnificent chamber and drew up the Peace Treaty of Versailles without wondering whether the spirit of these men is not essentially connected with the kind of work which has characterized the league during the whole period that has elapsed since that time.

I want to acknowledge very frankly some of the good things that have been accomplished by the league. It has, I take it, become a sort of registry office to which all treaties bearing on international political relations must be brought for registration and publication. That would seem to go a very considerable distance, if adhered to, in doing away with the dangers of secret diplomacy. We have gone a long way, through the league, in the establishment of a world court of international justice; and I understand that there is a possibility that America may definitely enter. If that can be accomplished a very great step forward would seem to have been achieved—a step of sufficient importance in itself in my judgment to warrant the creation of this league. Further than that we have established an international labour office.

In the Treaty of Versailles it was clearly recognized that without social justice there cannot be permanent peace; and we at last have an organization, that has, at least, given us considerable information with regard to the conditions which have prevailed in the various countries; has sought to correlate this information and, if possible, to standardize some of the great social reforms.

Some of the advocates of the league have been telling us of the international relationships that have been definitely improved by the good services of the league. I am not at all sure that the league has accomplished much along these lines. The action of the league in Austria has been severely criticized. Although, apparently Austrian conditions have been somewhat stabilized it has meant an immense amount of unemployment, the dismissal of large numbers of the civil service, and very great hardship on the common people of that country. Further, the Aaland isles have been referred to. I am not going into detail in regard to the decision in that case, but it is open to question as to whether the decision is in harmony with the principles of justice, or in harmony with the clause of Woodrow Wilson's declaration respecting self-determination. In the older countries the

decision of the league in this respect is very severely questioned. Another decision of the league was with regard to Upper Silesia. We have been told that this was a great triumph for justice. Here again there are two sides to the question. I have in my hand the following protest which was published in the old country papers against the decision of the league:

We, the undersigned, solemnly protest against the arrangement for partitioning Silesia approved by the council of the League of Nations. We recognize, especially in the economic division as now ordered, a departure from justice, a disregard of history, and a defiance of the verdict given by the recent plebiscite. We foresee that such a partition makes it more than ever impossible for Germany, thus still further and so terribly crippled, to meet the reparation demands upon her. And we believe that such a verdict will intensify afresh the unrest of Europe, the danger of future war, and the disorganization and impoverishment of society not only on the Continent, but in this country.

I notice among the signatories to this protest such names as Lord Parmoor, J. A. Hobson, Jerome K. Jerome, George Lansbury, J. Ramsay Macdonald, Sir George Paish, Arthur Ponsonby, Hon. Bertrand Russell, Charles Trevelyan, and Colonel Josiah Wedgwood. Here again it would seem possible the league may be simply an instrument for the carrying out the will of the victorious nations rather than an institution designed to lay the foundation for a permanent peace.

More recently we have had brought to our attention the question of the Saar valley. On the floor of this House a few weeks ago I asked a question with regard to this. We in Canada, perhaps, are particularly interested because a Canadian, a former mayor of Winnipeg, Mr. Waugh, is one of the British representatives on the Saar Commission. I should like to read just two or three paragraphs from a letter to the editor of The Nation and The Athenaeum in regard to what the writer calls "The Scandal of the Saar." The opening paragraph reads thus:

British opinion is tolerably informed as to what is happening in the Ruhr. Has it any idea what is happening in the Saar? Does it realize that the policy France has adopted in the area she holds under military occupation is being deliberately extended, under cover of what is nominally League of Nations government to the league-administered territory adjoining? And do the League of Nations Union and its supporters propose to take any action in regard the lamentable failure of the League of Nations Council last week to deal with a flagrant and undisguised abuse?

And again:

The Governing Commission of the Saar valley, it may be recalled, consists, as provided by the Treaty of Versailles of one Frenchman, one inhabitant of the area, and three members who must be neither French nor German. These three are at the present time a Belgian, a Dane who has lived for fifteen years in Paris, and a very able Canadian, Mr. Waugh, for some years mayor of Winnipeg. It is a matter of historic record that on practically every controversial question the commission, which takes its decision by a majority, divides three against two, the two being the Canadian and the Saar representative.

And again:

Far more important was the issue, in the middle of March, of an extraordinary decree (under circumstances which constitute a clear violation of the Treaty of Versailles) establishing practically a state of siege in the Saar.

The letter proceeds:

For commentary on the action of the Governing Commission it is sufficient to quote one or two entries in the minutes of the private meeting at which the League of Nations Council discussed the matter last week. The question was placed on the agenda at the instance of Mr. Branting, the late Prime Minister of Sweden, and from his observations the following passages may be cited:—

I must frankly record the unfavourable impression caused by the fact that it has been considered necessary to establish in a region administered by the League of Nations a regime only justifiable in time of war. This provisional decree authorizes the severest penalties for acts which are not punishable at all or are considered merely as insignificant misdemeanours in any other country.

It would appear from the later telegraphic despatches that the Saar matter is being more or less adjusted and, apparently, that the protest of the British representative has had some affect. I should like to suggest, though, that if we are really an integral part of the league that we should have some effective voice in determining its policies. Otherwise we may be simply contributing our share to the carrying out of policies that are far from those which would be endorsed by the people of Canada. In fact, the league might become simply another form of the union of the victors, and might carry on operations in Europe which would render anything like permanent peace or stable conditions impossible.

There is one more article from which I should like to quote, and I quote from these articles simply because we at this distance and without any direct information from our own government, must depend upon the judgment of other people in this regard. Therefore I pray the indulgence of the House while I read a few paragraphs from a recent paper by Mr. Robert Dell, former chief staff correspondent of the Manchester Guardian:

Why the League of Nations has failed

The assembly is mainly composed of diplomatists and politicians, and, in Europe at any rate, diplomatists and politicians are incorrigible. The war seems to have taught them nothing. Europe is in ruins, and they continue the methods that have brought it to this pass.

A few men in the League of Nations Assembly like Robert Cecil and Dr. Nansen recognize the realities of the situation and know that Europe must be united or perish.

And again the article says:

It is not, however, entirely or even principally the fault of the delegates that the assembly is so futile. The fault lies in the very origin and constitution of the league. Child of the Treaty of Versailles, the league has been tainted from birth.

That treaty gags and binds it. Last year M. Bourgeois, head of the French delegation, laid it down as a principle that the league has no right to deal with any matter arising out of the war or the peace treaties unless asked to do so by the Allied Powers.

This year Lord Balfour repeated that doctrine in his first speech in the assembly. The British and French governments now differ about most questions of policy, but they agree on that.

Since all or nearly all the problems now facing Europe arise out of the war or the peace treaties, or both, it follows that there is very little left for the League of Nations to do.

And again he says:

But no system could have worked if any nations were excluded from it. The Argentine Republic is right in its contention that the league should at once have been thrown open to every country that wished to enter it. So far as Europe is concerned, the league is paralyzed by the exclusion of Germany and Russia.

And further the article continues:

Not only are the activities of the league limited by the doctrine that it must not interfere in matters connected with the peace treaties, but the real power of the league, such as it is, is vested in the council, not in the assembly, and the council is completely dominated by the four great powers—Great Britain, France, Italy, and Japan—which have permanent seats in it.

So, with the best will in the world, the assembly will be impotent unless and until the constitution of the league is changed.

Let me give the assembly its due. It has done one good thing, if only a negative one. It has refused to amend article 18 of the Covenant, which makes treaties and international engagements not binding until their text has been registered with the Secretariat of the league.

And again:

What the assembly decides, however, matters little. In reality, Europe is still dominated by a combination of great powers, when they agree, and left to chaos when, as is more often the case, they disagree. Now, as before the war—perhaps even more than before the war—it is force that prevails.

In reference to the recent trouble between Greece and Turkey he says:

The war between Greece and Turkey was particularly scandalous, since it was in fact a war by proxy between England and France. In reality it was a conflict between British and French imperialism for the domination of the Near East. England egged on the Greeks and supplied them with munitions; France egged on the Turks and supplied them with munitions. It is a beautiful example to the rest of the world.

The British government has been obliged to capitulate by British public opinion, which made it very plain that it would tolerate no war to keep the Turks out of Constantinople or to maintain the British domination over the Dardanelles on the excuse of making them "free."

[Mr. Woodsworth.]

Here was a question eminently appropriate to the League of Nations, if the league were a reality. Dr. Nansen proposed that the council of the league should be asked to deal with it, but he was promptly opposed by England, France and Italy.

One final quotation:

Thus the state of Europe goes from bad to worse and the governments responsible for the situation continue the very methods that have created it. The League of Nations is impotent. Even when a question does go before the council, it is settled by a deal between England and France. The sittings of the council are usually public, but they merely confirm decisions arrived at in secret.

The case of the Saar valley is a good example of the methods employed. The regime imposed on the Saar by the Treaty of Versailles is a gross injustice, but the injustice has been aggravated by the conduct of the council. It has allowed the Governing Commission of the Saar, which has arbitrary powers, to violate the treaty by bringing in a French army and even French gendarmes.

Europe is still ruled by powers of greed and hatred. Until a new spirit is awakened, peace is impossible. Any league of nations is impotent.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is not my desire to comment at any length upon the excerpts which I have read. I should, however, like to urge upon the House the importance of the international questions which are facing us at the present time and to suggest that we should have, even at this session, late as it is, a fuller opportunity for discussing these world affairs. If the league is to be successful, if it is to carry out at all the idea that was in the mind of Woodrow Wilson when he first proposed it, which I fancy has been in the mind of a great many men who have thought of international relationship, it would appear the critics are right when they suggest that it must divorce itself from the Treaty of Versailles, and, that it must stand ready to admit all nations upon equal terms. At the present time Hungary, Austria and Bulgaria are not represented on the council. Mexico, Russia, Turkey and Germany are not admitted at all.

An hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Some hon. gentleman says "hear, hear." Well, if the League of Nations is simply to be a group of nations pitted against other groups of nations, it absolutely fails to fulfil the high expectations which were held at the time of its formation. It means that the world war has taught us nothing, and that we are going to proceed with the old game of imperialistic groups pitted against rival imperialistic groups. I submit that, with the close interrelations that exist in the world to-day with the serious collapse that threatens throughout the entire European Continent, we cannot regard these grave questions with levity.

I understand that in this country we are considerably removed from the theatre of the most important events, but in 1914 we were not too far away to be dragged into the maelstrom, and if anything like a world conflict breaks out again we shall not be too far away to be dragged in again. It would seem that Canada as one of the signatories of the Peace Conference at Versailles had a very important part to play. From the very fact that we are somewhat remote from the Old World, from the very fact that we are not cursed with the bitterness and hatred which seem to curse a great many of the countries of Europe, from the very fact that we belong to the great British Empire, and at the same time are living in friendly relations with the great English-speaking republic to the south of us, it seems to me that we are placed in a very favourable position to play an important part in world affairs. However, I cannot see that we are accomplishing much, if we simply pass votes of money and hand over our responsibility to the league. I cannot see that there is anything democratic in the league itself, unless we have brought to us, at frequent intervals, reports from that league, and unless the people of this country, not merely the government, but the people have some chance to express themselves with regard to the policies for which the league stands.

May I conclude these observations by urging, as I have previously done, that before the close of this parliament, in view of the unsettled conditions in the world to-day, we be given a fuller opportunity for discussing in detail the part that Canada should play in bringing about a solution of world problems.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): The hon. member who has just taken his seat (Mr. Woodsworth) usually defines with clearness his position on any question he undertakes to discuss; but I regret to say that in this instance I am unable to determine whether he is sympathetic to the league or not. It is quite true that he has expressed his approval of some things it has accomplished, but very frequently, and with especial emphasis, he deplored the fact that many of the world's troubles had not yet been settled by the league. The League of Nations, of course, is not a new idea; it is many centuries old. But when in past ages something corresponding to the present League of Nations, and the idea that inspired it, was promulgated, it was in a time or times of the world's history when it was hardly possible for such an association to function successfully. I think the grandest idea of recent centuries is the idea of the League of Nations; and every one who is interested in the welfare of humanity should support it with every atom of interest and fervour that is in him. It is not a perfect institution at present, but it has so far accomplished a great deal of good; and what it has accomplished in a practical way is known to almost every hon. gentleman in this House. I do not intend referring at this time to the achievements of the League of Nations.

Mr. POWER: What has it accomplished?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I do not propose taking up the time of the committee now in any endeavour to inform my hon. friend on that question, because I presume he has read the proceedings of the League of Nations, whose actual accomplishments have appeared in the public press and have been declared on public platforms from time to time. I have no memorandum before me just now that would recall the exact details of those accomplishments, and therefore I cannot state them at the moment. But a few days ago—in fact, I think it was only this week—we saw that an Austrian loan was being financed by certain nations of the world who are members of the league by which they hope to stabilize the currency of Austria. That will be a good thing for Austria and for the world at large. If that is done Austria will proceed to an economic recovery. This suggestion came from the League of Nations, and it is a practical demonstration of the value of the league.

The main idea behind the league is to develop and accentuate the value of thinking in terms of peace instead of war. That is the spirit that animates the league, and it is worthy of the support of the Canadian parliament and of the legislative bodies of all countries.

However, I rise just to make one suggestion. I very gladly support the vote before the committee, and if it were a larger vote it would equally have my sanction, because I should consider that there was some purpose to be served. My suggestion is that when the government next sends its delegates to the League of Nations, those delegates be empowered to extend an invitation to the league to meet at some early date in Canada. I do not know of any legal impediment. I think it is very desirable that the people of the North American continent come into closer contact with European problems, for they are just as much our problems. Our own problems can never be settled satisfactorily by ourselves, while the

difficulties that perplex the European countries remain unsettled. I repeat, it would be desirable for the people of the North American continent to have a world-wide deliberative body of this character convene somewhere on this continent, and the only country in which it could well meet, is Canada. It would also be a great thing for representatives of Europe to come here and see a land whose people have no memories of war on this continent and harbour no fears of war to come. It would be eminently beneficial for such a body to come here and deliberate on great international problems, in a country in which there are no racial hates, no deep-seated rivalries, no religious animosities, no differences of the character which, unfortunately, have separated the various countries and races of Europe for so long a time, much to their detriment, and, I add, to our own disadvantage. I do not make this suggestion casually; I offer it after due consideration. In my judgment, it is a practical suggestion and a useful one that might with advantage to ourselves and to the United States be carried into effect. While I do not intend extending my remarks on this particular point to-night, I do, with sincerity and emphasis, ask the Prime Minister that he and his colleagues take this suggestion into serious consideration. I trust that after deliberating upon it they will see fit to reach the conclusion that it is desirable and proper that we should extend an invitation to the League of Nations to convene in Canada in the early future.

Mr. GOOD: I suppose we should not be too much disappointed if a child has to creep before it can walk. I think that the League of Nations, as it has operated hitherto, has perhaps been controlled to too great an extent by certain influences. Probably it has not been accomplishing all that we would hope, and all that it may accomplish at some time in the future. Notwithstanding all these considerations, however, I do think we should give it our hearty support. There is no other idea, no other beginning that holds out to me greater hope for the solution of some of our greatest problems. I do not think there is much use in the citizen of any country confining his attention wholly to domestic affairs, if at the same time he disregards his obligation with respect to foreign relations. The time has come when all the nations of the world are bound to one another very closely, and if we are not going to take an active part in trying to secure world peace, then we have no assurance whatsoever of our own civilization and prosperity in this country, indeed that the lives of our own children shall be protected.

I endorse the suggestion made by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) in regard to inviting the League of Nations to convene in this country. I regard it as a very happy proposal. I do not know whether or not it is practicable, but I hope that if the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) has an opportunity this coming fall he will avail himself of it and extend a very cordial invitation as suggested.

I offer one further suggestion, that if the deficiencies of the league as it is operated at the present time are to be overcome, then it seems to me they will be overcome only in so far as the nations of the world actively participate in the affairs of the league. And that active participation, as the hon. member for Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth) has pointed out, cannot be carried on by our simply leaving its affairs to the officials or to any delegates that we may appoint to attend the league meetings.

I would emphasize the need of discussing these international affairs in this House. As the Prime Minister, I understand, and some of the members of his cabinet are going to Europe this fall to take part in the Imperial and Economic Conferences, it does seem to me that sufficient time should be set apart before the end of the session to discuss our larger relations—our relations within the Empire and outside. I would therefore most heartily and most emphatically urge the government to afford us this opportuity of discussing the various matters which are likely to come up for consideration at those conferences this fall.

Item agreed to.

To provide for Canada's contribution towards the maintenance of the permanent Secretariat of the League of Nations, $183,668.03.

Mr. POWER: A number of hon. gentlemen have expressed in my presence a desire to discuss the League of Nations. Unfortunately they are absent, some of them for very good reasons—they are fighting for the good cause in Ontario; others are absent because they were not aware this item would come up to-night. I think they will be disappointed at not having had an opportunity of expressing their views on this most important question.

Mr. GAUVREAU: They should have remained here.

Mr. POWER: Quite so. Then my hon. friend from Temiscouata (Mr. Gauvreau)

would have blamed them for not fighting for the cause to which he owes allegiance.

Mr. GAUVREAU: Their first duty is to parliament.

Mr. POWER: I agree with my hon. friend; but possibly some hon. gentlemen considered their loyalty to the party for which my hon. friend is always so proud to fight. However, since they are not here I presume the question has to be discussed at some length. Therefore I propose to make a few observations on the league.

In 1919 when the league was discussed in this House I expressed the hope that when a new government came into power it would see to it that we withdrew from this league. I do not wish to quote my own remarks at any length, and I shall content myself with this one paragraph:

> I had intended to criticize the time which is allowed us for withdrawing from the league, and I sincerely hope that when the next government comes into power—

The House will see I was somewhat of a prophet.

> —it will see to it that we do withdraw from it.

So that this, on my part at least, is no new crusade or agitation. I was not alone in that respect. On September 11, 1919, as will be seen at page 191 of the House of Commons Debates, Second Session, Volume 1, an amendment to the resolution which ratified the League of Nations was moved by the Hon. Mr. Fielding, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Lapointe, which reads as follows:

> That in giving such approval this House in no way assents to any impairment of the existing autonomous authority of the Dominion, but declares that the question of what part, if any, the forces of Canada shall take in any war, actual or threatened, is one to be determined at all times as occasion may require by the people of Canada through their representatives in parliament.

The present Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) moved this amendment because, to quote his own words:

> I think it must be clear that under article 16 this council may determine that an act of war has been committed and can demand of any country within the League of Nations that it shall contribute a certain proportion of the forces necessary to enforce the commands of the league. I do not think there ought to be any doubt about that.

I am not aware that any changes have been made in the article, so that the declaration, "That in giving such approval this House in no away assents to any impairment of the existing autonomous authority of the Dominion" still stands. Since this government has come into power, as I have said, there has been no change that I know of in the wording of article 16, any more than there has been any change in the wording of article 10. I speak subject to correction. I understand that our delegates at the last meeting of the league proposed that certain changes should be made in article 10, but that hitherto their proposal has not been accepted. I think I am correct in making this statement but, as I said before, I speak subject to correction. If, then, there has been no change, I fail to see how we can consistently remain members of this league in view of this declaration, endorsed by the Liberal party in the House of Commons at that time, proposed by the present Minister of Finance and seconded by the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe).

Now I come to the work of the league itself. My hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Maclean) has told us that the league has accomplished a great work, but he has not described just what that great work is. He cited as an example the recent rehabilitation of Austria—that a loan guaranteed by a number of the great powers had been remarkably successful. I think the hon. gentleman would admit that a loan such as that, carrying 7 per cent interest and guaranteed by Great Britain, France and the United States, is a mighty good suggestion.

Mr. MACLEAN: The suggestion came from the League of Nations.

Mr. POWER: It might just as well have come from any individual state. As it was in the general interests of Europe, I see no reason why the states which took part in guaranteeing the loan could not have done so without any suggestion from the League of Nations. It has been said that a number of wars have been prevented by the action of the league. That may be but I am inclined to the view that these wars were prevented more because the nations concerned were unable to go to war either because they had not the necessary financial resources or the necessary men and material. Apparently every time the nations have felt like going to war, even since the establishment of the league, they have done so. We need not go very far back to recall the Near Eastern question. The hon. member for Winnipeg Centre (Mr. Woodsworth) has read from the Nation, I think it was, an article in which reference is made to the Turks fighting the Greeks, the Greeks being backed by Great Britain and the Turks by France, both the latter countries being prominent members of the League of Nations. Surely if these two nations were sincere in their desire to avoid

wars and to bring about general peace they would not have contributed arms and money to the powers which were destroying or threatening to destroy the peace of the world, and on behalf of whom massacres were committed all through the Near East. When it came to a settlement of this question it was not the League of Nations that took action to that end. The powers themselves, independent of the League of Nations, met first on the island of Patras, and subsequently at Lausanne; apparently the latter meeting is still in progress. I believe that one of the belligerent powers actually asked that this matter be submitted to the League of Nations, and the offer was refused; so that any settlement that may be arrived at will not have been the result of the efforts of the League of Nations. Further, when France was not satisfied with the payment of reparations by Germany, there was no appeal to the League of Nations; in fact, when the question was raised of an appeal being made to the league, France, quite properly, I think, refused to consent to that procedure and on her own initiative entered upon German territory and imposed certain conditions to force the payment of what France thought was her due. The hon. member for Centre Winnipeg quoted from certain papers with reference to the conduct of the League of Nations committee in charge of the Saar Valley, and made reference to Mr. Waugh, former mayor of Winnipeg. I have here a copy of Toronto Saturday Night in which reference is made to the trouble in Saar valley. It says—I shall not quote it at length:

> According to the London Times, Mr. Waugh has found himself in a perpetual minority in his efforts to maintain Anglo-Saxon ideals of government, and his resignation has been tendered to the council of the league as a protest against imposition of the old Prussian lèse-majesté laws on the Saar populace. For the person of the former kaiser, a treaty has been substituted as the subject of compulsory loyalty, an action which exceeds in absurdity the Swiss analogy of Gessler's hat, to which William Tell refused to make obeisance. The imposition of these laws arose in connection with a miners' strike.

And so on. The League of Nations, I have no doubt, was formed originally with a good purpose; the proposers of the scheme were imbued with high ideals. But we now find that that very league has become an instrument of oppression. We find that in the Saar valley it is a crime punishable by fine or imprisonment to speak disrespectfully of the League of Nations or to say anything against the Committee on Reparations. I submit that a league whose fundamental principles are those of humanity and of justice should not function in this manner; oppression of that kind tends only to make the league not merely ridiculous but also hateful in the eyes of those who are thus made to suffer.

We have been told that the league has been of great service to mankind in preventing wars, but let me recall to the committee that the greatest step that has been taken for many years in the direction of the preventing of wars was the holding of the Disarmament Conference at Washington, which had nothing whatsoever to do with the League of Nations.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): The same idea was behind that as is behind the League of Nations.

Mr. POWER: Yes, but we are not required to spend enormous sums of money to maintain a permanent secretariat of the Disarmament Conference. The United States, Japan, Great Britain, France and other nations took part in this conference, not as members of the League of Nations, but simply as nations who wished to disarm. If the League of Nations had been worth anything, surely this disarmament could have come through the efforts of the league itself and not through the independent action of several of the great powers. The conference at Genoa in 1922 was held by the great powers of Europe without consultation with the league, and not under its auspices.

Reference has been made to what I might call the social work of the league, and there has been particular reference to the International Labour Bureau. The eight-hour day was one of the benefits which the world was supposed to have derived from the establishment of this International Labour Bureau, but when we came to put the eight-hour day into force we found that any such legislation would be ultra vires of the federal parliament; that it was a matter for the provinces alone. The same condition was found to prevail in other countries; it was impossible to put the eight-hour day into force, so that probably the greatest benefit which was expected to be derived from the International Labour Bureau has been nullified.

Now, either the league binds its members to take part in wars for the preservation of peace under article 10 and, I think, article 16, or it does not. If it does, I contend we have no business in the league; the Canadian nation has no business to enter into any compact or any commitment whatsoever which will bind Canada to take part in any war without previous reference of the subject matter of the controversy to parliament. If the league does not bind us to take part

in any war, then it sinks, so far as its mandates are concerned, to the level of a mere debating society, and I submit it is not the duty of the Canadian government to send the most brilliant of its members, to send its most experienced cabinet ministers, to take part in conferences of that kind. It would be just as well to take some prominent college student or some college professor and send him over and let him discuss these purely theoretical matters, and allow the minister to remain at home in Canada to look after his department.

In bringing this matter before the House I submit that I am perfectly consistent with the stand I have previously taken on questions of this kind. I have asked the House to pass a resolution which had for effect that Canada would not be committed to participation in any of the wars of the Empire without the previous consultation of parliament. Now, if we are not to be committed to participation in the wars of the Empire, surely we should not be committed to participation in wars on account of the Hedjaz, the Roumanians, the Czecho-Slovakians or any other of the new or old nations of Europe. If we have no business in coming to the assistance of the senior partner in the British Commonwealth I do not see what business we have to come to the assistance of people who are foreign to us, who are alien to us in language, in customs and in every possible way. I think it is our duty to look after our own affairs, to discuss in this parliament Canadian questions. We have questions innumerable. We have difficulties in this country which are almost as great as those which confront any other nation. We have financial difficulties, racial difficulties. Let us, for instance, endeavour to conciliate Quebec and Ontario before we start conciliating Roumania and Ukrainia. When we have done that, when we have become one of the great united nations when we have become real Canadians, then if our ministers or our members have any time to spare let them go to Europe if they wish and play at European diplomacy. Let them amuse themselves by jousting against the politicians and statesmen of Europe, but until such time I sincerely hope that we shall confine our activities to the development of our own country.

Item agreed to.

Canadian representation in the United States, $60,000.

Mr. STEVENS: Would the Prime Minister be good enough to say what steps, if any, have recently been taken regarding the filling of this appointment? There have been some rumours around, and it would be very profitable to have something definite.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The rumours to which my hon. friend refers are rumours. Nothing has been done in the matter up to the present time.

Mr. LUCAS: Would the Prime Minister explain what this vote is for?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: There is at the present time at Washington a representative of the Department of External Affairs and a correspondent. They have a very small staff and they keep the government at Ottawa informed on matters concerning the different departments. This item is to cover the expenses of that office as constituted at the present time, and to make provision for enlarging the office if thought advisable.

Item agreed to.

Amount required to meet expenses of Lake of the Woods Control Board, $10,000.

Mr. STEVENS: Is it the government's intention to proceed this session with some bill in connection with this matter?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes.

Item agreed to.

Salaries and expenses of the Paris Agency, $42,500.

Mr. KNOX: May we have a little information as to what this item covers?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: We have in Paris a Commissioner General who represents Canada in France. The office is similar to that of the High Commissioner in London. He corresponds with the government of France and, in fact, with other governments of Europe, and also looks after matters of interest to Canadians generally whether they be of a business or other nature.

Mr. LUCAS: What salary does he draw?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: He receives a salary of $10,000.

Item agreed to.

Chief Electoral Officer—salaries and contingencies of office, $16,300.

Mr. GOULD: Is there anything significant in that item this year?

Item agreed to.

Supervision of government purchases and sales, including salary of L. R. La Fleche at $6,000, $25,000.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The ex-Minister of Finance asked last night for some information on this item as to the method in which purchases were made by the Post Office Department, and the item was held

over pending the bringing down of that information. I have here all the information that was requested, and I might perhaps just read the memorandum that was given to me by the Postmaster General:

The procedure under the former administration was that the Post Office Department invited tenders, and when the tenders were sent in they were opened by officials of the Post Office Department, and the contract was awarded to the lowest tenderer.

The award was then submitted to the minister for his approval. Upon the minister's approval being obtained, the papers were sent to the Purchasing Commission for their approval and signature.

The latter procedure was purely formal as the Purchasing Commission in every case simply O.K.'d what had been done in the department. However, this latter step consumed considerable time and often delays occurred.

The procedure followed under the present administration in the purchase of supplies in the Post Office Department is exactly the same as that followed under the preceding administration, except that time is saved by the recommendation being sent direct to council and not to the Purchasing Commission, which merely acted as a rubber stamp under the preceding administration.

The order in council appointing the Purchasing Commission contains the following paragraph:

"Supplies or articles required of the value upon any one requisition not exceeding $500 may be purchased upon requisition of the deputy minister of the department concerned, but requisitions for supplies or articles exceeding in value the aforesaid amount must be approved by the minister of the department."

The Post Office Department acts strictly in accordance with the foregoing section.

The attached return, made this session on the motion of the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Kennedy), contains particulars, I think, of the kind which my hon. friend asked for.

Mr. STEVENS: Would the Prime Minister give the number of the return so that it may be referred to?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The number is 205. The details given are as follows:

Return to an order of the House of Commons, dated the 22nd March, 1923, for a return showing:

1. Whether all the departments of the government are making their purchases through the Purchasing Commission of Canada.

2. If not, what departments are, and what departments are not.

3. If all are not purchasing through the Commission, what the reason is.

The position of the Post Office department is stated therein. It is as follows:

The Post Office Department has an official who acts as its own purchasing agent, supported by a staff experienced in the control of the purchase of equipment for the department, and who is, therefore, in a better position to properly supervise this work than any outside body could possibly be.

While during the period of the war owing to the special conditions obtaining at that time, supplies and equipment were purchased through the War Purchasing Commission, after its conclusion there appeared to be no reason why the procedure in effect prior to the war should not be reverted to, and this was done. This admits of more satisfactory and less cumbersome arrangements being made, resulting in a more prompt and effective service and in closer supervision being given by an official experienced in post office requirements.

As a matter of information it may be stated that all purchases up to $500 must be approved by the Deputy Postmaster General, and those over $500 and up to $5,000 by the Postmaster General, and those over $5,000 by the Governor in Council.

Does my hon. friend want to have a specimen of the forms of advertisement that were used for tenders? I have a copy here which I will put on the Table with these papers. In the case of the purchase of supplies by the Post Office Department last year there are copies of the tenders invited and tenders received, in fact there is a complete statement of everything that has been purchased for the department, the tender being awarded in every case to the lowest tenderer. I think my hon. friend will find representatives of both parties in the list.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Without knowing anything about the matter but simply drawing a blank, I mentioned that one department and it is perfectly clear that the Purchasing Commission is not functioning—not functioning in the slightest. Just as I said they are doing nothing; the whole thing is done by the minister.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Yes, "hear, hear." We might as well be frank about it. My hon. friends have gone back to the same old system of political control and patronage that we had before. The statement that the Purchasing Commission was a mere matter of form is not the fact. It was not a mere matter of form. They had to do with the whole matter of purchases and had charge of the whole affair. The return simply amplifies the suspicion that I had.

Mr. MURDOCK: Will not my hon. friend admit that certain departments never did use the services of the Purchasing Commission, even under war-time conditions?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think the Printing bureau in some respects were left outside of it. Apparently they are all getting from under, and in that case why spend any more money?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: We do not propose to.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I thought there was a vote of $25,000?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I explained last night what the vote is for. It is intended

to have a committee of cabinet ministers, a body somewhat similar in form to the Treasury Board, to which would be attached a permanent official and such clerical assistance as he may require for the supervising of all government expenditures. All purchases in that way will be subject to the supervision of a group of ministers. Through the secretary attached to this body all such matters will be brought to the attention of the Prime Minister for the consideration of council wherever there may appear to be any reason to consider special contracts one way or the other.

11 p.m.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am afraid they will never know very much about it. They could not; it is absurd to think they could. The man who has to deal with the matter in the first place is able to put whatever complexion he likes upon it. My right hon. friend says that in the list of all who have tendered, which is attached to this return, we shall find the names of some of our political friends as well as his own.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I did not say that. I said that a list of all the tenders that had been sent to the Post Office Department was included, and he would find among those who had been awarded contracts were representatives of both parties who happened to be the lowest tenderers.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Who is the purchasing agent in the Post Office Department that is spoken of?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am sorry I do not know his name.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I wonder if the papers will tell us that. Well, we can see that afterwards. I am not going to delay the House.

Item agreed to.

To cover unprovided items, 1921-22, as per Auditor General's report, part b, page 3, 1921-22, $2,055,030.

Mr. KNOX: Can we get a little information in regard to what the vote covers?

Mr. FIELDING: It is really not an appropriation at all. It is the Auditor General's account; there is no new appropriation under it.

Item agreed to.

Mail subsidies and steamship subventions—Victoria and west coast Vancouver island, steam service between, $15,000.

Mr. KNOX: I think we should have some information as to what companies are getting these subsidies.

Mr. ROBB: This contract now under consideration is for the service; Victoria and west coast Vancouver Island. The contractors are the Canadian Pacific Railway. They make three complete round trips each month, calling at Victoria, Port Renfrew, Carmanah, Claoose, Bamfield, Port Alberni, Uchucklesit, Sechart, Ucluelet, Clayoquot, Tofino, Christie School, Ahousaht, Hesquiot, Nootka, Whaling Station, Kyuquot, Quatsino, and Port Alice; and if sufficient business offers at other intermediate, accessible points. The contract will be renewed, calling at New Wharf at Ucluelet and Centre island and Sydney Inlet and twice a month at Tofino, Sechart, and Kyuquot.

Mr. KNOX: Is it the Canadian Pacific Railway that supplies this service and draws these subsidies?

Mr. ROBB: Not this particular one under consideration. I will give the information as to the others as we go along.

Item agreed to.

Vancouver and Northern ports of British Columbia steam service between, $24,800.

Mr. ROBB: The Union Steamship Company has this contract.

Item agreed to.

Vancouver and ports on Howe island steamship service between, $5,000.

Mr. LUCAS: What is the service?

Mr. ROBB: The service is as follows:

(a) Daily service from May 15 to September 15 between Vancouver and Gibson's Landing, Hopkin's Landing, New Brighton, Port Mellon, Grantham, and Seaside Park.

(b) A regular service three times each week from April 1 to May 14 and from September 16 to March 31 and more frequently if business should warrant it, between Vancouver and Gibson's Landing, Hopkin's Landing, Grantham, and New Brighton.

(c) A regular service twice a week throughout the year between Vancouver and Hope Point (or Long Bay), West Bay, Grace Harbour, Elkin's point, McNab creek, Douglas, North Bay and Halkett Bay.

(d) A regular service twice a week from October 1 to March 31 between Vancouver, Port Mellon and Seaside Park, with more frequent trips if business should warrant it.

Mr. NEILL: I would suggest not on this particular item, but on the whole of the last three or four items—perhaps it would be an appropriate time to mention it now—that the government should consider the advisability of placing all the steamship lines on the Pacific coast under the Board of Railway Commissioners. The situation is this. I do not say that these companies do not give

value for the money in many cases; indeed in some cases they give more than value. On the other hand they are absolutely a law unto themselves. There is no means whatever of controlling the service they give. If they were under the Board of Railway Commissioners the public could make recommendations to them, and they would be directed to give such and such service, but under the present system the minister makes an attempt once a year to make an equitable arrangement with them which is not always satisfactory.

The way the system works out is something like my hon. friends from the prairies describe when they object to certain things in connection with protection. They begin by asking for a very small subsidy for a route that is needing assistance. They get a subsidy and after a little while they use that subsidy to freeze out any competition that there is. Naturally a boat that is subsidized can cut out one that is not subsidized and the result is that soon there is nothing but the subsidized boat on the service. Then, like everybody else who has a monopoly, they begin to be dictatorial. They will not call at any port where they think there is not sufficient traffic, and then they increase the freight rates and finally they hold up the government. The time comes round to renew the contract. The people want the service, and they cannot do without the boat. The company hold up the government, and the government say: "What can we do? There is only one boat on the route, and we have to allow the increased rate." That is very much like the system of protection.

I am not reflecting on the particular company which is mentioned in this vote though there have been complaints about them. But the cost of subsidies on the Pacific coast amounts to $205,400 a year. That is a very considerable sum considering the comparatively small extent of the coast line. If these lines were brought under the Railway Commission, there would be some method of appeal in order to get a reasonable service. I recall a case a year or two ago where a settlement had a complaint against a railway company of insufficient service, and the service was insufficient. They were giving a most unreasonable service. The Railway Commission came along, and it transpired that part of the service was made up of a boat service and the answer was "We cannot control the boat service because it is not under our board." And there was no redress. the board's agent told them they had no remedy. I would like to ask the minister what the attitude of the government would be in regard to this question of bringing the coast and inland waters of British Columbia generally under the operation of the railway board, so that the public would have some chance in having a say in the regulation of the service. It is all very well to say "If you do not like the service you do not need to use it." But as a matter of fact you do have to use it and you have to take the service subsidized by the government because there is only the one service. It was found by the railway board that there was great need for its operation for the protection of the public, and I maintain that it is only equitable that we should have a tribunal of some kind to settle a dispute between a powerful company on the one hand and a more or less scattered population on the other. I would like to hear from the minister in regard to this matter.

Mr. ROBB: This is the first demand we have had for bringing the service under the Railway Commission. I am not sure that my hon. friend represents the general view of the people on the coast in that regard. If there is any pronounced demand to bring these companies under the railway board, the government will consider it.

Item agreed to.

St. John and ports on the Bay of Fundy and Minas Basin, steam service between, $8,500.

Mr. KNOX: I would like to ask how these amounts are arrived at, whether it is an annual grant or whether they are paid according to the amount of work done.

Mr. ROBB: In most cases we invite tenders, but sometimes we take the best boat that is available. The contract is issued only for one year, subject to being voted by parliament. Sometimes it is very difficult to get boats to go on this service, and occasionally we are compelled to increase the subsidy somewhat. The service is largely for people in outlying localities where the population is sometimes scattered and the profit in the business is doubtful.

Mr. GOULD: On the Atlantic ocean there is a total of $521,666, and on the Pacific $224,-309. For local services the amount is $904,-766, or a total increase of $3,500 in the subsidies. I wonder whether the argument advanced by the member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill) would not also apply to the East where subsidies are greater and more numerous than on the western coast. Possibly the

information might show that there is no necessity for an increase in the subsidies.

Item agreed to.

Progress reported.

ONTARIO ELECTIONS AND PETAWAWA CAMP

Hon. E. M. MACDONALD (Acting Minister of National Defence): I desire to make a brief statement in reference to the question raised by the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) and referred to by other hon. gentlemen this afternoon as to the camp at Petawawa this year conflicting with the Ontario elections. The circumstances are these: Some time in February or March, I am instructed by my officials, arrangements were made for the camp at Petawawa, as for all other camps throughout the country, and therefore by no possibility could the department have been aware that it would in any way conflict with any elections that were to come on. These arrangements involve considerable preparations; they include the enlistment of men and the necessary steps that have to be taken by the officers and all those who get leave to attend the camp. Realizing the desirability of avoiding as far as possible any conflict with the elections, and of enabling the men to vote, after consultation with my officials, with the right hon. the leader of the Opposition, and with the Prime Minister, I have caused a telegram to be sent to the Hon. Mr. Raney, Attorney General of the province of Ontario, suggesting that arrangements be made if possible under the Ontario Act for the taking at advanced polls of the votes of any men who are in any of the batteries. The object is that their votes may be obtained previously to their going to camp. I have suggested further that, in the event of the provisions of the law of Ontario not being ample enough to permit of this being done, the votes be taken at the advanced polls, nevertheless, and if necessary ratifying legislation be enacted at a subsequent session to meet the situation. I am advised that the Hon. Mr. Ferguson, the leader of one of the groups in Ontario, is agreeable to the proposal, and communication has been had with the Hon. Mr. Hay, representing the other group. It was thought desirable, if the proposal were accepted by the Hon. Mr. Raney, that public announcement should be made of the fact immediately in order that those who are affected might be aware of the circumstances. I trust that the Attorney General of Ontario will see that this proposal is carried out. The situation does not affect the votes of any of the infantry regiments or battalions; it affects only some of the men in six or seven batteries of artillery who belong to various constituencies. Only about forty men are concerned, so that the difficulty is not as great as might be supposed at first. I sincerely hope that the suggested arrangements will be carried out and that these men will be able to vote. To make any change in the arrangements that have been already completed in connection with the camp would involve the country in a loss of $7,000 or $8,000, which under the circumstances I do not think we could fairly ask the House to sanction if there is any other way out of the difficulty.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the House adjourned at 11.20 p.m.

INDEX

SECOND SESSION—FOURTEENTH PARLIAMENT, 1923

Abbreviations:—1r., 2r., 3r.,=First, second, third reading. Admn.=Administration. Amdt.=Amendment. Com.=Committee. Dept.=Department. Div.=Division. Govt.=Government. M.=Motion. Neg.=Negatived. Qu.=Question. Ref.=Reference. Rep.=Report. Res.=Resolution. Sec.=Section.

Abattoirs. *See* Cold Storage Act Amdt.; Live Stock Acts Amdt.

Abbott's Harbour, N.S., breakwater, 4563

Abitibi Region
Colonization and settlement, 1401
Transcontinental railway, 2833

Abolition of Capital Punishment. *See* Capital Punishment

Abolition of Grand Jury system. *See* Grand Jury

Academy of Arts. *See* Royal Academy of Arts

Accidents
Automobile, 3958
Canadian National Safety League, 3954
Industrial and other, 3957
Insurance, 3978

Accounts. See Board of Audit Act; Finance

Accredited Herds. *See* Animal Contagious Diseases; Live Stock, Health of Animals

Acland, Mr. F. A. *See* King's Printer; Printing Bureau

Acoustics. *See* House of Commons

Actions. *See* Bankruptcy Act Amdt.

Active Militia. *See* National Defence.

Actuarial Computations. *See* Labour, Annuities

Adams, Dr. Frank, the coal situation, 1265

Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 9, 34, 54, 75, 99, 122
Mover (Mr. Putnam) 9
Seconder (Mr. Rheaume) 16
Amendment (Mr. Hoey) 65; neg. 178
Amdt. to (Mr. Shaw) 72; neg. 177
Motion agreed to, 179

Address—*Con.*
Speakers, Messrs: Bancroft, 99; Baxter, 132; Black (Yukon) 85; Brown, 47; Carroll, 80; Drayton, 153; Duff, 108; Evans, 145; Fielding, 89; Forke, 34; Graham, 54; Hoey, 63; amdt. 65; Hughes, 123; Kellner, 106; King, Mackenzie, 27; Lewis, 117; Lucas, 75; McConica, 166; McMaster, 172; Martell, 101; Meighen, 17; Millar, 50; Neill, 174; Raymond, 160; Robinson, 72; Shaw, 66; amdt. to amdt., 72; Stewart (Leeds), 169; Stork, 149; Woodsworth, 41

Acknowledgment of by Governor General, 1256

Legislation referred to in, qu. 2612

Adjournments. *See* House of Commons

Adjustment of War Claims. *See* War Claims

Administration. *See* Government

Administration of Justice. *See* Justice

Admiralty Act Amdt. Bill (Deputy Local Judges and Deputy Registrars) Res., 1080, 2051; 1r., 2r., com., 2052; com., 3r., 2204

Adulteration of Grain. *See* Grain

Adulteration of Mill Feeds. *See* Feeding Stuffs Act

Advertising. *See* Immigration; Labour; Magazines and Periodicals; Press; Publicity

Advisory Council. *See* Research

Advisory Fuel Committee. *See* Fuel Supply.

Advisory Tariff Commission. *See* Tariff

Advocate, N.S., wharf, 4560

Aeronautics, etc. *See* Air.

Aeroplanes. *See* Air; National Defence, Canadian Air Force

After War Conditions, 1231. *See also* War

Agassiz experimental farm. *See* Agriculture

Age of Consent. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.

Agricultural Conditions. *See* Agriculture

Agricultural Fairs. *See* Exhibitions

Agricultural Implements. *See also* speeches on Budget; Reciprocity with United States; Treaties, French Treaty
Comparative prices, 1912 and 1922, 1407
Duties, 2756, 2815, 2848, 2974, 2990, 3033. *See also* Budget; Customs Tariff
Complaint of, 2863
Increased by increased price, 2848, 2975
Reduction of, 2743
Free admission to United States, 3017, 3062, 3499
French Treaty, 2001, 2246
Georgia pine, importation for, 3411
Imports, qu. 617
Live stock, required to purchase, 1408
Manufacturing of, 2247
Meighen, Right Hon. Mr., speech in 1911, 2848, 2974
Prices, 2836, 2991, 3070. *See also that title*
Comparison with United States, 2739
Standardization, 789, 805
Stumping machines, duty, 2653, 2749, 2955, 3486
Taxation of, 1850
Wheat, bushels required to purchase, 1912 and 1922, 1408

Agricultural Institute. *See* Agriculture

Agricultural Instruction Act. *See* Agriculture

Agricultural Labourers. *See* Farmers; Immigration; Labour

Agriculture. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget; Grain and Grain Trade; Immigration
Accredited herds. *See* Animal Contagious Diseases; Live Stock, Health of Animals
Agricultural conditions, 641, 1165, 1189, 1190, 1192, 1196, 1201, 1231, 1357, 1398, 1402, 1407, 1423, 1438, 1841-47, 1880, 2797, 2810, 2815, 2829, 2830, 2861, 2872, 2928, 2961, 3002, 4038. *See also* Western Provinces
Aird, Sir John, 1407
"Calamity howlers", 2928, 2977

Agriculture—*Con.*
Agricultural Conditions—*Con.*
Canada generally, 2763
Farmers' profits, 2873
Financing. *See* Bank Act Amdt. bill; Credits
Great Britain in. *See that title*
Interest rates 2962
Larcombe, Mr. Samuel, statement, 2873
Parliament difficult to convince, 2730
Past and present price comparison, 2978
Pioneering, 2870
Prince Edward Island, 2972
Production costs and prices, 2835
Special Committee
Appointed, 706
Bradshaw Mr. Thomas, statement, 2829
Evidence, 2972
Inquiry as to, 667
Leave to report, 911
Leitch Prof., dairying industry, 1843, 1845, 1851, 1858
Oleomargarine, 3271
Railway and shipping combine, 1395
Reports qu. 2612
First, 911
Second, 986
Third, 1136
M. (Mr. McMaster) for concurrence, 1209
Fourth, 2127. *See also* Combines; Freight Rates
Interim, printing, 2181
Fourth, Fifth, Sixth and Seventh
M. (Mr. McMaster) for concurrence, 4295, 4363
Fifth, 4007
Sixth and Seventh 4075
Tariff Commmission evidence, 2296
United States. *See that title*
Western provinces 1885, 2845. *See also that title*
Agricultural Credits. *See* Credits
Agricultural education 2869
Agricultural exports, 1904. *See also* Imports and Exports
Agricultural fairs. *See also* Exhibitions
Horse-racing, 726, 750
Agricultural Instruction Act, 3315. *See also* Marshall, Mr. Duncan
Grant 607
Renewal of, qu. 490
Agricultural lands, 1344. *See also* Immigration; Lands
Agricultural loans. *See* Credits
Agricultural products 1857, 2716
Beans, 2981
Distribution, 1852, 2868

Agriculture—*Con.*
Agricultural Products—*Con.*
Duties on, qu. 1992
Comparison with United States, 2958
Reduction by order in council 2650
United States tariff against 2649, 2650
Exports, 1390, 1838, 3061. *See also* Imports and Exports
Freight rates, 3195. *See also that title*
French treaty, 1978, 2006, 2247. *See also,* Treaties, French Treaty
Imports, 445, qu. 617, 2708, 2917, 2958, *See also* Imports and Exports; United States
United States from, 1249
Markets, 1410, 1414, 2869, 3066, 4027. *See also* Markets; Treaties, French Treaty
Competitive, 1804
Disorganized, 2861
France, 2235
Great Britain, 1905, 2714
Marketing agent in, 4675
Home market fallacy, 2849
Marketing and quality, live stock, 2862
See also Live Stock.
Prices, 1168, 2731, 2748, 2861, 2928, 3018, 3069. *See also* Prices
Europe in, 1052
Manufactured products and, 1083, 1407, 1851, 1885, 1907
Production cost, 1858
United States, 2810, 2910. *See also that title*
Agricultural representative in Great Britain, 3291
Agriculture and Colonization Committee
Changes in personnel, 2926, 3261
Oleomargarine, discussion, 3266
Reports
First, 666, 858
Second, 911
Third, 986
Fourth, 1441
Fifth, 2204
Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill, 1441
Assistance to, 2947, 3237. *See also* Bounties
Bacon production. *See* Bacon
Bacteriology, 462
Bad farming, 1887, 2809, 2810, 2812
Banking system and, 4014. *See also* Bank Act Amdt. Bill; Banks and Banking; Credits; speeches on Budget
Bee-keeping, suppression of foul brood, 4675
Biological laboratories, 580
Bonus, 3239
Bovine tuberculosis. *See* Live Stock, Health of Animals

Agriculture—*Con.*
British Columbia, increased production, 1432
Butter. *See* Dairying Industry
Canadian Council of. *See that title*
Cereals, milling and baking test, 463
Cheese. *See* Dairying Industry
Combines and, 2786, 2787. *See also* Combines
Commissioner. *See* Marshall, Mr. Duncan
Committee on. *See under this title,* Agriculture and Colonization
Conditions. *See under this title,* Agricultural Conditions
Co-operation, 1400, 1852, 2869. *See also* Co-operation; Markets
Dairying Industry. *See that title*
Dehydration of fruits and vegetables, 4674
Department
Commissioner of. *See* Marshall, Mr. Duncan
Cook, Mr. Leonard, qu. 2179
Deputy Minister, 2065
Salary, 611, 4669
Deduction for rent of house, 4669
Dryden, Mr. W. A., qu. 384
Trip to South America, qu. 1031, 3294, qu. 3704, 3705
Employees, 815
Estimates, 456, 575, 3283, 3303, 3988, 4074
Marshall, Mr. Duncan. *See that title.*
Officials attending fairs, 285
Salaries and contingencies 610, 3303
Seed branch, 4621
Staff, 2756
Stuart, Mr. John Cameron, qu. 2179
Depression in, 1083, 1889. *See also* Immigration, and *under this title,* Agricultural Conditions
Destructive Insect and Pest Act
Administration, 595, 3988. *See also,* Insect Pests
Diseases of Animals. *See* Live Stock, Health of Animals
Economic organization, 1857, 1858, 1863
Eggs. *See that title*
Entomological branch 3988
Forest destruction by insects, qu. 2178. *See also* Forests and Forestry
Experimental and illustration farms, 456, 3237
Agassiz, 457
Botany, division, forest destruction, 2178. *See also* Forests and Forestry
Brandon, 457, 459
British Columbia, 458

Agriculture—*Con.*
Experimental Farms—*Con.*
Buildings, 4629
Cap Rouge, 459
Central, Ottawa, 456, 465, 485, 2869
Buildings, 4631
Charlottetown, 460, 470
Fredericton, 460, 471
Grain, new varieties, 483
Harrow, 466
Indian Head, 459, 472
Irrigation, Brooks demonstration farm, 3429
Kapuskasing, 459
Kentville, 460
Lacombe, 458, 471
La Ferme, Quebec, 471
Lennoxville, 460
Lethbridge, 458
Livestock, 460-485. *See also that title*
Nappan, 457, 460
Dairy herd, experiment with, 2863
Morden, 459
M. (Mr. Leader) to reduce appropriation, neg. 486
Overlapping, 4633
Publicity, 463, 470
Rosthern, 460
Ste. Anne de la Pocatiere, 460, qu. 1028
Scott, 458
Summerland, 464
Swift Current, 458
Farm credits, 1088, 2869, *See also* Bank Act; Credits
Farm homes, 1215. *See also* Housing
Farm labour, 1166 ,1174, 1424, 1427, 1475, 2876. *See also* Immigration; Labour
Competition with protected industries, 2731
Demand for, 1168
Immigration of, 1100
Farm loans and mortgages, 170-1, 2763, 2962, 4041. *See also* Bank Act; Credits
Farm products. *See under this title* Agricultural Products
Farm women, 1844
Farmers. *See also that title*
City man and, 2869
Earnings, 2813, 3023
In parliament, 2787. *See also* Progressive party
National policy, 2917
Feeding Stuffs, adulteration. *See* Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill
Fertilizers. *See that title*
Field crops, 1889, 2861
Competitions, 600, 602
Production of, 2846
Value, 2845, 2934

Agriculture—*Con.*
Forage plants, 463
Free land available for settlement, 1087
French treaty, 2006. *See also* Treaties, French Treaty
Fruit. *See that title*
Grain-growing. *See* Grain and Grain Trade
Grants to provinces, qu. 490
Grasshoppers, 2774. *See also under this title*, Destructive Insects; Insect pests
Health of Animals. *See* Animal Contagious Diseases; Live Stock
Hudson Bay region, possibilities of, 1065
Immigration and, 1186, 1228. *See also* Immigration
Income tax. *See also* Taxation
Agricultural forms, 4498
Payments by farmers, qu. 1259
Insect pests and fungus diseases, 2774. *See also* Forests and Forestry; Insect Pests
Interest rates in western Canada, 1088. *See also* Bank Act; Budget speeches; Credits
International Institute of Agriculture, 599
Land. *See also* Dominion Lands; Lands
Along national railways, price, 1087
Sale of in western provinces. *See* Immigration, Canada Colonization Association
Live stock. *See that title*
Maritime provinces, conditions in, 1132
Markets. *See under this title* Agricultural Products; *also* Markets
Methods, 3071
Mixed farming, 2747, 2772, 2862, 2953
National policy and, 2786
Needs of, 3065
Noble Foundation farm, 2813
Noxious weeds, 1887, 1888, 2305. *See also* Seed
Organizations, 2976
Plant pathology, 463
"Plutocrats and profiteers," burden of, 1417-18
Poor farming, allegation of. *See under this title* Bad farming
Potatoes. *See* Vegetables
Production, cost of, 640, 1190, 1410
Profitable lines of, 2862
Publications. *See* Government Publications
Review of. *See under this title* Experimental Farms
Sacrifices, 3065
Seed. *See that title*
Seed testing. *See* Seed
Single-crop farming, 2862
Specialized, 2763
Stability, 3068

Agriculture—*Con.*
Tariff and, 1355. *See also* Budget; Tariff
Two ministers of, 3313
Votes for, 3237
Wages of farm labourers. *See* Labour
Weed menace, 1887, 1888, 2305
Wheat-growing. *See* Grain and Grain Trade

Air Board, annual report, 4510

Air Force. *See* National Defence

Air Service. *See also* Canadian Air Force, under National Defence
Destructive insects and pests, control of, 597
Forest patrol. *See* Forests and Forestry

Aird, Sir John
Agricultural conditions, 1407
Prices, agricultural implements and farm products, 1409

Alaskan, steamship, wreck of, 1212, 1659, qu. 1763, 3160, 3330

Alberta. *See also* Western Provinces
Agricultural conditions, 1435, 1438, 2766. *See also* Agriculture; Freight Rates; Immigration
Alberta Drainage Company, 3144
Bank Act revision, 4016, 4041, 4045, 4048
Bituminous sands, 3198
Butter shipments to China, 1840
Change of government, 2799, 2810
Coal, 790, 1262, 1265, 1275, 1281, 1282, 4692. *See also* Coal; Freight Rates; Fuel Supply
Canadian National Railways, qu. 1363, qu. 4437, qu. 4752
Consumption in Ontario, 1276
Freight rates on, 1280, 2781, 2828
Mines, 3424
Crown lands, revenue from, qu. 2515
Dairying industry, 1839, 1851, 2766
Production 1921, 2774
Destitution, 1440
Dominion forest reserves, 1256, 2061
Dredging, 1012
Farms, abandoned, 67
Freight rates, 1957, 1958. *See also that title*
Grain production, 1435
Harbours and rivers, 1001, 4589
Hemp production, 2780. *See also* Hemp Bounty bill
Highways. *See* Canada Highways bill;
Immigration, 1476. *See also that title*
Indians, 2145
Insolvent farmers, 1202
Iron ore, 2512
Irrigation, 1436, 3428
Liberal Convention, 2995

Alberta—*Con.*
Mixed farming, 2772
Natural resources, revenue, qu. 2515
Oil, 2802
Bounty, 2510
Oil-drilling, 2508
Prospecting and developing, 780
Political patronage, 522
Privy Council decision, 2559
Public buildings, 1023
Sales tax collections, qu. 2417
Sessional indemnity, reduction, 1155
Settlers' relief, 3447
Tax sales, 4062
Telegraph and telephone lines, 2683
Tourist traffic, 3438
United Farmers of Alberta
Economic group organization, 3003
Freight rates, 3190
Immigration, 1440
Vermilion, town lots, qu. 489, 1307, 2417

Alcohol, denatured. *See* Inland Revenue

Alderson Claim. *See* Live Stock

Alfred peat plant. *See* Fuel Supply.

Aliens. *See also* Immigration; Labour; Naturalization Act Amdt.
Convicted, deportation of, 2123
Enemies.
Citizenship, 1380
Immigration, restriction of, 1128. *See also* Immigration Act Amdt. bill
Property, 2499. *See also* War Claims
Claim of Canada against United States, 2496, 3823
Custodian of, qu. 1486
Pugsley, Hon. William, appointed as Commissioner. *See* Pugsley
Securities held by United States custodian, 2496

Alliances, Political. *See also* speeches on Budget; Political Parties
Liberals and Conservatives on Bank Act, 4019, 4048, 4125, 4126, 4142, 4245

Alpine Club grant, 3414, 3444, 3954

Alternative Vote. *See* Proportional Representation

Aluminium Company of America, Massena plant, 659

Ambassador, British, at Washington. *See* British Ambassador; Treaties, Halibut Fishery

Ambassador to United States. *See* Canadian Representation

Amendments. *See* House of Commons

American Bank Note Company, postage stamps, printing, 1818

Americanization. *See* Magazines and Periodicals

Amery, Colonel L. C., 1328
Economic conditions in Great Britain, 1205
West Indies steamship service, 3392

Ammunition. *See* National Defence

Ampthill, Lord, unemployment in Great Britain, 1205

Analyst, certificate of. *See* Inland Revenue Act Amdt. bill

Anchor-Donaldson Line
Immigration, 1193
Ocean freight rates, 2127

Anderson, Captain, report on Hudson bay, 1042

Anderson, Mr. G. C., 1823

Anderson, Mr. R. K. (Halton)
Brant hospital, closing of, 1995
Budget, 2837. Colourless budget drafted for political effect, 2837; Right Hon. Mr. Fielding; reciprocity; free trader in opposition, protectionist in power; tariff record of Liberal party; the tariff; average rate of duty; National policy, adoption by minister, 2838; Minister of Agriculture convert to protection; revenue tariff and incidental protection; excise and customs duty; cost of living; Minister of Interior convert to protection; tariff a tax; who pays? excise taxation, 2839; sales tax and cost of living; collection of tax on domestic and foreign goods; sales tax increase in and revenue; question as to origin of finished articles, 2740; turnover tax; automobile industry; customs duty and sales tax 52 per cent; Liberal platform of 1919, repudiation of; reported statement of Minister of Finance on North Essex election; tariff stability, 2841; economy; balanced budget; public debt; cost of government; expenditure, rapid increase of; reciprocity; Treaty of 1854, 2842; depression following abrogation; Fordney-McCumber tariff; time inopportune for negotiations; lines of transportation; interprovincial and world trade; trade with British Empire; imports and exports; trade lines running East and West; wheat, market for, 2843; immigration, reported statement of Sir Henry Thornton; Bishop Lloyd, 2844; amendment; a political gesture; Progressive platform; attitude of opposition towards budget; western provinces, conditions in; rural income tax-payers, bank stock shareholder; field crops, value by provinces, 2845

Anderson, Mr. R. K.—*Con.*
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 534
Customs officials, Halton county, 914
Dundas street highway, qu. 708
Duties on farm and animal products, qu. 1992
Elevators, Ontario, 2037
French treaty, 455
Highways, grant to Ontario, qu. 620
North Oakville post office, 914
Pensions
Disability entitling to, 679
European war and active militia, 3726
Private abattoirs, 185-6
Proportional representation, M. (Mr. Good) 394, 429
Return, inquiry for, 2008
Sales tax on automobiles, qu. 1993, 2841
Soldier Settlement, 2029
Trade and Commerce dept. staff, 2035

Anglo-Canadian commerce. *See* British Preference; Trade

Anglo-Japanese treaty, 1449. *See also* Japan. Restriction of provincial rights 1453

Anglo-Saxons, a colonizing race, 1426

Angouleme, Que., postmaster, qu. 3139

Animal Contagious Diseases. *See* Dairying Industry; Live Stock, Health of Animals

Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt. Bill. *See also* Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill (Compensation for slaughter, reduction of)
Res., 666, 2647; 1r., 2r., com., 2048; com., 2131; 3r., 2138
Sections and subjects discussed:
Abortion infective, 2867
Glanders, 2868
Hog cholera, 2867

Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt. Bill—*Con.*
Sections and subjects discussed—*Con.*
Internal parasites, 2867
Research work, 2867
Tuberculin test 2867
Tuberculosis, 2867
Immunization from, 2866
Watson Dr., chief bacteriologist, 2866

Animals. *See also* Live Stock
Inspection of. *See* Live Stock Act Amdt.
Products, duties on, qu. 1992
Wild. *See* National Parks and Reservations
Wolves, destruction of live stock by, 597

Annapolis Royal, wharf, 941

Annual Drill. *See* National Defence

Annuities, Old age. *See* Labour; Pensions

Anti-Combines bill. *See* Combines bill

Anti-Dumping. *See* Customs and Excise

Appeal Boards. *See* Pension Act Amdt bill; Pensions; Soldiers Civil Re-establishment

Appeals
Attorney-General of Ontario vs. Wholesale Grocers, 2051, 2521
Canada Grain Act 781, 2045
From convictions, inquiry, 4250
Narcotic Drugs Act, 1136
Right of. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.; Yukon Act Amdt.

Apples. *See* Fruit

Appointments. See Civil Service

Appropriation Acts
1. Bill No. 103 (Interim Supply—for $44,725,058.25 for 1923-24) Res. 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 1539
2. Bill No. 202 (Interim Supply—for $46,558,391.58 for 1923-24) Res. 3705; 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 3706
3. Bill No. 252 (for $18,202,105.66 for 1922-23 and $196,870,229.79 for 1923-24) Res. 4735; 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 4736

Appropriations set forth in Estimates. *See* Canadian National Railway bills; Estimates

Arbitrators. *See* Judges

Archambault, Mr. Joseph (Chambly and Verchères)
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4099
Bankruptcy Act, M. (Mr. Casgrain) 1503

Archambault, Mr. Joseph—*Con.*
Belgian Exposition, 496
Bolte, Mr. Camille, 1032, qu. 1138
Budget, 2879. Income tax, 2879; proposed changes; exemption on account of children; community of property; earned and unearned incomes, 2880; income derived from (a) inheritance, (b) accumulated capital, (c) profession or trade; revenue; dividends, 2881
Business of the House
Questions, as orders for returns, 939
Inquiry for, 3507
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Disposal of scrap material, etc., qu. 1138
Tank cars, transportation, qu. 1361
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 528, 567
Civil Service, temporary employees made permanent, qu. 814, 1385
Code Napoleon, 1526, 1558
Contrecœur, wharf, 952
France, reconstruction, 2012
French treaty, 445, 2009, 2262
Grand Trunk, list of shareholders, 940
Greece, loan to, 2010
Imperial conference, 4653
Income tax, exemption for children, M. 1382, 2128, 2880, 4502
Income War Tax Act 1917 Amdt. bill, 4502
Levis dry dock, 1261
Liberal platform, taxation of luxuries, 2011
Montreal-Longeuil bridge, 2086, 2640
Return, inquiry for, 3507
Montreal post office
Appointments, qu. 1361
Bolte, Mr. Camille, 1032, qu. 1138
Political patronage, 528
Public Works Act, tender and contract, 952
Rhineland occupation, qu. 2696
Roumania, loan to, 2010
Trade commissioners, 856

Archibald, Mr. E. S., purchase of thoroughbred stock, 3290

Architects. *See* Parliament Buildings; Public Buildings

Archives. *See* Public Archives

Arctic Expeditions, 4012
Correspondence, 814
New ship, purchase of, 4702
Publication of reports, 3360
Wireless stations. *See* Yukon

Argentine Republic, Senate, 1373

Arichat, wharf, qu. 2180

Armouries. *See* National Defence

Army. *See* National Defence

Army and Navy Veterans, petition, 4536

Army Officers, settlement in Canada, 1432

Aronovici, Mr. A. *See* Canadian National Railways, Paris offices

Arsenals. *See* National Defence

Arsenault, Mr. H. P. *See* House of Commons, Staff

Arthur Young Company. *See* Civil Service

Arthurs, Mr. James (Parry Sound)
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4509
Budget, 3033. Congratulations to Finance Minister; tariff platform of 1921; failure to implement; agricultural implement duty; boots and shoes; tariff changes offset by increased sales tax, 3033; cheque and receipt taxes inconvenient and discriminatory; net increase in duties under budget of 1922; budget of 1923 disappointing; British preference; direct importation through Canadian ports; hardship to the woollen industry; sugar duty; raisins and dried currants; scrap iron; paint ingredients, 3034; potato duty; Fordney-McCumber tariff; crude petroleum bounty; cost of living; French treaty; reductions of duties on luxuries, wines and spirits; favoured nation; prohibitionists and wine duty; 3035; sales tax; pyramiding; freight rates; Crowsnest pass agreement; railway receipts reduced by $20,000,000; reduction made at expense of shipper; rates on lumber, pulpwood and ties; immigration policy; Canada Colonization Association; differences of opinion amongst Liberal and Progressive members, 3036; "blue ruin" speeches; immigrants from Stornoway; northern Ontario and Quebec; agricultural and business conditions, 3037
Canadian Expeditionary Force, enlistments, qu. 1031
Civil Service, salaries and bonus, qu. 2179
Depot Harbour roadway, 4691
Deputy Minister of Agriculture, salary, 4673
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 329
Government workshops, Ottawa, 4617
Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia, 4560
Housing Act, administration, 2171

Arthurs, Mr. James—*Con.*
Immigration Act Amdt. bill, 2429
Mail carriage by subsidized steamships, 2172
Military hospitals, neurological cases, 696
Murray Stewart, vessel, purchase, 3355
Muskoka harbour improvements, 4612
O'Connor, Mr. P. J., qu. 2085
Pensions commission, report, 2128
Petawawa camp and Ontario elections, 3976
Public buildings, new, 4614
Sales tax, 3033-36, 4181
Soldier Settlement Board, loans, qu. 2207
Steamship services, 2171, 2172
Terrebonne public building, 4614
Unemployment relief, 690
Vetcraft shops, 696
Vocational loans, 687
Wireless equipment for vessels, 3355

Artificial Silk. *See* Customs Tariff Items; Textiles, Silk

Artillery. *See* National Defence

Artisans. *See* Immigration; Labour

Arts
Academy of. *See* Royal Academy of Arts
Recognition. *See* Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner)

Ascension Day, adjournment. *See* House of Commons

Ash Wednesday, adjournment. *See* House of Commons

Asiatics. *See* British Columbia, Fisheries; Immigration

Assassination. *See* Immigration Act Amdt.

Assay Office. *See* Mines and Minerals

Assessors. *See* Judges

Assignments. *See* Bankruptcy Act

Assiniboine River
Encroachments of, 999
Expenditure on dyking, etc., qu..3264
Floods, 993, 998, 3041

Assisted Passages. *See* Immigration

Astrophysical Observatory, Victoria, 3242

Athabasca, Lake, discovery of iron ore, 2512

Athletics. *See* National Defence, Cadet training; Olympic Games

Atlanta Exhibition. *See* Exhibitions

Atlantic Fisheries. *See* Fish and Fisheries

Atlantic Ports. *See* Canadian National Railways; Halifax; Ports; St. John

Attendance of Members. *See* Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill

Attorney General vs. Wholesale Grocers, decision, 2051, 2521

Audibility of Debates. *See* House of Commons

Audit, Board of. *See* Board of Audit Act

Auditing. *See* Bank Act; Canadian National Railways

Auditor General. *See also* Board of Audit
Appointment, qu. 2298, 2710, 3307, 3987, 4355, 4512
Payments to temporary postmasters, 1823
Report
Referred to Public Accounts Committee, 434
Tabled, 8
Salaries and contingencies, 3987, 4674
Unprovided items, 4003
Vacancy. *See under this title,* Appointment

Australia
Australian Commonwealth Bank, 4067, 4075, 4092
British immigration, preference for, 2932
Budget, 2984
Chinese immigration, 2313
Dairying industry, 3297
Empire settlement scheme, 1473
Hughes, Premier, statement at Imperial Conference of 1921, 4663
Immigration policy, 1882
Land settlement, 1389
Participation in Eastern Crisis. *See* Near East Crisis
Pearce, Hon. Senator, 1849
Postal rates, decrease of, 1779
Raisins and currants, duty, 2990, 3017, 3069, 3474
Senate, constitution of, 1370
Tariff shutting out Fiji Islands fruit, 1848
Trade treaty with, 36, 245, 1848, 2815, 2964, 2990, 3069, 3474, 3476
Visit of Minister of Trade and Commerce to, 1849. *See also* Robb
Wool-combing industry, 2866

Austria
Bean-growing industry, 2982
Senate, constitution of, 1371
West Ukrainian Republic. *See that title*

Authors. *See* Copyright Act Amdt. bill.

Automobiles
Accidents, 3958

Automobiles—*Con.*
Admission fee to national parks, 3942, 3943
Automobile industry, protection, 2841
Canadian National Safety League, 3954
Civil servants, and, 1772
Customs and sales taxes, 2841
Duty on, 2908, 3075
Farmers, and, 100, 2812, 2874
Ford car, farmers and, 1466
Ford Motor Company
Organization and efficiency, 2544
Prices, fixing of, 2525
French treaty, 1982, 1990, 1996, 2236
Gasoline
Price, 2547
Short measure, 810
Highways. *See* Canada Highways
Immigration of United States garage owners, 1416
India, shipments to, 508
Insurance, 3147, 3977
Ottawa, in, 2874
Purchase of by instalments, 2874
Railways and, 1619
Sales tax on, qu. 1993, 2841
Saskatchewan in, 82, 148
Taxation, 52%, 2841
Western provinces, 1889

Autonomy. *See* Canada's participation in War; Imperial Conference

Aviation. *See* Air Service

Aylesworth, Sir Allen, decisions. *See* Disallowance

Backus, Mr. E. W. *See* Lake of the Woods Regulation Bill

Bacon. *See also* Live Stock
Bacon industry, 2864
British market, 2864
Canadian, selling price in Great Britain, 1905
Corn-fed, 2865
Danish, 2864, 2865
Grades, 590.
Hog grading, 590
Imports and exports, 938
Pork products, and, 1978
Price of, 2585, 2933
Salty, 3301
Wiltshire sides, 2864

Bait. *See* Fish and Fisheries

Baker, the Late Colonel G. H., M.P.
Memorial to
Special Committee, report, 435, 730, 1256, 1991

Balance of Trade. *See* Treaties, French Treaty

Baldwin, Mr. W. K. (Stanstead)
Annual training, 875

Baldwin, Mr. W. K.—*Con.*
Excise taxes, payment with postage stamps, 1822
Hudson Bay railway, M. (Mr. Knox) 1054
Immigration policy, 1247
Labour, demand for, 1248
Military expenditure, 875
Rural mail service
Carriers, remuneration, 1822
Spur lines, 1826
Tariff protection, 1249
Taxation, increase of, 1822
Woollen industry, 3470

Baldwin, Right Hon. Stanley, budget, 2824

Baldwin Tinplate Industry, 2819. *See* also Tinplate

Balfour, Colonel N. H. *See* Canadian National Railways

Balkan States, credit to. *See* Roumania

Bamfield, B.C., public building, 1024

Bananas
Production in Fiji Islands, 1848
Trust, 2979

Bancroft, Mr. L. P. (Selkirk)
Address in reply, 99. Mr. Carroll and prosperity of the western farmer, 99-100; farmers and automobiles, 100; condition of the West, 100-101; causes of emigration; mixed farming, 101
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4035
Budget, 2736. Liberal tariff policy; amendments moved when in opposition; high cost of living; duties upon necessaries of life; reciprocity; tariff plank chief issue in last election, 2736; rejection of Conservative policy by western provinces; low tariff sentiment; Liberal and Progressive tariff planks almost identical; mandate clear and unmistakable; Tory reactionaries in garb of official Liberalism; tariff; protection responsible for immigration; high prices; reduced purchasing power, 2737; United States largest free trade area in world; per capita customs tax; United States and Canada; prices, comparison of United States and Canada; mail order catalogues, 2738; clothing; sewing machines; paints; agricultural implements; harness, 2739; nails; wire fencing and poultry netting; washing machines; dairy supplies; tools; rubber boots safety razors; prosperity impossible with present production costs; barriers obstructing development of natural industries, 2740
Dominion Lands and Parks branch, 3251
Drawbacks on steel, coal and woollen goods, qu., 1994
Dredging, Grassy Narrows, 1013
Emerson public building, 4628
Grain for exhibition purposes, 1455
Highways, federal grant, 519
Homesteads, improvements, 3251
Indian Affairs, department, salaries, 2165
Indians
Manitoba, 2153
St. Peter's reserve, 2153
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4231, 4283
Lake Manitoba, flooding, 999
Masters and mates, 2610
Parliament buildings, Commons chamber, lighting, 1728
Patrol of northern waters, 3360
Penitentiaries, 771
Privilege—titles—amdt. (Mr. Neill) 1308
Raisins and dried currants, duty, 3476
Royal military college, expenditure, 4628
Rural credit system, 4035
St. Andrew's dam, fishway, 1000
Selkirk wharf, 1000
Shipping combines, 4283
Soldier settlement, 2021
Steamship services, 2173, 2174
West Ukrainian republic, M. (Mr. Campbell) 655

Banff National Park, 3434
Calgary Power Company and, 3442, 3750, 3938
Canmore sanitation, 3434, 3941
Electric plant, 3949
Hotel, 3435
Power privileges, 496, 3750
Water powers, 3420

Banff-Windermere Highway, opening, 3584

Bank Act. *See* also Bank Act Amdt. bill; Banks and Banking; Credit; Finance
Revision, 26, 70, 77, 170, 496, 634, 638, 644, 858, 4014, 4035. *See also* Address; Bank Act Amdt. bill; Budget
Alberta legislature, res., 2084
Canadian Council of Agriculture, 255, 4016, 4041, 4045
Proposed extension of charters for twelve months M. (Mr. Spencer) 683, ruled out of order, 643

Bank Act Amdt. Bill. *See also* Bank Act; Banks and Banking
Res., 1167, 1310; 1r., 2r., 1314; ref. to

Bank Act Amdt. Bill—*Con.*
Banking and Commerce Com., 1314; com., 4013, 4014, 4077, 4133; 3r., 4162; Senate amdts. 4058
Sections and subjects discussed:
Agency, 4093-8
Agreement of sale, 4138
Amendments to Bank Act, 4052, 4056
Antagonism of financiers and farmers, 4044
Assets, sale to another bank, 4134
Audit, chartered accountants, 1311. *See also under this bill,* Shareholders
Australian Commonwealth bank, 4067, 4075, 4092
Bank charters continued to July 1, 1923, as to some particulars, 4014
Amdt. (Mr. Speakman) extending charters for one year 4017, neg. 4075
Amdt. (Mr. Good) to M. for 3r., 4141, neg. 4147
Bank circulation redemption fund continued
Amdt. (Mr. Coote) interest on, neg. 4093
Bank loans, approval by directors, 4098
Bank may sell assets to another bank, 4134
Bank of British North America, 1312, 1313
Bank premises, value of, 4085
Bank statements, 4020, 4030, 4047, 4085, 4139
Banking and Commerce Committee
Evidence, 4039, 4142
Printing, 3887
Banking monopoly, 4045, 4047, 4050, 4087 4103, 4157, 4166
Banking system, 4016, 4029, 4036, 4046, 4051, 4059, 4065
Bradford Chamber of Commerce, prior lien, 1312
Branch banks, 4047, 4122, 4128
Business and powers of the bank, 4093
Amdt, agency (Mr. Garland, Bow River) 4093; withdrawn, 4094
Amdt., insurance, agents for (Mr. Garland, Bow River) 4094, neg. 4098
Canadian Bankers' Association, representation before Com. 4058
Cash reserves in Dominion notes, 4091
Centralization, 4079
Circulation, 4092
Security of, 1312
Co-operative banking, 4067
Criticism of the banks, 4039
Currency, 4072
Depreciated, 4027
National, 4048
Definitions, 4014
Delay in 1909, 1910 and 1911, 4033, 4035

Bank Act Amdt. Bill—*Con.*
Sections and Subjects—*Con.*
Directors, 1313, 4084
Amdt. (Mr. Good) 4084 neg. 4084
Attendance at meetings, 1313
Qualifications of, 4077
Discount, 4509
Discussion, opportunity for, 4063, 4225
Dividends, 4039, 4121, 4124
Division between East and West, 4040
Divisions
Bank charters, renewal of, amdt. (Mr. Good), 4141, 4147
Interest rate, amdt. (Mr. Shaw) 4148, neg. 4148
Interest rate, maximum, amdt. (Mr. Coote) 4149, neg. 4149
Merchants' Bank investigation, amdt. (Mr. Bird) 4150, neg. 4161
Right of association of officers, amdt. (Mr. Woodsworth) 4161, neg. 4161
Failures, 1312, 4037
"Fantastic" schemes, 4038
Federal reserve system, 4069
Financial system, re-adjustment of, 4053, 4057
First lien upon seed grain and crop, 4102
First meeting of subscribers, 4075
Gold standard, 4021, 4027, 4047, 4093
Government audit, 4020, 4030, 4087
Government inspection, 1310
"Gramophones" 4058
Hicks, Mr. T., and Merchants Bank, 4059
Industrial conditions, 4054
Insurance, agency, 4093, 4509
Interest at 7 per cent may be charged, 4103
Amdt. (Mr. Shaw) 4105, neg. 4119
Maximum rate, amdt. (Mr. Coote) 4125, neg. 4131; 4149; neg. 4149
Maximum rate, amdt. (Mr. Shaw) 4148, neg. on div. 4148
Interest rates, 4119, 4020, 4028, 4047, 4050, 4062, 4065, 4509
Locality and security, 4120
Interlocking directorates, 4022, 4157
Investment bankers, 4157
Liberal and Conservative union, 4019, 4048, 4125, 4126, 4142, 4245
Loans
Live stock, 4103
Officials, to, 1313
Wholesale dealers, 4101
Merchants' Bank investigation
Amdt. (Mr. Bird) 4150, neg. on div. 4161
Mergers, 1311, 4031, 4050, 4071, 4072, 4080, 4134

Bank Act Amdt. Bill—*Con.*
Sections and Subjects—*Con.*
Money
Nature and function, 4020, 4055
Purchasing power, 4067
Trust, 4026
Montreal Standard, editorial, 4125, 4142
Mortgages and hypothecs of realty and agreement of sale, 4099
Property exempt from seizure, amdt. (Mr. Kellner) 4099, withdrawn, 4133
Motion (Mr. Fielding) for Com. not debatable
Ruling (Mr. Speaker), 4013
National currency, 4048
Notes, issue of, 4092, 4122
Officers
Appointment of, 4048
Right of association, amdt. (Mr. Woodsworth) 4084, neg. 4085; 4161, neg. on div. 4161
One vote for each share, 4085
Particulars of act of incorporation, 4075
Pension fund, 1313
Percentage chargeable for collection, 4133
Price level, stabilization of, 4069
Prices, control of, 4047
Prior claim of bank over unpaid vendor, 4103
Prior liens, 1312
Private bankers, licensing of, 1314
Production and consumption, 4054
Profits, 4121, 4124
Property, 1313
To be sold within certain time, 4101
Protection of the public, 1312
Questionaire and answers, 4062, 4128
Re-discount system, 4081
Returns of interest rates charged, 4119
Revision, postponement of. *See* Bank Act
Rural credits, 4015, 4028, 4035, 4037, 4039, 4041, 4066. *See also* Credits
Shareholders' audit, 1311, 4037, 4087
Auditors to report to Minister, amdt. (Mr. Coote) 4090, neg. 4091
Government audit, amdt. (Mr. Woodsworth) neg. 4090
Short title, 4014
Small banks, 4077
Stability, 4078
Statement of liabilities, assets, etc., 4085
Stock, allotment of, 1312
Taxes, refusal to pay, 4099
"Unholy alliance," 4031
United Farmers of Ontario, co-operative stores, 4068
Unpaid vendor, 4509
Warehouse receipts and bills of lading, 4101
Weyburn Security bank, 4509. *See also* Banks and Banking

Banking and Commerce Committee
Bank Act, proceedings, 4039, 4142
Printing, 3887
Inquiry by, 2937
Leave to sit while House in session, 986
Members in attendance at, 2167, 2171
Personnel, 2639, 2926, 3261
Reports
Inquiry, 2612
First and second, 986
Third, 1080
Fourth, 1538
Fifth, 2926
Sixth, 3505
Seventh, 3887
Eighth, 4131
Rural credits, 2929. *See also* Credits
Williams-Taylor, Sir Frederick, 4019

Bankruptcy
Farmers, 1412. *See also* Credits
Number of failures, 648

Bankruptcy Act. *See also* Bankruptcy Act Amdt.
Administration, 780
Amendment or abrogation, M. (Mr. Casgrain) 1490, withdrawn 1528
Assignments
Preliminary expense, 1412
Since 1916, 1495
Galipeault, Hon. Mr., 1499
Girouard, Judge, law of 1864, 1497
Perrault, Hon. Mr., 1499
Taschereau, Hon. L. A. 1499
Assignments, 1916-1922, qu. 937

Bankruptcy Act Amdt. Bill (Trustees; custodian; sales of property; landlord's privileges; examination of debtor; composition; discharge of trustees; claim of wife; examination of relatives; distribution between assignment and composition; doubt as to interpretation)
1r., 2252-2253; 2r., 3085-3091; com. 3091, 3209; 3r., 3222; Senate amendments, 4201
Sections and Subjects discussed:
Abstract of receipts and disbursements, 3116
Application by trustee for discharge, 3116
Assignment
Authorized, 3106
For general benefit of creditors, 3110

Bankruptcy Act Amdt. Bill—*Con.*
Sections and Subjects—*Con.*
Assignment—*Con.*
Form of, 3110
Bankruptcy proceedings, cost of, 3090
British North America Act, 3095
Canadian Credit Men's Association, 3088, 3093
Canadian Manufacturers' Association, 3093
Commencement of act, 3127
Composition, extension or scheme of arrangement, 3110, 3209
Debtor
Conditional discharge, powers of court, 3125
Description of property, 3115
Discharge of, 3086
Examination of, 3124
Examination of bankrupt by official receiver, 3121
Farmers, 3211
Claims of, 3214
Fees of attorney and trustees, 3087, 3090
Hypothecated immovable property, sales of, 3114
Jurisdiction, 3095
Landlords, claim of, 3086
Marriage settlement, 3087
Married woman, claim, 3087, 3121
Meetings of creditors, 3117
Objections to, statement, 3098
Officer to be assigned to duty by Chief Justice, 3126, 3220
Official receivers, 3087
Petitioning creditor secured, 3108
Priority of claim, 3214
Proof of debt, 3119
Publication of notice, etc., 3110
Quebec, sales in, 3114
Release of security, 3116
Remedy of creditor against property, 3109
Repeal of, 3091
Right of manufacture, 3114
Secured creditor to value security, 3119
Security to be furnished by trustee, 3111
Short title, 3091
Stay of proceedings, 3109
Tariff of costs and fees, 3126
Trustees, 1412, 3088, 3113, 3210
Remuneration of, 3116
Vestment of property in, 3109
Voting by proxy, 3119
Wife's claim, 3087, 3121
Banks and Banking. *See also* Bank Act Amdt. bill
Advances to chartered banks, 4249, 4408. *See also* Finance Act Amdt. bill
Agricultural credits. *See* Credits, Rural
Australian Commonwealth Bank, 4067, 4075, 4092

Banks and Banking—*Con.*
Bank Note Act, 4093
Bank of British North America, 1312, 1313
Bank of Commerce
Aird, Sir John, 1407
Domestic debts, 1343
Overgovernment and taxation, 1391
Prices of agricultural and manufactured products, 1409
Bank clearings, increase of, 3055
Bank directors dominating industrial and commercial affairs, 4022
Bank draft tax, 3925
Bank notes
Bank Note Act, 4093
Issues, 4408
Substitution for national notes, 4408
Bank returns
False, 4030
M. (Mr. Coote) 3264
Bank robberies, 776
Bank statements, 4020, 4047
Banking system, 634, 4016, 4017, 4029, 4036, 4046, 4051, 4059, 4065
Borrowings, 4030
Bradford Chamber of Commerce, prior lien, 1312
Branch banks, 4047, 4122, 4128
Capital, control of, 4026. *See also* capital
Central gold reserve, qu. 1739, 4406
Circulation
"Bank specials" 1739
Security of, 1312
Combinations, 2578, 4083
Commission on banking and credit, 2929
Cost of living and, 1409
Credits. *See also that title*
Control, 631, 2725
Financial machinery, control of, 2725
Monopoly, 2725
System, 1252
Dividends, 4121, 4124
Dollar, stabilizing of, 4666
Dominion Bank, statement as to economic conditions, 1394
Dominion notes, circulation, qu. 1739
Employees, married, 4084
Farmers' bank, 4034
Farmers
Credits. *See* Credits
Pressure on, 1202
Shareholders, qu. 1486, 2846
Treatment of, 2929
Federal jurisdiction, 2592
Federal reserve bank, 4067
Financial influence in parliament, 2733
Gambling in staples of life, 3058
Gold, percentage of national wealth, 2720

Banks and Banking—*Con.*
Gold standard, 4249, 4405, 4666. *See also* Bank Act Amdt. bill
Government audit, 4020
Hail insurance, 4509
Immigration and, 1133, 4042
Interest rates, 635, 2812, 2962, 4020
Western Canada, 1088, 1440
Interlocking directorates, 636, 4022, 4157
Legislation, 3060. *See also* Bank Act Amdt.
Lobbyists, 4029
Merchants' Bank, 70, 1310, 3990, 4020, 4025, 4028, 4029, 4031, 4034, 4036, 4042, 4047, 4049, 4057, 4058, 4066, 4087, 4139, 4145, 4150, 4297
Government action, 2576
Investigation
Amdt. (Mr. Bird) 4150, neg. 4161
Proposed resolution, 4068, 4069
Merger with Bank of Montreal, 4031
Mergers, 1311, 4019, 4031, 4134. *See also* Bank Act Amdt. bill
Money. *See also* Credits; Money
Nature and function, 4020
Origin and meaning of exchange, 633
Paper, 635
Purchasing power, 4666
Monopoly, 636, 4018
Montreal, Bank of
Directorships, 4022-25
Merchants' Bank merger, 4031
Statement of agricultural exports, 1390
National City bank, bulletin on potatoes, 2820
National Land bank, 4366
Nationalization of banking system, 2728
Northern Crown bank, 4080
Note issues, 4405. *See also under this title,* Bank notes
Nova Scotia, Bank of, 4079
Officers, right to organize, 4084, 4161
Ontario government savings office, qu. 1488
Ottawa, Bank of, 4081
Payments in bank notes instead of gold, 4249
Penny Bank of Toronto. *See that title*
Profits, 1209, 4121, 4124. *See also under this title,* Dividends
Promissory notes, taxation, 3923
Quebec savings bank, 4183, 4392, 4405
Rural bank shareholders, 2846
Rural credits. *See* Credit
Salaries and wages, 4084
Savings deposits, increase of, 3055
Security market and, 4157
Small banks, establishment of, 4019

Banks and Banking—*Con.*
Toronto, Bank of
Gooderham, President, debt, aggregate and per capita, 2721
Union Bank, position of, 4225, 4250, 4272
M. (Mr. Forke) to adjourn the House to consider, 4296; withdrawn, 4300
United States Federal Reserve bank, 3059, 4106, 4407
Universities and educational institutions, 4025, 4073
Vancouver, Bank of, failure, qu. 4011
Weyburn Security bank, 2813, 4081, 4122, 4509
Widows and orphans, stockholders, 2743

Banting, Dr. F. G., discoverer of insulin, 703, 1285-1287
Annuity, 4645, 4676
Expression of nation's gratitude, 4437
Patenting of insulin, 2077

Barnardo, Dr., child immigration. *See* Immigration, Child

Barnhill, Mr., 60

Barnjum, Mr. Frank J. D. *See* Export Act Amdt. bill; Forests and Forestry

Barrow, Hon. E. D., Asiatic immigration, 1900

Bartlett, Captain, Hudson Bay railway, 1017

Basic Industries. *See* Industries

Battlefields Memorials. *See* Canadian National Parks and Historic sites; Martell; Monuments and Memorials; Vimy Ridge Memorial

Baxter, Hon. J. B. M. (St. John city and counties of St. John and Albert)
Address in reply, 132. Necessity for economizing time of session, 132; Mr. Hoey's speech, 133; government ownership of railways, 133-134; Sir Henry Thornton, 134; national railways and political patronage; regional administration of Canadian National Railways, 135; Crowsnest pass agreement, 135-136; sectionalism; potato-growers and grain growers, 136; freight rates on potatoes, 137-138; lumber rates on; Canadian ports, development, 139; the Conservative party in Quebec, 140; achievements of government; Near East crisis; Imperial centralization, 141; League of Nations; amdt. and sub-amdt.; amdt. of Mr. Fielding in 1921, 142; standard of living, 143; waste of time in legislating, 144
Automobiles, insurance, 3977

Baxter, Hon. J. B. M.—*Con.*
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4094
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3087-3127, 3220
Banks, federal jurisdiction, 2592
Belle River harbour, 4607
Board of Commerce Act, 2590
Boots and shoes, duty on, 3500
Boulay, Mlle., postmistress, Sayabec, dismissal, 387, 3706, 3750
British North America Act, amendment of, 2592
British preference, limitation to Canadian ports, 1757, 2678
Canada Highways bill, 2341
Canada Shipping Act amdt. bill, 3973
Canada-West. Indies steamship service, 3390
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, advances, 3377
Canadian National Railways
Advances
Additional amount, 3376
$73,000,000, 3629
Branch lines construction bill, 4304
Express and electric lines bill, 2481
Management, responsibility and powers, 3638, 3697
Maritime region, boundaries, 1754
Mileage, 3197
Paris offices, 3637, 3697
Providence, R. I., building, 1755
St. John
Station, 3645
Train shed, 3188
Terminals
Atlantic division, qu. 1363
Maritime regions, qu. 1662
United States, 1755
Toronto office building, 3629
Canadian National Safety League grant, 3953, 3955, 3960
Chinese immigration bill, 2309
Combines bill, 2589
Combines and Fair Prices Act, 2590
Privy Council decisions, 2590
Companies Act Amdt. bill, 4210-4217
Conley, Mr. James, dismissal, qu. 4183
Criminal Code, combines clause, 2592
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 2362
Distressed seamen, 3974
Duke and Duchess of York, congratulations, 2251
Exchequer Court, judgeship, 2499
Export Act Amdt. bill, pulpwood, 4350
False Creek bridge, 3375
Freight rates, Crowsnest pass agreement, 135-136, 3239
French Treaty bill, 2243
Fuel supply, 803

Baxter, Hon. J. B. M.—*Con.*
Government publications, waste, 1734
Grain and grain trade
Shipments from Portland, St. John and Halifax, qu. 1484
Shipping rates on, 2517
Harbours and rivers
New Brunswick wharves transferred to Dominion govt. 947
Nova Scotia, 942, 4566
High Commissioner's office, London, 4630
Historic sites, 3407
Hoppe leases, 3128
Hudson Bay railway, construction vote, 4683, 4685
Immigration
Maritime provinces and, 1131
Policy, 1130-32
Immigration Act Amdt, bill, 2430
Exclusion, 2436
Ship's crews, 2435
Undesirable classes, 2669
Income War Tax Act 1917 Amdt. bill, 4497
Insurance Act 1917 Amdt, bill, 3977
Isle Perrot bridge, 3646
Lake Grain Rates inquiry, 247
Lake of the Woods Regulation bill, 4173, 4178
Lee, Miss Barbara, dismissal, qu. 385, qu. 2393
Lumber, sales tax, 3181, 4418
Marine dept. salaries, 3373
Maritime provinces, secession, 1757, 2245
Martello tower, St. John, 3444
Matapedia bridge, repairs, qu. 4184
Motion, increasing taxation, 3936
Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. bill, 2118
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2108, 2110, 2196, 2437 2462, 3984
British system, 2438
Consolidation of the law, 2437
Judges, 2438
Secretary of State, 2437
Negro Point breakwater, 4587
Official report of debates, abolition of, 1734
Patents of Invention bill, 2102
Penitentiaries, 774
Petition of Right Act Amdt bill, 3128
Pilots, pensions, 3359
Preston, W. T. R., Mr., qu. 206, 247
Printing bureau new building, 1733, 1737
Public buildings, renting or building, 1734
Public ownership, 3640
Pugsley, Hon. William, appointment, 2499
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4350
Railway Commission, 3188
Railways, surveys and inspections, 3648

Baxter, Hon. J. B. M.—*Con.*
Registration of ships purchased from foreigners, 3973
Rush-Bagot treaty, negotiations, qu. 2700
St. John
Harbour improvements, 2676
Station and train shed, 3188, 3645
St. John and Quebec railway bill, 3404
St. Lawrence river ship channel, 3375
Sales tax, 4418
Salmon river protection work, 946
Secession, Nova Scotia 1757, 2245
Shipping combines, statement in Toronto Globe qu. 1362
Sorel shipyard, dismissals, 3374
Steamship services, 3397
Canada-Newfoundland, 3377
Canada-West Indies, 3390
Three Rivers harbour bill, 3964
Wheat board, 2592

Bay of Fundy, icebreakers, 2615

Bayfield, Ont., pier, 981

Bean-Growing Industry, competition from abroad, 2981

Beatty, Mr. E. W., President of the C.P.R.
Appointment as President, 373
Bank director, 4024
Immigration 1337-8

Beaubien, Mr. A. L. (Provencher)
Assiniboine river, flooding 998
Auditor General, appointment, qu. 2298
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2414
Drainage, 3257
Grain dockage, 783
Grand Trunk arbitration, payments to Hon. Howard G. Taft, qu. 1157
Immigration
Empire settlement scheme, 1461
Policy, 1461
Western provinces, natural resources and policy, 1092
Indians, St. Pie reserve, fencing, 2154
Lake Grain Rates bill 4285
Marketing of grain, M. (Mr. Millar) 299, 305
Political patronage, 3348
Prosecutions for operating illicit stills, Vita, Manitoba, 3280
Public Works expenditure, Manitoba, 998
Sawdust pollution of rivers and streams, 3364
West Ukrainian republic, M. (Mr. Campbell) 655
Wheat, grading of, 305

Beck, Sir Adam. *See* Hydro Electric Power.

Beckett, Matt C., appointment and dismissal, qu. 283, 816

Bee-Keeping, suppression of foul brood, 4675

Beef. *See* Live stock; Meats

Beer. *See* Liquor.

Beet Sugar. *See* Sugar.

Behring Sea Fisheries. *See* Northern Pacific Halibut bill; Treaties, Halibut Treaty

Beland, Hon. H. S. (Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment and Minister in charge of the Department of Health)
Banting, Dr. F. G., recognition of, 704, 4438
Blinded soldiers, travelling expenses, 693
Business of the House, 3750
Deportation of British soldier, 2255
Dominion Council of Health, lady members, 3649
Dry Dock Subsidies Act Amdt. bill, 3583
Estimates, time of presentation, 4703
Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia, 4565
Health, Department of
Estimates, 2167, 2170
Marine hospitals, 701, 2167
Quarantine stations
Grosse Isle, 2168
St. John, 4614
Salaries and contingencies, 2170
Leprosy, treatment of, 702
Pharmaceutical preparations, 3261
Pollution of boundary waters, 700
Proprietary or patent medicines, 700
Venereal diseases, 705
Housing Act, administration, 2171
Insulin treatment for diabetes, 704
Maple products industry, 1810
Marine hospitals, 701, 2167
Medical advisory boards, 677, 697
Medical inspection of immigrants, 702
Meighen, Right Hon., alleged speech in North Essex, 670, 708
Military hospitals, 670
Mental cases, 671
Neurological cases, 696
Nursing hospitals, 686
Motions, opportunity to speak to, 3583
Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. bill, 1136, 2114, 2116, 2124
Deportation of convicted alien, 2123

Beland, Hon. H. S.—*Con.*
Opium and Narcotic Drugs Act
Administration, 697, 698, 3149. *See also under this title,* Narcotic Drugs
Prosecutions, 698
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3401, 3748, 3848-85
District appeal boards, 4703
Senate amdts. 4744
Pension regulations, review of, 3851
Pensions
Appeal boards, 677, 681, 697, 4703
District board of review, 4703
European war and active militia, 2166 3706, 3718, 3735
Fenian raid and Northwest rebellion, 3742
Pension Commissioners, Board of
Interpretation of act, 2640
Report, 4736
Salaries, etc., 2168, 3742
Royal Commission, 288
Recommendations, legislation to be introduced, 2394, 2519, 2639, 2983, 3400
Reports
First, interim, on second part of investigation, 1631, 2166, 2167, 2926
Printing, 1992, 2128, 2983
Opportunity for discussion, 674
Printing, 3401
Unemployed pensioners, relief, 2168
Printing bureau, new building, M. to reduce item, 1730
Provincial employment offices, 2169
Public buildings, new, departmental, 1729
Redistribution committee report, 4736
Returned soldiers, emigration to United States, 691
Returned Soldiers Insurance Act Amdt. bill, 3582, 3743, 3892, 4734, 4751
St. John river, pollution of, 701
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment
Department
Estimates, 668, 2166, 2168
Expenditure, 3893
Reduction of, 2032
Salaries and contingencies, 668, 687
Vancouver employees, 3085, 3822
Employers' liability compensation, 691
Hospitals, Brant House and Euclid Hall, closing, 1995, 4075
Interest on war service gratuity, 689
Operating expenses, etc., 690
Sheltered employment, 694
Unemployment relief, 690, 695
Vocational loans, 687
Vocational training, 686

Beland, Hon. H. S.—*Con.*
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment—*Con.*
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment Act Amdt. bill, 3648, 3745, 3892, 4750
Tracadie lazaretto, 702
Van Koughnet, Mrs., 4727

Belanger, Mr. U., agent at St. Moise, 1489

Belgium. *See also* Germany Reparations
Belgian exposition, 496
Butter, export to, 2217
Economic organization, 1857
Immigration from, 1085, 1096, 1173. *See also* Immigration
Imports and exports, 1977
Senate, constitution of, 1371
Treaty with, 246

Bell, the late Dr. Alexander Graham, contributions to scientific knowledge, 1287

Bell, Major Graham A. *See* Railways and Canals

Bell, the late Dr. Robert, Hudson Bay route, 1052

Belle River Harbour, 4594, 4638
M. (Mr. Meighen) to reduce, 4600, neg. 4610

Belleville harbour commissioners, qu. 490

Belloc, Mr. Hilaire, European situation, 1231

Benoit, Mr. A. J. (St. Johns and Iberville)
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, Mr. H. Milburn, qu. 1138
Grand Trunk arbitration
Doherty, Right Hon. Charles J., pension, qu. 1029
Purchase, arbitrators, fees, profit and loss, qu. 1257
Tilley, Mr. W. N., K.C., qu. 1029; qu. 1661
Introduction of, 3
Judges
Pensions, qu. 492
Retirement fund, qu. 1362
Metric system, qu. 914
Welland canal, towing, qu. 4132

Bernasconi, Mr., report of, 4723

Berne Convention. *See* Copyright Act Amdt. bill; Patents of Invention bill

Bernier, Captain. *See* Hudson Bay railway

Berry Containers. *See* Fruit

Best, Mr. C. H., associate of Dr. Banting, 703, 4439

Betting. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.; Race Track Betting
Tax on in Great Britain, 2824

Beverages, tax on, 2979, 3046. *See also* Budget; Special War Revenue Act; Taxation

Bienfait briquetting plant, 789, 3206

Big Bay Point, wharf, 981

Big Interests. *See also* Combines bill
Political parties and, 2856, 3070

Biggar, Mr. W. H., K.C. *See* Canadian National Railways

Bill of Exchange. *See* Taxation

Bill of Rights. *See* Immigration Act Amdt. bill

Bills. *See* Deputy Speaker; House of Commons; Speaker
For Public Bills, *See* their individual titles
For Private Bills. *See* Private Bills Discussed

Bilodeau, Mr. Jean, qu. 1487

Binder Twine, 2780
Bounty, 4369. *See also* Hemp Bounty bill
Duty removal of, 2965, 4379
Imports and exports, 2965
Industry
Discrimination, 2964
History of, 2965
Manufacture, amendment of act respecting, 3231
Prices and abolition of duty, 2965, 4379
Production in Canada, 2780

Binders. *See* Agricultural Implements

Bindings. *See* Books; Public Libraries

Binette, Mr. Joseph (Prescott)
Hawkesbury government offices, revenue and salaries, qu. 2205
Judges' salaries, qu. 491
Ottawa river, Pointe Fortune water power, qu. 1974.
Peat investigation at Alfred, qu. 1487

Biological Board. *See* Marine

Biological Board Act Amdt. Bill (Representation of Marine and Fisheries department and fishing industries)
Res., 1r., 3820; 2r., com., 3974; 3r., 3974

Bird, Mr. T. W. (Nelson)
Agricultural conditions, 1861
Agriculture, economic organization, 1863

Bird, Mr. T. W.—*Con.*
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4029, 4150
Merchants' Bank investigation, amdt. 4150, neg. 4161
Point of order, interruptions, 4064
Ruling, Mr. Speaker, 4013
Bright, John, free trade in Great Britain, 3051
Budget, 2787. Minister of Agriculture and Moose Jaw election; speech of Mr. Raymond; tariff stability, 2787; taxation, experiments in perpetuation of crude methods; income tax, costly and inequitably graduated; well-to-do not bearing fair share; unearned and earned incomes; war profits; inheritance tax, 2788; business profits tax; sales tax; luxury tax; taxation, indirect; taxing the consumer; necessities of life, taxation of; apportionment of taxes in Great Britain, 2789; emigration to the United States; Winnipeg *Free Press,* statement of; Minister of Agriculture and Free Press; Right Hon. Mr. Meighen, reported statement as to emigration in New York *Tribune,* 2790; taxation and immigration; agriculture pushed into background by industrialism; governmental neglect of the farmer; world organization of farmers; National Farmers' Union of Great Britain; Farmers' Bloc in United States; Progressive Party in Canada, 2791; future of farmers' organizations; principle of protection; no difference between Tory and Liberal budgets; tariff variation not over two and a half per cent; 2792; the Big-endians and the Little-endians, two parties but one policy; total of tariff taxation for 50 years; tribute to Minister of Finance; violation of pledges by Liberal party; Progressive party, policy, 2793; political ideals; patriotism and love of country, a transformed country-side; Mr. Fielding's budget speeches past and future, 2794
Canadian National Railways, branch lines, 4688
Civil Service, deputy ministers, 368
Combines bill, 2625
Crowsnest pass agreement, Progressives and, 2855
Drainage of agricultural lands, 3257
Emigration to the United States
Meighen, Mr., reported statement in New York Tribune, 2790
Winnipeg, from, 1975

Bird, Mr. T. W.—*Con.*
Great Britain, free trade and protection, 1862, 3051
Hemp bounty bill, 4388
Homesteaders, relinquishment of holdings, 3257
Hudson Bay railway
Commercial feasibility of, 3006
Construction vote, 4688
M. (Mr. Knox) 1037
Income tax, total assessment, qu. 2393
Macphail, Miss, members and party funds, 4239
Merchants' Bank merger, 4029, 4030, 4031, 4050, 4061
Napoleonic wars, problems after, 1233
Non-confidence, M., (Mr. Irvine) 225
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3567, 4387
Political parties and big interests, 2856
Progressive party, economic not political, 1863
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good), 760
Rules of the House, M. (Mr. Johnston) 1303
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4239
Taxation, luxury taxes, collections, qu. 2393
West and protected industries, 1222-3

Bird Sanctuaries. *See* National Parks and Reservations bill

Birmingham, Bishop of, on immigration, 1205

Birth Rate, 1197. *See also* Population
Decline in, 1195

Bituminous Coal. *See* Coal; Fuel Supply

Bituminous Sands, Alberta, 3198

Black, Mr. George (Yukon)
Address in reply, 85. Visit of their Excellencies to the Yukon, 85; the Yukon territory, its history, and mineral wealth, 85-89
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3112
Blackwood, Mr. H. P., Winnipeg, 856
British Columbia
Fishing licenses, 1557
Liquor law, administration of, 2419
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2419, 2428
Canadian National Railways, Paris offices, 3683
Chinese Immigration bill, 2337
Civil Service list, publication, qu. 3134
Contracts with newspapers and printing companies, 1974, 2394, 2614
Copyright Act Amdt. bill, 3155

Black, Mr. George—*Con.*
Customs and Excise dept. legal work, 856
Dominion Bureau of Statistics, qu. 938
Farmers, shareholders in banks, qu. 1486
Guessing competitions, qu. 733
Income tax, farmers paying, qu. 1486
Members' stenographers, qu. 518
Mining fees, Yukon, 1636
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2467
Judges, Yukon Territory, 2458
Secretary of State, administration, 2458, 2467
Northwest territories
Administration, 3949
Wireless telegraph service, 3945
Oleomargarine
Further legislation, inquiry, 2927
Members circularized, 3402
M. (Mr. Carroll) 3544
Pension Act Amdt. bill
District review board
Appeals, amdt., 3875, neg. 3881
Appointments to, amdt. 3875, neg. 3875
Pensions
Commuted, qu. 4132
European war and active militia, 3732
Royal commission, qu. 207
Proportional representation, M. (Mr. Good) 423
Quartz-mining claims, Yukon territory, 249
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 1143
Thompson, Mr. F. G., Winnipeg, 856
Timber protection, qu. 2205
Vancouver, Second Narrows bridge, qu. 1258
Yukon Act Amdt. bill, 767, 4247
Yukon territory
Administration, 3943
Egg inspector, qu. 2516
Minerals, exhibit at British Empire exhibition, qu. 3143
Quartz-mining claims, 249
Telegraphs, qu. 1662, qu. 2206, 3945
Revenue from, qu. 2417

Black, Mr. William (South Huron)
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4034
Bayfield harbour, 981
Customs and excise taxes and collections, qu. 814
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4539
Income tax collection, cost, qu. 733
Merchants' bank case, 4034
Toronto seed branch building, 4623

Black, Mr. W. J. *See* Immigration

Black Point, N.S., breakwater, 941

Blackadder, the late Dr. Edward, M.P., references to, 4, 6, 8, 102

Blackfeet Indians. *See* Indians

Blackwood, Mr. H. P., Winnipeg, 856

Blake, Mr. Charles, Brandon, 4513

Blind. *See* Canadian National Institute; Soldiers

Blind River wharf, 981

Blondin, Mr. Charles E., Pierreville postmaster, qu. 4511

"Blue Ruin" speeches. *See* Immigration

Board of Audit Act (Inquiry into auditing and accounting system) Res., 4249; 4355; 1r., 2r., com., 4356; com., 3r., 4369; Senate amdts., 4733

Board of Commerce. *See also* Combines
Repeal of Act, 2521
"Wooden gun" 2564

Board of Grain Commissioners. *See* Grain

Board of Pension Commissioners. *See* Pensions

Board of Railway Commissioners. *See* Railway Commission

Boats. *See* Canadian Government Merchant Marine; Marine and Fisheries; Vessels

Boivin, Mr. George H. (Shefford)
Indemnity of members, 4008, 4236
Joint Committee on legislation, report, 3887, 4007
Macphail, Miss, members and party funds, 4239
Members, attendance of, 4008
Questions passed as orders for returns, 939
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4236-46
Deduction for non-attendance, 4244

Bolshevism
Bolshevists, socialists, communists and anarchists, 2744
Children of Russian and Polish parents at Welland, 2844
Discontent and, 2982
Farmers, 4045
Oriental immigration, 505
Russia, example of, 2744
Trade unions bulwark against, 2887

Bolte, Mr. Camille, 1032, qu. 1138

Bonaventure
Forest fires, relief, 4010
Railway facilities, 4186

Bonded Warehouses. *See* Liquor

Bonds. *See* Canadian National Railways; Finance; Loans

Bonus. *See* Civil Service

Book-Making. *See* Criminal Code Amdt. bill

Books. *See also* Copyright Act
Purchase of. *See* Library of Parliament
Sales tax on, 1870

Bootlegging. *See* Canada Temperance Act Amdt.; Liquor; Tobacco

Boots and Shoes. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget; Customs
Duty, 2849, 3033
French treaty, 1990, 2240
Prices, increased, 2873
Sales tax, 2999
United States markets, free entry to, 2856, 3016, 3062, 3499

Borden, Camp. *See* Camp Borden

Borden, Right Hon. Sir Robert
Administration, 2815
Canada, constitutional development, 4465
National debt, diminution of, 2920
"No truck or trade with the Yankees," 3080
Treaties, signing of, 4465

Border States. *See* Treaties, French Treaty

Botany Yarn. *See* Textiles, Silk

Bouchard, Mr. George J. (Kamouraska)
Agriculture department, employees, 815
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3562
Ste. Anne de la Pocatiere experimental farm, qu. 1028

Boucher, Mr. Aime (Yamaska)
Bankruptcy Act, M. (Mr. Casgrain) 1510

Boucher, Mrs., postmistress, Pierreville, qu. 4511

Boudreau, the late Mr. Rodolphe, 1805

Boudrot, Mr. Edward E., dismissal, qu. 2613

Boulay, Mlle. Adrienne, postmistress, Sayabec, dismissal, 387, 3706, 3750

Boulay, Mr. Hermengilde, Sayabec post office, 3750

Boundaries. *See* International Boundaries; Surveys
Forest areas. *See* Dominion Forest Reserves

Boundary Waters, Pollution of, 700, 3362

Bounties, 2948. *See also* Trade and Commerce
Advances to be repayable, 4369, 4376
Agricultural and manufactured products, 1196
Agriculture and, 3237
Artificial silk, 2931
Binder twine, 4369
Copper bars or rods, 2646, 2709, 2734, 2778, 2827, 2861, 2931, 2943, 2944, 2958, 3017, 3031, 3035, 3069, 3231, 4369, 4376
Cordage, 4369
Fishing, report on, 911
Hemp, 2647, 2709, 2778, 2780, 2823, 2827, 2931, 2957, 2958, 2964, 3017, 3031, 3911, 3963, 4376
Extension of time, 3911
Resolutions, 3911
Increased, demand for, 3076
Iron and steel, 4371, 4381
Linen thread, 2647, 2897
Loans, repayable, 4369, 4376
Manila fibre, 2657, 3231, 3242, 4369
News, 3062
Oil. *See under this head,* Petroleum
Permanent when established, 2957
Petroleum, 2648, 2657, 2949, qu. 3262, 3914, 3963, 4392
Administration of, 780
Protection and, 2778
Wheat, on, 1196
Wool, 2866

Bounties on Copper Bars or Rods, Act Respecting Res. 3231; 1r., 3242; 2r., com., 4369; 3r., 4376
Advances to be repayable, amdt. (Mr. McMaster) 4369, neg., 4376

Bounties on Manila Fibre, Repeal Bill Res. 2657, 3231; 1r., 3242; 2r., com., 3r., 4369

Bourassa, Mr. Henri, Nationalist party, 2924

Bourassa, Mr. J. B. (Levis)
Levis county postmasters, qu. 519
Nolin, Mrs. J., postmistress, St. David, 1489
Quarantine station, Levis, purchase of beef, qu. 3141

Boville, Mr. T. C., service and superannuation allowance, qu. 3135

Bovine Tuberculosis. *See* Animal Contagious Diseases; Live Stock, Health of Animals

Bowder, Mr. W. R. *See* Immigration

Bowen, Mr. Fred W. (Durham)
Grain surveys, qu. 4131

Boy Scouts Association, 114, 879

Boyer, Dr. G. F., appointment, qu. 2418

Boys, Mr. W. A. (South Simcoe)
Ammunition, 887
Received from England, 1741
Annual training, 874
Annuities, old age, 1640
Basis of computation, 1683, 1694
Cost of at various ages, 1641
Postmasters as agents, 1642
Atherley bridge, 3648
Bankruptcy Act, M. (Mr. Casgrain) 1495, 1506, 1513
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3085-3127
Big Bay point wharf, 981
Buffalo and Fort Erie Bridge Company, 1835
Business of the House
Easter adjournment, 1162
Empire day adjournment, 2795
Camp Borden, approach to, 4565
Canada Gazette, printing, 1709
Canada-West Indies Steamship service, 3384
Canadian Air Force, Camp Borden, 1749, 4565
Hospital accommodation, 1777
Canadian National railways
Branch lines construction bill, 4327
Crowsnest pass agreement, 1620
Paris offices, 3630
Property, purchases and sales, 3324
Canadian Press, Limited, 1464
Cayouette, Miss Evangeline, postmistress, Ste. Claire, qu. 1031
Combines bill, 2621-37
Commissioners, appointment of, 2629
Distribution of report, 2632
Registrar, inquiry, 2621
Copyright Act Amdt. bill, 2144
Criminal Code Amdt. bill, 2053
Debates, official report, omission of undiscussed item in supply, 1638
Dominion arsenal, Quebec, 1740
Evidence in marriage or divorce proceedings, bill, 2053
Excise taxes, use of postage stamps, 1820-1
Exhibitions, 1465
Federal printing company, 1623
Fuel supply, M. (Mr. Church), amdt. (Mr. Carroll) 1281

Boys, Mr. W. A.—*Con.*
Grain elevators, Montreal, qu. 1663
Harbours and rivers
Nova Scotia, 4564
Ontario, 981
Quebec, 969
Highways
Bradford-Barrie, 2489
Hamilton-Brantford, 2493
Statement of, 3174
Hopper barge construction, 3351
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1323
Agreement, 1104
McRae, General, salary, 1324
Policy, 1095
Income tax, unearned income, 2882
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1629, 1655, 1706, 2062.
Insurance Act 1917 Amdt. bill, 3147
Labour
Conciliation and Labour Act, 1621
Department
Estimates, 1621
Staff, reduction, 1671
Technical Education Act, 1638
Labour Gazette, printing, 1622-1625, 1709
Lighthouses, maintenance and repairs, 3353
Lindsay arsenal, 883
L'Islet wharf, 970
Lunenberg harbour, dredging, 4578
Marine agencies, 3351
Marine signal service, 3358
Matane harbour improvements, 970
Meaford-Clarksburg highway, 4565
Military hospitals, 669, 672
Morrison, Mr. T. D., Little Anse breakwater, claim, 4574
National Defence
Canadian Air Force, Camp Borden 1749, 1777, 4565
Militia payments, qu. 205, qu. 344, 386
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2184, 2193
Navigation, aids to, 3357
Old age annuities, 1640, 1683. *See also under this title,* Annuities
Ontario government savings office, interest rate, 1697
Parliament buildings, 1719
Committee on, 1724
Cost, estimated and actual, 1723, 1726
Patents of Invention bill, 2069, 2075, 2079, 2086, 2099, 2129
Peat, experiments, 3199
Pensions
Appeal boards, 680
European war and active militia, 3739

Boys, Mr. W. A.—*Con.*
Pensions—*Con.*
Unemployed pensioners, relief, 2169
Widows, 681
Port Burwell harbour works, 983
Printing bureau, new building, 1733
Quebec wharves, 977
Railway lands, purchases or sales, 1739
Returned Soldiers Insurance bill, 3744
Revenue and postage stamps, 1820-1
Rural mail service.
Carriers, remuneration, 1780, 1785
Spur lines, 1822, 1826
Ste. Anne des Monts pier, 979
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 668
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment bill, 3746
Soldier Settlement Board, insurance, 3506
Steamer Murray Stewart, purchase, 3356
Steamship services, 2173
Canada-West Indies, 3384
Quebec-Natashquam-Harrington, 2175
Toronto union station, 4326
Trade Mark and Designs bill, 2063
Trent canal, qu. 205, 3648
Troops, use of in labour troubles, 869
Unemployment relief, 690, 1655, 2169
Vocational loans, 687

Bracken, Premier of Manitoba, on immigration, 1123

Bran and Shorts. *See* Feeding Stuffs Act

Branch Lines. *See* Canadian National Railways

Brandeis, Judge Louis, on banking, 4022

Brandon, Man., damage by flood, 999.

Brandy. *See* Liquor; Treaties, French Treaty

Brant Military Hospital, closing, 677, 1995, 4075

Brantford binder twine industry. *See* Binder Twine; Hemp Bounties bill

Brazil, constitution of Senate, 1373

Breadner, Mr. R. W. *See* Taxation, Commissioner of

"Breezes Blowing in Mulberry Trees." *See* Secession

Brenner, Meyer, release on parole, 1975

Brethen, Mr. G. A. (East Peterborough)
Accredited herd system, 577, 586, 3303
Bacon, salting, 3301
Cheese grading, 3295
Experimental farms, 483

Brethen, Mr. G. A.—*Con.*
Grain, new varieties, introduction, 483
Health of animals, 586
Hebridean immigrants, treatment of, 3599
Potatoes, prices, 2821
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 751
Shire horses, gift from Great Britain, 2253
Weights and Measures inspector, qu. 492

Breweries. *See* Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill; Liquor

Brick. *See* Building

Bridges. *See also* Public Works
Atherley, 3648
Buffalo and Fort Erie, 1834
Burlington channel, 2682
Burrard inlet, 4709
Calumet-Bryson, 1014
Clair, N.B.-Fort Kent, Maine, 4590
Edmundston, N.B.-Fort Kent, Maine, 1014, 2342, 4589
False Creek, 3375, 4708
Fredericton, 3645, 4310
Girrard Bridge Company, charter, 1008
Grand Etang, 4589
Hawkesbury, 4589
International, 2342, 3647
Interprovincial and, 2342
Isle Perrot, Ste. Anne's lock, 3646
Kingston, 2682
Lachine canal, Montreal, 2299
McAdam-Vanceboro, 2342
Matapedia, Restigouche river, 1014
Repairs, qu. 4184
Michigan Central at Niagara Falls, qu. 1257, qu. 1864
Montreal-Longueuil, 2086, 2615, 2640
Report of harbour commissioners, 3507
Orleans island, 3646
Ottawa-Hull, 1015, 4590
Roads and bridges, 1014
St. Croix river, 2342
St. John and Quebec railway, 3644
St. John river, 2342
Second Narrows, Vancouver, qu. 1258, 4708
Trent Valley canal, qu. 205
Vancouver-North Vancouver, 1008

Bright, John
British free trade movement, 3050
Repeal of Corn Laws, 3013

Briquetting. *See* Bienfait

Bristol, Hon. Edmund (Centre Toronto)
Patents of Invention bill, 2096, 2103
Postmasters, appointment of, 1828-9
Woodbridge postmaster, 1828

Britain. *See* Great Britain

British Admiralty, war claims. *See* War Claims

British Ambassador at Washington. *See also* Treaties
Signature of treaties, 2403
Halibut Fishery Treaty, 734, 858, 1308, 4457, 4480, 4664

British and Foreign News Service, 4712

British Columbia
Aerial forest patrol, 1776
Agricultural conditions, 2769
Agriculture, increased production, 1432
Associated boards of trade, letter of Hon. Mr. Carvell, 1915
Bootlegging, 2419. *See also under this title,* Canada Temperance Act; Liquor
Attorney General and, 2407
British Columbia building, London, 4630
British Columbia Prohibition Association, 2408
Canada Temperance Act Amdt.
Bill, 2284
Correspondence, 1032, 1307
Canadian air force, 1748, 1776
Canadian Northern railway guarantee, 1946
Canadian Pacific railway, construction, 1916
Chilliwack reclamation project, 3431
Chinese immigration. *See that title*
Civil Service appointments in, 372
Claims against federal government, 708
Coal
Competition of fuel oil with, 1245
Deposits, investigation, 3198, 3202
Production, 1244
Copper bounty, 2734
Creosoting industry, 1245
Creosoted piling, use in, qu. 1137
Debt, per capita, 2941
Dominion forest reserves and parks, 2061
Dredging, 1014, 4590
Esquimalt dry dock, 2671
Experimental farms, 457
Fisheries
Commission, 1453, 1540, 3372
Fishing licenses, M. (Mr. Clark) 1540
Japanese engaged in, 1540, 1889, 1901, 4484
Forests, fungus and insect control, qu. 2697
Fraser river improvements, 1003
Freight rates
Discrimination, 1936
Equalization of, 1911, 1914
Fruit-growing industry, 2942
Fuel oil, importation, 1245
Geological survey explorations, 2504
Harbours and rivers, 1002, 2671

British Columbia—*Con.*
Highways, 2341, 2941, 3186. *See also* Canada Highways; Highways
Hindu franchise and, 4640-4651
Hydrographic survey, 3336
Immigration, 1096, 1112, 1327
Indian army officers, settlement in, 1096
Indians, 2152, 2163
Kitsilano reserve, 383
Schools, 2164
Iron ore deposits, 2505
Japanese fishermen, 1540, 1889, 1901, 4484
Kitsilano Indian reserve, 383
Kootenay flats reclamation scheme, 3431
Labour conditions, 1125
Legislation, disallowance of, 1261
Life-saving appliances, 1659
Liquor
Breweries and export liquor houses, licensing, 1636
Exportation of, qu. 1260
Importation, 2404. *See also* Canada Temperance Act Amdt.
Liquor laws, administration, 2419, 2423
Corruption, charge of, 2412-13
Ottawa Citizen, editorial, 2412
Public accounts com. investigation, 2410-13
Purchases, 2410
Warehouses, qu. 1974
Bonded, qu. 1260, qu. 1971, 2404
Licenses, qu. 1866
Lumber industry, 1245
Marine biological board of Canada, 3372
Oil companies, 2505
Oliver, Hon. John, freight rates, 1915, 2505
Correspondence, 1307
Orientals
Business interests of, 1896, 1901-03
Correspondence, 1307
Fishery licenses, 1541. *See also under this title,* Japanese
Immigration, 1217. *See also* Chinese Immigration; Immigration, Oriental
Restriction, 1453
Steveston fishing industry, 1901
Public buildings, 1024
Railway grades, 1917
Resources, 2940
Salmon-canning industry, 1540
Steamship services, 4003
Sumas lake reclamation project, 3431
Telegraphs and telephone lines, 2683, 3946
Terms of union, 1916
Trade with Britain via Panama canal, 3053
Unemployment, 1678
Relief, discontinuance of Federal aid, 1658

British Columbia Fisheries Commission 1453, 3372
Salmon-canning licenses, 1540

British Columbia Salmon Canners' Association, licenses, 1541

British Constitution. *See* Lack of Confidence, M. (Mr. Irvine)

British Dominions, Senates, constitution of, 1370, 1375

British Empire Exhibition. *See* Exhibitions

British Empire Settlement Board. *See* Immigration, Empire Settlement

British Empire Steel Corporation, 1391. *See also* Labour, Strikes
Letters from Messrs. McNeil and McLachlan to Prime Minister, 1704
Wolvin, Mr. Roy, 1704

British Goods, importation. *See* British Preference; Customs; Trade

British-Japanese Treaty. *See* Japan

British Market. *See* British Preference; Grain; Live Stock, Cattle Trade

British National Labour Party. *See* Labour

British North America Act
Amendment of, 2592, 4660
Bankruptcy legislation, 3095
Constitution, control over, 2895
Intercolonial railway and, 1765
International labour conference, 1645
Labour organizations, jurisdiction, 2891, 2892
Readjustment of representation. *See* Redistribution bill
Right to revise, 1378, 3059
Unemployment relief, responsibility, 1680

British Preference, 2734, 2948, 3082. *See also* Budget; Customs; Trade; Treaties, French Treaty
Australia, 1850
British goods free, 3039
Canadian industry penalized, 2957
Cattle embargo and, 3053. *See also this title under* Live Stock
Clothing, 3032
Direct importation by Canadian ports, 1757, 1772, 2645, 2678, 2734, 2898, 2948, 3015, 3039, 3053, 3068, 3082, 3454, 3895
Goods via Suez canal and Hong Kong, 3454, 3895
Transhipment at port in British colony, 3895

British Preference—*Con.*
Discount of 10 per cent, 2645, 2650
French treaty and. *See that title under* Treaties
Hudson Bay railway and, 2878
Increase, 453, 2243, 2713, 2741, 2832, 2854, 2898, 2907, 2937, 2989, 3034, 3039, 3053, 3454, 3487
Benefit to maritime provinces, 2968
Fifty per cent of general tariff, 2718, 2928, 3039, 3048
Knitting industry, 2958
Petition against, 2958
Woollen industry affected, 2958
Introduction of, 2832, 3009
Liberal policy and, 3007
Limitation to Canadian ports. *See under this title,* Direct Importation
Percentage of duties to general rate, 2776
Progressive party and, 2776, 2777
Rates under government and Progressive proposals, 2809
Sugar, 2651
Ways and Means committee, 3454
Woollen industry, 2989, 3034, 3458

British Shipping Board, loss of Llandovery Castle, 1745

British Subjects, definition. *See* Naturalization Act Amdt. bill

British War Medals. *See* War, Medals

British Wars, participation in. *See* Canada's Participation in War; Near East Crisis

Broadcasting Stations. *See* Radiotelegraphy

Bronze Powder industry. *See* Treaties, French Treaty

Brown, Mr. J. L. (Lisgar)
Address in reply, 47. Inheritance and pride in family traditions, William Lyon Mackenzie, 47; conditions in the West; lake grain rates; cattle embargo, 48; inquiry into grain trade; the British Empire, 49; national obligations, 49-50
Agricultural instruction grant, 607
Annuities, advertising, 1642
Breweries and export liquor houses, Licenses, 1636
Violation of liquor laws, 1866
Canadian National Railways, Paris offices, 3691
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 566
Dredging, maritime provinces, 1009
Elevators, overages, 2043

Brown, Mr. J. L.—*Con.*
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4538
Conference, 606
Fishing schooner race, 115
Freight rates, Manitoba-Canadian Northern agreement, 1934
French treaty bill, 2223
Fruit and fruit containers bill, 194
Health of animals, 576
Hog grading, 592
Hudson Bay railway, 3784
Iron ore discovery, Lake Athabaska, 2513
Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. bill, 2119
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill (value of citizenship) 2441
Ottawa-Hull bridge, 1016
Penitentiaries, 771
Proportional representation, 402
Public buildings, New Brunswick, 4613
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 716, 743
St. Lawrence river waterway, 3783
School lands, unpaid balances, 1385, 4203
Seed inspection, 196,198
Steamship services, 2172
Toronto seed branch building, 4621, 4623
Triplets, bonus for, inquiry, 3145
Vimy Ridge memorial, 183
Vocational training, 687
Welland canal construction, 3783

Brown, Mr. M. A., Medicine Hat. *See* Immigration, Canada Colonization Association

Browntail Moth. *See* Insect Pests

Bruce County pioneering conditions, 2870

Brussels Exhibition. *See* Exhibitions

Bryant's Landing, wharf, 950.

Bryce, Lord, proportional representation, 390

Budget. *See also* Ways and Means
Alterations in budget of 1922 and results, 2988
Amendment (Mr. Forke) 2717, 2755, 2776, 2787, 2803, 2809, 2817, 2820, 2822, 2837, 2845, 2854, 2861, 2884, 2932, 2944, 2947, 2955, 2966, 2973, 2976, 3010, 3014, 3015, 3023, 3039, 3051, 3073, 3077; neg. on division, 3082
Planks of Liberal platform included in 2861
Balanced, 2986, 3005, 3078. *See also* speeches on Budget
Changes, 3082
Date of, inquiry, 1163, 1483, 1740, 1869, 2128, 2254, 2347, 2469,
Debate on, 2701, 2741, 2795, 2837, 2898, 2928, 2984, 3046
Precedence, 2694

Budget—*Con.*
Deficits, 2784
Divisions
Amdt. (Mr. Forke) neg. 3082
Motion (Mr. Fielding) for Ways and Means Com. agreed to, 3084
Finance Minister
Record established by, 2852
Seventeeth budget, 2657, 2852
Speeches, 2701, 3074
Liberal and Conservative, no difference between, 2792
McMaster, Mr., attitude on budget, references, 3013, 3022, 3026, 3029, 3043, 3050, 3055, 4393
Presentation, form of, 2818, 2984, 3001, 3077
Record established by Minister of Finance, 2657, 2852
Resolutions, 2650, 3084, 3229, 3454, 3895, 3963, 4369, 4392, 4408, 4409. *See also* Customs Tariff Items
Amended, 3046
Ruling, Mr. Speaker, as to necessity for M. for Ways and Means, 2640
Speakers in debate: Messrs. Anderson, 2837; Archambault, 2879; Arthurs, 3033; Bancroft, 2736; Bird, 2787; Church, 2817; Denis (St. Denis), 3038; Drayton, Sir Henry, 2657; Drummond, 2973; Evans, 3067; Euler, 2852; Fielding, 2701, 3074; Findlay, 2883; Fontaine, 2814; Forke, 2711, amdt. 2717; neg. on div., 3082; Gould, 2951; Grimmer, 2898; Harris, 2804; Hopkins, 2980; Hudson, 3060; Hughes, 2919; Humphrey, 2940; Kellner, 2809; King, Mackenzie, 3046; King (Huron), 2908; Leader, 3039; Lovett, 2944; Lovie, 2871; Maclaren, 2948; Maclean (Prince), 2967; Maclean (Halifax), 3000; Maclean (York), 3055; McBride, 3031; McKillop, 2981; McMaster, 3012; Manion, 2746; Marler, 3022; Martell, 2904; Meighen, 2984; Morrison, 2928; Motherwell, 2756; Pritchard, 2730; Raymond, 2741; Reed, 2830; Robichaud, 2935; Ross (Kingston), 2832; Ryckman, 2912; Senn, 2957; Sexsmith, 2784; Spence, 2976; Stansell, 3062; Steedsman, 2835; Stewart (Argenteuil), 2795; Stork, 2733; Tolmie, 2861; Ward, 2959; White, 2961; Woods, 2846; Woodsworth, 2718
Statements omitted, 2860, 2926
Inquiry, 2898
Wood, Mr. H. W., Alberta, opinion on, 2771, 2853. 2946

Buffalo
Elk island park, 3435
Lamont park, 3941
Slaughter of, 3435, 3439, 3941, 4702
Tuberculosis, 3439
Wainwright herd, 2773, 3941

Buffalo and Fort Erie Public Bridge Company. *See* Bridges; Private Bills

Building. *See also* Housing; Labour
Bricklayers' wages, $12 per day, 2165, 3017
Building materials
Brick 3017
Cement, free admission, United States, 3017
Firebrick duty, 3481. *See also* Customs Tariff Items
Freight rates, 1961, 3036
French treaty, 1982
Prices, 2164, 3004
Roof coverings, investigation, 4703
Farm homes, 1178. *See also* Housing
Fuel supply and house construction, 3203
Increase of, 3055
United States, activity in, 3004, 3017. *See also* Emigration to United States
Wages, building trades, 2165, 3017. *See also* Labour, Wages

Building Stone, Hudson bay region, 1073

Building Trades. *See* Labour.

Bukowina. *See* West Ukrainian Republic

Bunyan, John, imprisonment, 3157

Burdis, Mr. W. D., salmon canners, 1541

Bureau, Hon. Jacques (Minister of Customs and Excise)
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4101, 4136
Officers and employees, right to organize, 4162
Beckett, Matt C., dismissal, 816
Bonded liquor houses, New Brunswick, 1212
British preference, Canadian ports, 3457
Building trades, 1812
Business of the House
Estimates, method of discussion, 4615-6
Legislation pending, 3265
M. to increase taxation, 3937
Questions passed as orders for returns, 939
Cadet services, 877, 879
Canadian National Railways, branch lines, 4306
Canadian ports, use by United States fishermen, 3361
Canned salmon shipment, Panama canal to Halifax, 2615, 3272

Bureau, Hon. Jacques—*Con.*
Cheque tax, 3926, 3929
Civil service, political partisanship, 286
Customs and Excise
Department, estimates, 3272
Duty on goods from one Canadian port to another, 2615, 3272
Excise taxes, payment with postage stamps, 1815, 3928
New York, Canadian officer at, 1213, 3273
Tomato plants, duty, 4433
Experimental farms, 471
Hamilton customs house, 3278
Ice-breaking, Thunder Bay, 3359
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 4360
Inland Revenue Act Amdt. bill (Certificate of analyst) 3749, 3969, 4131, 4207, 4528
Judges Act Amdt. bill, 3604
Macphail, Miss, members and party funds, 4238
McKenzie, Hon. D. D., appointment to Bench, 1810
Marking Act, 931
Masters and mates, 2610
Petroleum and Naphtha Act Inspection bill, 3969, 4248, 4276
Pilot boats, 3358
Postage stamps, for revenue purposes, 1815, 3298
Post Office
Postmasters, appointment, 1830
St. Baranabe Nord, Mr. Gelinas, 1830
Superintendent of Mail Contracts, 1814
Preston, Mr. W. T. R., 249
Prince Edward Island car ferry terminals claim, 4680
Prosecutions for operating illicit stills, 3280
Radiotelegraphy, 3374
Reciprocity. "No truck or trade with the Yankees" 3080
St. Lawrence river ship channel, 3375
Sales tax, 4429
M. (Mr. Stevens) for committee of inquiry, 245, 923
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4238-4246
Sorel shipyard, dismissals, 3345, 3374
Special War Revenue Act, M. (Mr. Stevens) 245, 923
Three Rivers harbour bill, 3863, 4207
Toronto
Customs building, 3278, 3282
Viaduct, 4441
Woollen industry, M. (Mr. Drummond) 931, 936

Bureau of Standards, 788

Bureau of Statistics. *See* Statistics

Burke, Edmund
Function of Parliament, 3018
Relation of member to constituent, 3022

Burne, Mr. Joseph, Immigration department, qu. 3141

Burns, Mr. Pat, price of live stock, 1101

Business Depression, 2798. *See* Address; Budget; Immigration

Business of the House. *See* House of Commons

Business Profits Tax. *See* Taxation

Business Profits War Tax Act, 1916, Amdt. Bill (Removal of restrictions as to liability for)
Res. 4440, 4489; 1r., 2r., 4491; com., 3r., 4492

Butter. *See* Dairy Industry Act; Dairying Industry

By-Elections. *See* House of Commons

Byng, Lord, Governor General. *See* Governor General; reference to in address

Cabinet. *See* Government

Cables. *See* Telegraphs and Telephones

Cabot Strait, ice obstruction, 2614

Cadet Services. *See* National Defence

Cahill, Mr. Frank S. (Pontiac)
Belle River harbour, 4600
Business profits tax, 4490
Canadian exhibition in France, 4711
Canadian Press Limited
Bill, 1464
Subsidy, 4727
Combines bill, 2628
Esquimalt dry dock, 2674
Halifax grain elevator, 4714
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1133
Empire settlement scheme, 1132
Policy, 1132
Reference to speech on, 1209
St. John immigration building, 1460
Newspaper combine, 4728

Cahill, Mr. Frank S.—*Con.*
Paternalism, excess of, 1133
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4513
Railways, Canals & Telegraph lines Com., report, 2252
Riordan Pulp and Paper Company, business profits tax, 4490
Rural depopulation, causes of, 1133
Supply, relevancy, 4719
Tariff, immigration and, 1133

Calcium Carbide, free admission to United States, 3017

Calder Act. *See* Civil Service, Superannuation

Caldwell, Mr. Thomas W. (Victoria and Carleton, N.B.)
Accredited herd system, 577, 582, 585, 626
Agricultural conditions, 1845
Agricultural publications, 598
Agriculture department, salaries, 610
Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt. bill, 2048, 2133, 2136
Annual drill, 4637
Audibility of debates, 976
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4115
Bonded warehouses, New Brunswick, 1212
Business of the House
Private members' days, 574
Prorogation, postponement of, 4754
Questions, as orders for returns, 938, 1386
Butter, British market for, 3298
Camp Hill hospital, Halifax, qu. 3506
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill 3973
Coasting regulations, 4276
Canadian National Railways
Branch lines construction bill, 4311
Expenditure, appropriation by Parliament, 4401
Rejection by Senate, 4698
Capital punishment, 768
Civil government estimates, form of, 610
Dairying industry, 609, 1845
Destructive insects and pests, 596
Dominion Lands Act (homesteads), 4365
Duties, revenue loss and smuggling, 3231
Emigration to the United States, 1845
Execution in Carleton county, 778
Exhibitions, 1465
Experimental farms, 484
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4273, 4541
Fertilizer Act, administration, 601
Fertilizers, duty on, 3486
Fisheries
Fishways in Salmon river, 3362
Pollution of streams, 701, 3362
Forest protection, M. (Mr. Michaud) 819
Fox-breeding industry, 588
Freight cars, interchange, 4697

Caldwell, Mr. Thomas W.—*Con.*
Gasoline and oil pumps, inspection, 810
Government workshops, Ottawa, 4617
Governor General's cars, repairs, 4691
Grand Falls railway, 4311
Harbours and rivers, Manitoba, 4589
Health of Animals, 582, 586, 3989. *See also under this title,* Accredited herds; Animal contagious diseases
Hector celebration, 4637
Highways, 3188
House of Commons. *See also under this title,* Business
Acoustics, 1722
Members' rooms, lighting and ventilation, 1728
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1480
Child, 1470
Indians
Tobique reserve, 2154-55
Victoria reserve, roads, 2153
Inland Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 3231
Intercolonial, employees' pensions, 3196
Interest rate, 4115
International boundaries, surveys, 3248
International Institute of Agriculture, 599
Judges' Act. Amdt. bill, 3265
La Société des Artisans Canadiens Français, 1027
Lake Grain rates bill, 4232
Live stock, 587, 588
Magazines, M. (Mr. Hocken) 835
Manitoba Plup and Paper Company, 3256
Marketing of grain, M. (Mr. Millar) 308
New Brunswick export warehouses, 815
New departmental building, Ottawa, 4617
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3271
Parliament buildings, 1718
Acoustics, 1721
Reconstruction committee, 1724
Patents of Invention bill, 2077, 3154
Penitentiaries, earnings of inmates, 772
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3848-3884
Widow who marries after disability appears, amdt. 3882, agreed to, 3884
Pensions, royal commission, 674, 681
Recommendations, 2394
Point of order (Mr. Carroll) 3267
Potatoes
Duty, 2707
Grading, 598
Growing and marketing, 308
Wharfage tolls, 975
Prince Edward Island railway, 3196
Privilege (Mr. Carroll) 3268, 3270
Radiotelegraph service, 3374
Root vegetables bill, 937

Caldwell, Mr. Thomas W.—*Con.*
Roumanian and Greek loans, qu. 623
St. John and Quebec railway
Connection with Eastern Maine railway, 4311
Interruption of traffic, 3644
St. John river, pollution of, 701, 3362
St. John-Westfield branch line, 4312
Seed inspection, 197
Soldier settlement, 2030
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment
Hospitals, 669
Salaries and contingencies, 669
Soldiers, venereal diseases, 705
Spruce bud worm, 596
Steamship services, 2171
St. John-Digby, 2176
Taxes, unpaid, 3258
Testing dairy cattle, 1307
Vancouver harbour bill, 332
Wharfage tolls, 974

Calgary
Customs examining warehouse, 1023
Post office, 629, 1024
Hayes, Mr. John J., dismissal, 1687, 1868
Returned soldiers, unemployment relief, 1679, 1683

Calgary Power Company, 3442
Banff national park, power rights, 3750, 3939

Calves, inspection of. *See* Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill

Camp Borden. *See* National Defence, Canadian Air Force

Camp Hill hospital, Halifax, qu. 3506

Campaign Funds and Literature. *See* Elections; Senate and House of Commons bill

Campbell, Mr. A. W. *See* Highways

Campbell, Commander, report, St. Andrew's harbour, 2900

Campbell, Mr. Milton N. (Mackenzie)
Agricultural conditions, 1402
Agricultural implements, standardizing, 805
Agriculture, sacrifices, 3065
Alberta coal, transportation, 1283
Bank Act Amdt. bill, interest rate, 4118
Binder twine duty, removal, 4387
Canada-West Indies service, 3379, 3386
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, 3798
Advance, 3824
Shipping combines, 3845
West Indies service, 3379, 3386

Campbell, Mr. Milton N.—*Con.*
Canadian National Railways
Advance of $73,000,000, 3651
Capitalization and fixed charges, qu. 3323, 3680
Paris offices, 3197
Transcontinental, condition of, 3680
Canadian Pacific railway
Dividends, 1406
Mail contracts, qu. 3143
Cheque tax, 3934
Copper bounty bill, 3240
Dominion Lands Act (homesteads) 3982
Dredging, 1012
Experimental farms, 3240, 4631
Farm labourers' dwellings, 1406
Fort Churchill townsite, qu. 284
Freight rates, Railway Commission, 3194
Fuel supply, 806
Governor General, expenditure, 4628
Grain-growing and freight rates, 3194
Hebridean immigrants, treatment of, 3599
Hemp bounty, 3913, 4387
Hudson Bay railway
Commercial feasibility of, 3006
Land, qu. 283
M. (Mr. Knox) 1070
Immigration
Land settlement, 1406, 1883
Policy, 1402
Soldier settlement board, 1406
Insurance branch, salaries, 3987
Interest rate, 4118
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4222-34
Land settlement policy, 1406, 1883
National Gallery, 1018
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 3983
Northover, Major H. R., claim, 4635
Passports, issuing of, 3988
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 4750
Prices, farm and manufactured products, 1403
Prince Edward Island railway, 3196
Printing bureau, improvements, 1022
Public archives, 3985
Quebec elevator, grain shipment, 4233
Rural depopulation, 1406
Taxation, burden of, 1403
West Ukrainian republic, M. 651, 657
Western provinces, conditions in, 1402
Wheat board, 2857

Campbell, Mr. Orin, claim, 626

Campbellton wharf, 945

Camps, Militia. *See* Militia and Defence, Annual Drill; Petawawa

Canada Colonization Association. *See this title under* Immigration.

Canada-France Convention of Commerce. *See* Treaties, French Treaty

Canada Gazette, 1707

Canada Grain Act. *See* Grain

Canada Highways Act Amdt. Bill. *See also* Highways, (Time for earning and receiving payment of grant extended for two years.)
Res. 2253, 2338; 1r., 2343; 2r., com., 2469; 3r., 2470

Canada, Status of, 40, 165. *See also* British North America Act; Imperial Conference; Near East Crisis; Treaties, Halibut treaty

Canada's Claims. *See* Germany, Reparations

Canada's Constitutional Development, 4455-80. *See also* Treaties, Halibut

Canada's Participation in War, 4655. *See also* Imperial Conference; Near East Crisis
M. (Mr. Power) 1529

Canada Shipping Act. *See also* Marine; Shipping and Shipbuilding; Vessels
Announcement of legislation on lake freight rates, 3507. *See also* Lake Grain Rates bill

Canada Shipping Act Amdt. Bills
1. Certificates to masters and mates; pilotage
Res. 2418; 2668; 1r., 2668; 2r., com., 3r., 3146
2. Distressed seamen; certificate of registration; certificate of inspection
Res. 574, 3969; 1r., 2r., com., 3973; 3r., 4207
3. Restoration of ships purchased from foreign subjects; loading of grain cargoes; port wardens; returns by surveyors
Res. 3749, 3961, 4235; 1r., 4236; 2r., com., 3r., 4276

Canada Steamship Lines, Limited
Capitalization, 1391
Hanna, Mr. D. B., director, 3208
Shipping combine, 4278
Sifton, Sir Clifford, director, 4285
Thornton, Sir Henry, director, 2983, 3208, 3845, 3848
Traffic, exchange, 2983, 3208

Canada Steamship Lines Limited—*Con.*
War claims, qu. 3142

Canada Temperance Act, 2942. *See also* Liquor
Administration, 2495
Plebiscites under, 2495

Canada Temperance Act Amdt. Bill (Importation into prohibition province prohibited)
Res. 574, 767; 1r., 767; 2r., 2284; com., 2284; 2404, 2419; 3r., 2428; Senate amendments, 4732
Sections and subjects discussed:
Amdt. (Mr. McQuarrie) 2414-15, neg. 2428
Amdt. (Sir Lomer Gouin) 2419, agreed to, 2428
Blending, 2408, 2419
Brewers, 2404
British Columbia
Administration of law, 2404-13
Correspondence with, 1032, 1307
Exportation, 2404
Government control, 2406
Importation prohibited, 2404, 2419. Exceptions, 2404, 2419
Manson, Hon. A. M., Attorney General of British Columbia, 2412
Newcombe, Mr. E. L., K.C., opinion of, 2408

Canadian Air Force. *See* National Defence

Canadian Ambassador at Washington. *See* Canadian Representation

Canadian Athletic Team at Olympic Games, 4706

Canadian Authors Association. *See* Copyright Act Amdt. Bill

Canadian Bronze Powder Works, Valleyfield, 1998. *See also* Treaties, French

Canadian Citizenship. *See* Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill

Canadian Council of Agriculture
Bank Act revision, 4016, 4041, 4045
Res. respecting, 255

Canadian Council of Horticulture, 2307

Canadian Council of Immigration, 1876

Canadian Credit Men's Association. *See* Bankruptcy Act

Canadian Domicile. *See* Immigration Act Amdt. bill

Canadian Economic Conference, Sir Charles Gordon, 4023

Canadian Engineering Standards Association, 788

Canadian Expeditionary Force. *See* War

Canadian Express Company. *See* Canadian National Railways

Canadian Forestry Association, 3409. *See also* Forests and Forestry

Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 110, 2172. *See also* Canadian National Railways; Canals; Freight Rates; Shipping and Shipbuilding; Steamship Services
- Advances to, 2641, 3830
  - $1,700,000, 3376
  - $1,500,000, 3798, 3824
- Assets and liabilities, 3804
- Atlantic combines, qu. 2613
- Cattle shipments, 2758, 2807, 3040, 3811
- Coal cargoes, 3807, 3814, 3826
- Committee, 2474
- Construction, 3780
  - Cost per ton, 957
  - Without tender and contract, 957
- Deficit, 2928, 3006, 3038, 3072, 3377, 3798, 3802, 3843
- Directors, 3811
- Expenditure, 3802
  - Earnings and, 1868
- Flour, discrimination against Canadian, 2761
- Freight rates, regulation of, 3806
- Grain trade, 2828, 3263, 3812, 4234
- Insurance, 1568
- Lake grain-carrying trade, 3776, 4223, 4284. *See also* Freight Rates, Shipping; Lake Grain Rates bill
- Lease of freighters to Great Lakes Transportation Company, 3848
- Loan to, 113-114. *See also* under this title, Advances
- Management, 3637
- Mediterranean service, qu. 1488, 1636
- Milburn, Mr. H., qu. 1138
- Negotiations for sale of 27 ships, 1975. *See also under this title,* Vessels, sale of
- New York pool, 3806
- North Atlantic Conference, 2127, 2761
- Ocean rates, 2760
- Policy, 3798, 3827, 3830
  - Unemployment, 3828, 3846
- Prince Rupert Dry Dock Company, 4708
- Public ownership, 3798
- Return cargoes, absence of, 2928
- St. Lawrence and Great Lakes, service on, qu. 2613
- Sailings, qu. 4511
  - Arrangements for 1924, qu. 4751
- Scrap metal and material, qu. 1138
- Shipping combines, 1395, 2127, 2760, 3848, 4223
- Ships, sale of. *See under this title,* Vessels
- Subsidized steamship services, competition, 3378
- Tank cars, transportation, qu. 1361
- Thornton, Sir Henry, 3811
  - Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, 2983, 3208, 3845, 3848
  - Utilization of boats for cattle, 3040
  - West Indies service, 3379
- Trade with Fiji Islands, 1848
- Trader, wreck of, qu. 1763
- Transportation combine. *See under this title* Shipping Combines
- Vessels
  - Earnings, etc., 3324, 3399
  - Laid up, 3379, 3386
  - Sale of, 1975, 2518, qu. 2613, 2828, 3385-6, 3705, 3813, 3822, 3846
- Vote under closure 4598
- West Indies and South American trade, 3378, 3808, 3835, 3840

Canadian Government Railways. *See this title* under Canadian National Railways

Canadian High Commissioner. *See* High Commissioner

Canadian Liner Committee. *See* Freight Rates, Shipping

Canadian Magazines, Encouragement of. *See* Magazines

Canadian Manufacturers Association. *See also* Budget; Manufacturers
- Bankruptcy, 3093
- Canada Colonization Association, disbursements to, 1164, 1171
- Canadian Trade Index, 2217
- Copyright, 2142, 2289
- French treaty, 1997, 2001, 2209, 2229
- Greater production campaign, 2725
- Shaw, Mr. J. B., fuel policy, 1265
- Trade Mark and Designs Act bill, 2293

Canadian National Express Company. *See* Canadian National Railways

Canadian National Institute for the Blind, 693

Canadian National Parks and Historic Sites, 3406, 3432. *See also* Dominion Lands and Parks
Administration, 66
Automobiles, admission fee, 3942
Banff National park
Canmore sanitation, 3434, 3941
Electrical equipment, 3434, 3949
Springs and cave, 496
Waterpowers, 496, 3420, 3750
Power rights, Calgary Power Company, 3750, 3442, 3939
Buffalo in. *See* Buffalo
Commissioner, location in Western Canada, 3436
Elk Island buffalo park, 3435
Expenditure, 3941
Further amount, 4702
Fort Edward, Windsor, N.S., 3406, 3432, 3435
Fort Prince of Wales, preservation, 1041
Historic sites commission, 3406
Golf course, Jasper park, 3435
Minette Hot springs, 3949
Moose mountains pleasure resort, 3408
Municipal government in, 3436
Niagara forts, preservation of, 4707
Nova Scotia historical society, 3406
Quebec battlefields commission, 3406, 3432
Playgrounds, 3432
Port Dover, Fathers Dollier and Galinee, 3433
Preservation of, 3249
Roads and bridges, 1014
Supplementary vote, 3948
Timber wolves, destruction by, 597
Tourist traffic, 3435
Revenue, 3942
Wainwright, slaughter of buffalo, 4702
Waterton lakes park, 3435

Canadian National Railways. *See also* Address; Budget; Freight Rates; Railways and Canals;
Accounting, 4328. *See also* Board of Audit
Unification of, 3196
Acquisition, history of, 55
Advances, 2641
$73,000,000, 1619, 3610, 3650, 3676
M. (Mr. Stevens) to reduce by $2,000,000, 3681, neg. 3701
Statement of appropriations, 1922-23, 1923-4, 3789
Additional
$1,550,000, 4692
$13,099,493.34, 1752, 1764, 3376
Advertisements for farm labourers, 1101
Agents for labour supply, 1191
Amalgamation, 18, 28, 56, 61, 2471

Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
Amalgamation—*Con.*
Causes of delay, 56
Economies resulting from, 1616
Orders in council effecting, 34, 53, 3620
Annual statement of minister, 1558
Appointments, 2472
Balfour, Col. H. N., reported, 2794, 2828
From outside Canada, 2827
Promotion, principle of, 3621
Thomas, Mr. A. J., reported, 2794, 2828
Appropriations, statement of, 2898, 2926, 3789
Atlantic division, boundaries, qu. 1363, 1754-62, 1770-72
Atlantic ports, 1754. *See also under this title,* Ocean Ports; Terminals
Audit staff, Moncton, removal, 574, 1756
Bank accounts, qu. 205
Betterments, 1562
Board of Directors. *See under this title,* Directors.
Board of management. *See under this title,* Directors; Management
Branch lines, 1568, 3626, 4688. *See also* Canadian National Railway Bills
Advances, 4329
Baie St. Paul-St. Urbain, 4189, 4197
Bruederheim, 4199, 4316
Brule Lake-Grande Prairie, 4699
Construction of, 1185, 3625
Cost per mile, 4327
Dunblane-Aylesbury, 4308, 4333
Dunlane-Mawer line, 4201
Eston branch, 4201
Expenditure
Appropriations, 4303, 4329, 4337
Authorization by Parliament, 4515
Financing, 4304, 4319, 4329
Grand Falls, 4310
Grande Fresniere-Rinfret Junction, 4312, 4326
Grande Prairie, 1185, 4200
Halifax-Musquodobit, 4317
Hanna-Medicine Hat, 4321
Hanna-Warden-Loverna, 4308, 4322, qu. 4436
Inverness railway, 4198
Inverness and Richmond, 4324
Kamloops-Okanagan, 4314
Kent Northern, 4189, 4197
Lockeport railway, 4326
Long Lac-Nakina, 3224, 4194, 4310, 4326
Meductic-International boundary, 4309, 4311
Melfort, 4319
Moncton-Buctouche railway, 3646, 4197
Moose Jaw-Riverhurst, 4333
Murray Bay-Nairn Falls, 4189, 4197

Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
Branch lines—*Con.*
Okanagan, 4314
Oliver-St. Paul, 4323
Paddockwood, 4319
Peace River, 4324
Peebles-Lampman, 4325
Prince George to Peace River, construction, 1434, 4701
Purchase of, 3646
St. John and Quebec, 4305
St. John and Westfield, 4312
St. Peter's-Louisburg, 4319, 4324
Sunny Brae-Guysborough, 4316, 4320, 4321
Thunderhill, 4311, 4315, 4322
Waterous-Swift Current, 4308
Windsor-Chester, 4333
Yorktown-Willowbrook, 4308
British mails, delay in, 2695
British preference and, 3053
Buffalo and Fort Erie Bridge Company, 1835
Business cars, 489, 4527
Canada Colonization Association, 1181, 1328, 3400, 3633
Canada Steamship Lines, Limited
Exchange of traffic, 2983, 3208
Thornton, Sir Henry, director, 2983, 3208, 3845, 3848
Canadian customs officer at New York, 3275
Canadian Government Merchant Marine. *See that title*
Canadian government railways
Advances, 1565
Audit office, transfer, Moncton to Montreal, 574, 1756
Deficit, 1560
Operating divisions, earnings and expenses, qu. 2298
Canadian National Safety League, 3956
Canadian National telegraphs, qu. 707, 2471
Canadian Northern, 1760. *See also under this title,* Annual Statement of Minister
Acquisition of, 56-57, 1937
Advances, 1565
Aid, conditions of, 1766
Amalgamation, causes of delay, 56-58
Arbitration, 56
British Columbia guarantee, 1946
Embezzlement of funds, 381
Fixed charges, 1565, qu. 3323
Gratuities to directors and officials, disclosure of, 2962
Insurance, 1568
Manitoba, agreement with, 1932, 1939
Securities, 1564
System, 55-56
Canadian Northern Express Company. *See under this title,* Express

Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
Canadian ports, 3454. *See also under this title,* Ocean Ports, Terminals
Capital expenditure, control of, 2827
Capitalization, 3192
Fixed charges and, qu. 3323
Reduction of, 3058
Car shortage, 62
Champlain market station, 4446
Chicago, traffic originating at, 1760-1770
Coal. *See also that title*
Freight rates on, 1264, 1268, 1277, 1280, 2828, 3200, 3621. *See also* Coal; Freight Rates; Fuel Supply
Increase of 300 per cent, 1277
Purchases, 1277, 1561, qu. 4303, 4708, qu. 4752
Alberta coal, qu. 1363, qu. 4437, qu. 4752
Maccan and river Hébert, mines, 1027
United States, in, 1277, 3493, qu. 4511
Transportation, 1264
Commitments, 18-19
Committee on, 2473
Construction, new, 1562, 1922
Co-ordination, 18, 28, 34, 53, 56, 61, 1616, 2471, 3620
Correspondence, M. for, 244
Cost of taking over, 92
Courtesy, 2859, 2971
Debt, 2802
Deficits, 1613, 2658, 2802, 2827, 2831, 3006, 3024, 3038, 3078, 3610, 3620, 3651, 4190. *See also* speeches on Budget; Supply
Taxation and, 3006
Directors, 36, 60, 62, qu. 1973, 2833
Additional, for Quebec, 34. *See also this head,* Talbot
Address and occupation, qu. 1973
British Columbia appointment, 373
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, 3811
Cattle shipments, 2758
Dawson, Mr. F. G., 373, qu. 1973
Gratuities to, 1687, 2962
Inspection trip, qu. 489
Labour, representation of, 1652, 1656, 3636
M. (Mr. Lapointe) 1653-56
Moore, Mr. Tom, 1654
New board of, 13
New Brunswick representation, qu. 282
Private cars, qu. 489
Removal of late board, correspondence, 3962
Responsibilities and powers, 2478, 3610, 3653. *See also under this title,* Management
Retiring allowances, 1483, qu. 1632
Sinclair, Mr. John A. statement, qu. 1363

Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
Directors—*Con.*
Special train, qu. 489
Stewart, Mr. James, qu. 205
Talbot, Mr. Onesiphore, qu. 707, qu. 1031, qu. 1258, 2004
Doctors, qu. 814
Dominion Express Company. *See also under this title,* Express
Dorchester employees, qu. 2086
Earnings, 3620, 3651
Eastern division
Brown, Mr. L. S., superintendent, 2971
Improved situation, 2971
Moncton headquarters, 2971
Eastern Land Company, purchase of land at Capreol, 626, 1635
Efficiency, 2859
Electric lines, sale of to municipalities, 2475. *See also* Canadian National Railway bills
Electrification, qu. 283, 3203, 3422, 3425
Employees, 55, 3621
Pensions, 14, 288. *See also under this title,* Pensions
Equipment, 1561, 4692
Orders, 2701
Estimates, 1566, 1619, 1764
Expenditure, 2987, 3078, 3620, 4305
Authorization by Parliament, 3615-40, 4304, 4397, 4515
Express. *See also* Canadian National Railway bills
Canadian Express Company, 2470
Canadian National Express, qu. 707
Canadian Northern Express, 2470
Dominion Express Company, termination of contract with, 2473
Intercolonial Express Company, 2470
Rates, 2876
Fish, on, 3365
Fidelity insurance, qu. 1029
Finance
Advances by government, 1565
Consolidated income figures, 1564
Financial statement, inquiry, 666
Financing in 1922, 1564
Securities, approval of, 4402. *See also under this title,* Securities
Fixed charges, qu. 708, qu. 814, 1565
Flavelle, Sir Joseph, 1612
Foster, Mr. A. de Witt, qu. 1633
Fredericton bridge, 3645, 4310
Freight cars, 4692
Interchange with United States, 4697
Purchase of in United States, 4692
Freight rates. *See also that title*
Coal, 1264, 1268, 1277, 1280, 2828, 3200, 3621. *See also* Coal; Fuel Supply

Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
General conditions, 1559
Georgetown wharf, 4587
Grades, 1965
British Columbia, 1917
Grain shipments, qu. 1484. *See also* Grain
Canadian and United States ports, 1756
Diversion to American ports, 2899
Portland, 1756
St. John, 1768
Grand Trunk, 1562
Additions and betterments, 1564
Advances, 1565
Amalgamation, delay in, 18, 56
Arbitration, 59, 1154, 1307
Arbitrators, fees, etc., qu. 624, qu. 1257
Doherty, Right Hon. C. J., qu. 1029
Legal expenses, qu. 730
Taft, Hon. Howard G., payments to, qu. 1157
Tilley, Mr. W. N., K.C., qu. 1029, qu. 1661, 2813
Assets, disposal of, 1665
Atwater, Mr. A. R., gratuity, qu. 1632
Biggar, Mr. W. H., K.C., gratuity, qu. 1632
Central Vermont
Deficits, 1563
Operating results, 1613
Transportation Company, 1564
Chicago, New York & Boston Refrigerator Company, 1563
Coal purchases, 1564
Commitments, qu. 206, qu. 207
Crowsnest pass agreement, rates, 1563
Dalrymple, Mr. J. E., gratuity, qu. 1632
Deer, Mr. H., gratuity, qu. 1632
Deficits, 1563
Electrification, qu. 283, 3203
Elevator, Montreal, qu. 1974
Equipment, all lines, 1564
Galloway, Mr. D. E., gratuity, qu. 1632
Grades, 1965
Gratuities to retiring directors and officials, 1664-68
British board of directors, qu. 1632
Disclosure of, 2962
Payments out of insurance, 1632, 1665
Progressive party and, 1687
Refund, 1667
Royal commission, 1665
Congdon, Mr. F. T., appointment, 2297, 2710, qu. 3131
Order in Council, tabled, 2347
Inquiry, 1976, 2297
Income account, 1563
Insurance, 1568
Insurance fund, payment of gratuities out of, 1632, 1665
International bridge company, 1563

Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
Grand Trunk—*Con.*
Kelley, Mr. Howard G., gratuity, qu. 1632
Logan, Mr. R. S., gratuity, qu. 1632
Management, personnel, 1612. *See also under this title,* Directors; Management
Martin, Mr. H. G., gratuity, qu. 1632
Montreal and Southern Counties Railway, 1564
Montreal Warehousing Company, 1564
Norman, Mr. H. H., gratuity, qu. 1632
Ocean ports, 1758. *See also under this title,* Terminals
Providence, 1755, 1762
Operating results, 1560-3
Oshawa Railway, Rail and River Coal Company, 1564
Pensioners, annual passes, qu. 2418
Pension rights of employees, 14
Preference and common shareholders, representations, 3960
President, retiring allowance, 2785
Prince Rupert dry dock, qu. 1664
Profit and loss, qu. 1257
Pullen, Mr., 2472
Purchase price, qu. 1257
Robb, Mr. W. D., gratuity, qu. 1632
Rosevear, Mr. J. M., gratuity, qu. 1632
Scott, Mr. Frank, gratuity, qu. 1632
Separately-owned companies, 1563
Shareholders, list of, 939
Stock, 61
Terminal Warehousing Company, 1564
Terminals in United States, 815
Portland, 1755, 1758, 1768, 2898
Providence, 1755, 1762
Thousand Island railway, 1564
Ties, tenders, qu. 3821
Traffic, 1563
Grand Trunk Pacific, 58-59, 152, 1761
Aid, conditions of, 1766
Bell, Mr. G. T., gratuity, qu. 1632
Construction, cost of, 1918
Debenture holders, representation, 3507, 3581
Fixed charges, 1565
Hansard, Mr. H. H., gratuity, qu. 1632
Hinton, Mr. W. P., gratuity, qu. 1632
Loan of $15,000,000, 2920
Porter, Mr. S. P., gratuity, qu. 1632
Gratuities. *See under this title,* Grand Trunk
Refund of, 1667
"Greatest railway in the world," 3056
Halifax grain elevator, qu. 4751
Halifax terminals, qu. 4518. *See also under this title* Terminals

Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
Hanna, Mr. D. B.—*Con.*
Hanna, Mr. D. B., 1612, 2050
Director, Canadian Steamship Lines, 3208
Retirement, 1666
Gratuity, qu. 1632
Hayes, Mr. 2471
Headquarters, 62, 3224. *See also under this title,* Moncton
Divisional, 63
Montreal, 1757
Hotel Scribe. *See under this title,* Paris Offices
Hotels, 938, qu. 1257
Deficits, 2976
Manager, qu. 1257
Hudson Bay railway and. *See that title*
Immigration, 1121
Canada Colonization Association, 1181, 1328, 3400, 3633
Conference, 1193
Income account, 1559
Inquiry into, 19
Insurance, 1567, 1616. *See also* Canadian National Railways bill, Insurance
Hanna, Mr. D. B. and Mitchell, Mr. A. J., interests in, 2050
Mortgaged premises. *See this title under* Canadian National Railway bills
Rates of, statement, 2106
Intercolonial, 135, 1756, 1760, 1765
Atlantic ports, 1754-62
British North America Act and, 1765
Express. *See under this title,* Express
Moncton headquarters, 13
Paradis, Mr. Telesphore, claim, 4691
Pensioners, annual pass, qu. 2418
Pensions, 3195
Kelley, Mr. Howard, 1612, qu. 1632
Labour, representation, 1561. *See under this title, also,* Directors; Moore
Land
Contiguous to, 1880
Purchases or sales, 1739
Legislation, qu. 4300. *See also* Canadian National Railway bills
Liquor transportation, 1868, 3324
Mail contracts, qu. 3143
Management, 1616, 2832, 3041, 3623. *See also under this title,* Directors
Details of, 2472
Liberal resolution of 1921, 3685, 3688
Non-interference with, 2473, 3670
Personnel, 3058
Responsibility and powers, 3615, 3620, 3623, 3653, 3811. *See also under this title,* Paris Offices; Thornton
Capital investments. *See under this*

Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
title, Paris Offices
Maritime provinces in, 126-130
Maritime region, 1754, 1757
Mileage, 55, 1765, 3197
Cost, and, 914
Operated, 1558
Traffic and, comparison, 2949
Minister, acting, statement by, 55-63
Minister's annual statement, 1558; operated mileage, 1558; general conditions, 1559; income account, 1559; net operating deficit, 1560; decreased operating expenses, 1560; operating ratio, 1560; traffic results, steam lines, 1561; operating expenses, 1561; labour, 1561; locomotive coal purchases, 1561; equipment, 1561; betterments, 1562; new construction, 1922, 1562; Grand Trunk, 1562; income account, 1563; Grand Trunk traffic, 1563; separately-owned companies, 1563; employees and compensation, 1564; equipment, Grand Trunk, all lines, 1564; coal, 1564; additions and betterments, 1564; finance; consolidated income figures, 1564; financing in 1922, 1564; advances by government, 1565; fixed charges, 1565; estimates, 1566; reorganization, Sir Henry Thornton, 1566; insurance, 1567; tabulated statements, 1570-1611
Mitchell, Mr. A. J.,
Insurance, interest in, 2050
Petiring gratuity, qu. 1632, 1667
Moncton and Buctouche railway, 3646, 4197
Montford railway, 4199
Moore, Mr. Tom
Labour representative, directors, 1652, 1654, 3636
Statement on immigration, 1167
Mulligan, Mr. D. B., qu. 1257
National Transcontinental. *See under this title,* Transcontinental
Net operating deficits, 1560
New positions and salaries, 2701
Niagara and St. Catharines railway, 2475
Niagara Central railway, 2480
No politics order, 3623
Ocean ports and terminals, 1754, 1757-1762, 1767, 1768, 2898, 2899, 2937, 3454. *See also under this title,* Terminals
Official cars, 3621
Officials, retiring allowances, 1483, qu. 1632
Operation
Costs, 1919
Deficits, 3701
Expenses, decreased, 1560, 1561

Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
Ratio, 1560
Orders in council, 815
Over-capitalization, 2860
Ownership, 3192, 3224
Page, Supt., alleged statement, 4514
Paris offices, purchase of Hotel Scribe, 3197, 3208, 3224, 3279, 3610, 3610-46, 3650-76, 3676-3708, 3811, 3813, 3838, 4514
Amdt. (Mr. Stevens) 3664, ruled out of order, 3667
Aronovici, Mr. A., 3612, 3652
Peace river
Branch lines, 1434, 4324, 4701
Survey, 4898
Policy, 1764, 3620
Pre-audit, 3701
Preferential treatment of localities, 1762
President, appointment of, 2827
Prince Edward Island car ferry claim, 4676
Prince Rupert, 2734
Printing, 1623
Contracts, 3144
Winnipeg, qu. 3323
Private cars, 489, 4527
Property, purchases and sales, 1739, 2518, 3324
Prospects of success, 2830
Providence, Rhode Island, building, 1755
Public ownership, 1614, 1618, 1770, 2859, 3007, 3056, 3622, 4190. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget
Quebec terminals, 446
Railway Commission and, 666
Railway mail service, 1783, 1786
Rates. *See under this title,* Freight Rates
Real estate, 1739, 2518, 3324
Regional areas, 135, 3621
Regulations, 496
Reorganization, Thornton, Sir Henry, 1566
Report, 3223
Retirement fund, 1667
Retiring allowances to officials and directors, 1483. *See also under this title,* Grand Trunk, Gratuities
Revaluation, 2859
Earning power, 2860
Replacement, 2860
Revenue, detailed, 2898
Riley's army, transportation, 3042
Robb, Mr., qu. 1632, 2471
Rolling stock and equipment, 61, 1561, 3962
St. Croix, 2899
St. John and Quebec railway, 3403
Interruption of traffic, 3644
St. John terminal, 3645. *See also* St. John, *and under this title,* Terminals
St. Malo repair shops, 4447

Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
Sales tax, qu. 1157
Scarfe Varnish Works, purchases, qu. 1485
Service, improved, 2859, 3041
Settlement along, 1185
Shannon, Mr. L. S., gratuity, qu. 1632
Shipping. *See* Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Combine, 2127
Steel, lifting of, 1664
Strategic advantages, 3057
Superannuation fund, qu. 2418
Tabulated statements, 1570-1611
Talbot, Mr. Onesiphore. *See under this title,* Directors
Teakle, Mr. R. B. letter as to cattle shipments, 2758
Telegraph service, Canadian Press, 4728
Terminals. *See also under this title* Ocean ports
Atlantic division, qu. 1363, 1771
Halifax, 1756, 1759, 1768, 4713, qu. 4751
Maritime region, qu. 1662
Ocean. *See also under this title,* Ocean Winter ports, 2902
Portland, Maine, 1755, 1768
Providence, 1755, 1762
St. John, 1756, 1759, 1768
Thornton, Sir Henry, 13, 52, 1566, 1612, 2833. *See also under this title,* Paris Offices
Appointment, 2828
Agreement tabled, 574
Correspondence, 495
Assistants, reported appointment of Messrs. Balfour and Thomas, 2794, 2828
Atlantic division, 1771
Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, director, 2983, 3208, 3845, 3848
Cattle shipments, 2758
Coal transportation, 1264
Criticism of, 3640
Crowsnest pass agreement, 1966
Financial statement, 666
Freight rates on Alberta coal, 1268
Immigration, 1167, 2795, 2840
Maritime boards of trade, conference, 1755, 1771
Ocean ports, 1758-69
Operating costs, 1919
Paris offices, 3208, 3611, 3615, 3653
Radial railways, sale of, 2476
Rate discrimination, 1914
Sale of 27 ships, 2828
Speeches, 3637
Ties, purchase of, qu. 516
Toronto
Approaches and terminals, 4193, 4447
Connection between lines, 3224

Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
Toronto—*Con.*
Level crossings, 2477
Office building, qu. 814, qu. 1663, 2481
King and Yonge Streets property, qu. 1994, 2518, 3224, 3399, 3629, 3642
Union station, 3620, 4325, 4442
Viaduct, qu. 517, 4306, 4325, 4441, 4442
Toronto Eastern railway, 2475
Toronto Suburban railway, 2181, 2475
Sale of, qu. 2612, 3399
Traffic, 3041
Results, steam lines, 1561
Staff, removal from Truro to Halifax, 4708
Train to carry troops to Sydney, qu. 624
Transcontinental, 1760
Branch line to Montreal, qu. 2393
Cattle shipments, 2807
Development of northern Ontario and Quebec, 2833
Fortin & Moffat claim, 3646
Freight rates, 3680
Operating results, 1560
Strategic advantages, 3057
Winnipeg-St. Croix projected route, 2898
Transportation combine, 1395. *See also* Freight rates
Truro subway, 4454
Unification of system, 1615, 1666, 3196, 3223
Union stockyards, 2762
United States
Lines, 3197
Terminals, 1755, 1762, 1768
Value of property, 55
Wages, reduction, qu. 1363. *See also* Labour
Waterways, 3057

Canadian National Railways Bills
1. Insurance of mortgaged premises
Res. 1635, 2048; 1r., 2050; 2r., com., 2105; 3r., 2107
2. Express business and sale of electric lines; radial railways
1r., 2392; 2r., com., 2470; 3r., 2481
3. Construction of branch lines
Res. 3961, 4185; 1r., 4201; 2r., 4303-4308; com., 4308; 3r., on div. 4397, 4401
Sections and subjects discussed:
Advances for government railway lines, 4329
Advances pending issue of guaranteed securities, 4344
Amdts. (Mr. Meighen) expenditure, appropriation of by Parliament, 4337, neg. 4339; 4398, neg. 4401
Guarantee of securities of other lines up to $40,000 per mile, 4339
Lines connecting with Canadian government railways and constructed by company, 4327

Canadian National Railways Bills—*Con.*
Construction of branch lines—*Con.*
Sections and subjects discussed—*Con.*
Nature and form of securities, 4339
Power to construct described in schedule, 4308
Rejection by Senate, 4753, 4688, 4689, 4694, 4695
4. Securities, approval of
Res, 4012, 4402; lr., 4405; 2r., com., 4515; m. for 3r., amdt. (Sir Henry Drayton) to refer back neg., 4732; 3r., 4732
Senate amendments, 4754
Amdt. (Mr. Meighen) expenditure, appropriation of by Parliament, 4527, neg. 4528
Form, term and amount of securities to be approved, 4515

Canadian National Safety League grant, 3953

Canadian Naval Volunteer Reserve. *See* National Defence, Naval Service

Canadian Northern Railway. *See this title under* Canadian National Railways

Canadian Pacific Railway. *See also* Address; Budget; Freight Rates
Advertisements for farm labourers, 1101
Agents for labour supply, 1191
Assets, obligations, etc., qu. 625
Attitude towards Canadian National Railways, 3056
Banff hotel, 3435
British Columbia, qu. 626, 1916
Canada Colonization Association, 1172, 1324, 1328, 3400
Canadian customs officer at New York, 3275
Canadian Pacific "party", 3056
Cattle shipments, 3043
Chinese sailors, 2334
Consolidated Mining & Smelting Company, 3235
Construction, 1880, 1916, 1918
Crowsnest pass agreemet, 1620. *See also that title.*
Dividends, 1203, 1392, 1406, 3190
Dominion Express Company, 2470
Earnings, 1919
Net, 1130
Surplus, 1130
Efficient service, 127
Express charges, 2876
False Creek bridge, 3375, 4708
Freight Rates. *See also that title*
Copper bounty and, 3239
Dividends, and, 1134
Ocean, 2127

Canadian Pacific Railway—*Con.*
Grades, 1965
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1172, 1324, 1328, 3400
Conference, 1193
Russia, 1340
Labour, shopmen, resolution of, 1338
Land, 3704
Sale contracts, revision of, 2930
Lanigan, Mr., freight rates, 1918
Operation, cost of, 1918
Quebec terminals, 815
Railway mail service, 1783, 1786
Mail contracts, qu. 3143
St. John immigration buildings, 1457, 1458
Shares, transfer under Treaty of Versailles, 2496
Steamship lines, British mails, 2695
Telegraph service, Canadian press, 4728
Toronto, level crossings, 2477
Union stockyards, 2762

Canadian Ports. *See* British Preference; Canadian National Railways; Ports; Treaties, French and Italian

Canadian Press Limited. *See Press*

Canadian Representation in the United States, 65, 2735, 3016, 3085, 4001, 4664. *See also* Treaties, Halibut Fishery
Delay, 3085

Canadian Society of Chemical Industries, 2069

Canadian Trade Index, 2217

Canadian Vickers. *See* Vickers

Canadian Wheat Board. *See* Grain and Grain Trade, Wheat Board

Canadians
Distressed, relief of, 1456
Emigrating. *See* Emigration
Repatriation of. *See* Immigration

Canals. *See also* Railways and Canals; St. Lawrence Waterway
Canadian National railways, and, 3057
Cornwall, employees, political partisanship, qu. 3135
Freight rates, water transportation, 1914
Georgian Bay construction, 2816
Grain shipments and, 2808. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade; Lake Grain Rates
Improvement of, 1619
Isle Perrot bridge, Ste. Anne's lock, 3646
Panama. *See that title*
Rideau
Improvements, 4691
Water powers, qu. 622

Canals—*Con.*
St. Lawrence. *See that title*
Trent
Bridges, qu. 205
Campbell, Mr. Orin, claim, 626
Expenditure, qu. 4301
Improvements, 3647, 4691
Traffic, qu. 4301
Young's Point dam, qu. 1363
Welland
Construction, 3760
Contracts, qu. 1489
Deepening, 2979
Expenditure, 3073, qu. 3820
Inquiry into, 3006
Request for, 3073, 3766, 3772, 3773
Grain shipments, 2808
Grenville by-election, 4606
Hudson Bay railway, 1054, 1068, *See also that title*
Importations of lumber for, qu. 1867
Port Colborne elevator, 4690
Towing, qu. 4132

Canned Goods and Fish, freight rates, 1915

Canned Meats Act, inspection, 2202

Canning Licenses. *See* Fish and Fisheries

Cannon, Mr. Lucien (Dorchester)
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3090-3105
Business of the House, closure, 3668
Business profits and income taxes, qu. 1157
Canadian National railways
Advance, $73,000,000, 3623
Dorchester county employees, qu. 2086
Management, 3623
Details of, Liberal res. of 1921, 3685
Responsibility and powers, 3623, 3684
Paris offices, 3684
Amdt. (Mr. Stevens), ruling, 3667
Civil Service
Dismissals after 1911 election, 3347
Quebec city and district, 387
Freight rates, Manitoba-Canadian Northern, 1933
Grondines wharf, 964
Harbours and rivers, Ontario, 981
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3560
Point of order, letter reflecting on House, 4060
Portage la Prairie sewage system, 996
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 754
St. John immigration building, 1461
Toronto Harbour improvements, 985
Toronto island breakwater, 984
Votes of parliament and pledges, 3536

Canso, N. S. wharf, 941

Cap de la Madeleine wharf, 950

Cape Breton North and Victoria, vacancy, 1763, 2469

Cape Breton Strike. *See* Labour, Strikes

Capital. *See also* Banks and Banking; Credits; Finance
Attraction of, 2802, 3050
Basic industries, and, 3239
Canadian National railways, ownership of, 3192, 3224
Capital levy to pay war debt, 2728, 2743, 2909
Capitalistic system
Control of educational agencies, 2725
Defence of, 2743
Failure of, 2722
Government, influence over, 2726
Labour organization and, 2895
Political parties and, 2810
Capitalists, position of, 2583
Carvell, Hon. F. B., and, 3191
Centralization of, 4047
Control of interlocking directorates, 4026
Definition of, 3068
Diverted by income tax to tax-free bonds, 2914
Domination of, 4026
Farmers, 4045. *See also that title*
Investment in production, 2720
Investment, knowledge as to conditions, 2966
Natural resources, development of, 3027
Rights of, Abraham Lincoln on, 2967
Tariff and, 3025
Taxation of, 2801, 2879, 3010

Capital and Labour. *See also* Labour
Royal commission on industrial relations, report, 2890

Capital Investment, power to make. *See* Canadian National Railways, Paris Offices

Capital Punishment
Abolition of, 487. *See also* Criminal Code Amdt. bills
Carleton county execution, 768

Caraquet and Gulf Shore Railway, qu. 204, 1258, 2938, 2939

Carbonic Acid Gas. *See* Budget; Special War Revenue; Taxation

Carleton Point, Que., lightkeeper, qu. 285

Carleton County, N.B., execution in, 768

Carmichael, Mr. A. M. (Kindersley)
Annual training, 868
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 255, 4110
Butter factories in new districts, 3284
Canadian National parks, automobile admission fee, 3942
Canadian National Railways, branch lines, 4201
Cheque tax, 3932
Divorces granted, qu. 622
Dominion Lands Act, school lands, 4202
Eston branch railway, 4201
Grain Commission, salaries, 787
Indians, 2153
Interest rates, 4110
Military hospitals, 672
Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. bill, 2123
Opium and Narcotic Drugs, 699
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2113
Penitentiaries, 770
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 735
Relief of distressed Canadians, 1456
School lands
Reversion of, 3445
Unpaid balance of purchase price, 4202
Seed grain advances, 3444
Vancouver harbour bill, 260

Carnegie, Colonel, 1648

Carney, Stephen P., conviction, qu. 3582

Caron, Mr. E., postmaster, Tadoussac, qu. 3139

Carroll, Mr. William F. (Cape Breton South and Richmond)
Address in reply, 80; unemployment decrease; anti-combine legislation, 80; immigration, desirable types; United Farmers of Alberta and immigration 81; prosperity of western farmers; Soldier Settlement board as an aid to immigration, 82; amendments; Vancouver harbour expenditure, 83; coal resources of Canada, 83-84; strikes, 84; the farmers and larger markets; question of tariff reduction, 85
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3088-3121
Brule Lake-Grande Prairie railway, 4700
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill, 3973
Chinese immigration bill, 4537
"Merchants" definition of, 2483
Civil Service appointments, postmasters, 377
Coal
Eastern and Western Canada, 3204
Freight rates, 3204
Coasting laws, suspension of, 4231
Cold storage warehouses, 189
Combines bill, 2529, 2626

Carroll, Mr. William F.—*Con.*
Dairy Act 1914 Amdt. bill
Notice of M. for 2r., 3402
Renovated butter, 4262
Estimates, method of discussion, 4616
Fuel supply, 3203. *See under this title,* Mines and Minerals
M. (Mr. Church)
Amdt. proposing reference to Mines and Minerals Committee, 1271
Grain shipments, 4230
Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia, 4561
Howat and Meyerscough, Messrs., detention at border, 3157
Immigration Act Amdt. bill, 2428
Record of immigrants, 2670
Undesirable classes, 2669
Imperial Conference, 4643
Inverness-Richmond railway, extension, 4324
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4230
Mines and Minerals Committee
First report, 1384
Third report, 4436, 4592, 4743
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2462
Repatriation, M. 1379
Oleomargarine, 4263
Committee on Agriculture, discussion, 3266
M. to permit manufacture, importation and sale, 1382, 3399, 3508, 3573
Point of order, anticipatory motion, 3327
Peace river railway, 4324, 4700
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3850-3881, 4747
Pensions
Appeal board, Ottawa, 3731
Royal commission on, opportunity for discussion of report, 674
Petition of Right Act Amdt. bill, 3128
Privilege, Com. on Agriculture, 3266
Public Works, salaries, 2685
Public Works Act, tender and contract, 954
Railway Commission, criticism of judgment, 1916
Registration of ships, 3973
Renovated butter, 4262
St. Peter's Louisburg railway, 4324
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment bill, 3747
Taxation, 2837
Wheat board, Manitoba legislature, 2836

Carruthers, Mrs. James. *See* Labour, International Labour Conference

Carruthers, Mr. John (East Algoma)
Eastern Lands Development Company, 1635
Young, Mr. C. T., qu. 1739

Cartwright, Right Hon. Sir Richard, on protection, 3070

Carvell, Hon. F. B. *See* Railway Commission

Casgrain, Mr. Pierre F. (Charlevoix-Montmorency
Baie St. Paul-St. Urbain railway, 4189
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4102, 4509
Bankruptcy Act
Amdt. or abrogation, M., 1490, 1528
Repeal of, 1158
Business of the House
Audibility, 4594
Private members' day, 1158
Canadian National Railways, branch lines, 4189
Chairman, ruling:
Comittee report not debatable in advance of presentation, 1906
Combines bill, 2549, 2618, 2627
Commissioners, appointment of, 2627
Murray Bay-Nairn Falls railway, 4189
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) point of order, 3570
Quebec and Saguenay railway, 4190
Senate and House of Commons, bill, 4244

Cattle. *See this title,* under Live Stock

Cattle Diseases. *See* Animal Contagious Diseases, Live Stock, Health of Animals

Cattle Embargo. *See* Live Stock

Caucus, Party. *See* Lack of Confidence

Cayouette, Miss Evangeline, postmistress, Ste. Claire, qu. 1031

Cecil, Lord Robert, lecture, adjournment, 1685

Cedar Rapids power, Aluminium Company of America, 659
Cement, French Treaty, 1984

Central Research Institute, 788

Census. *See* Immigration; Population; Redistribution; Statistics

Central Supply Association, decision, 2593

Chair, Rulings of. *See* Deputy Speaker; Speaker

Chairman. *See* Deputy Speaker

Champlain Dock. *See* Quebec (port)

Champoux, Mr. J. E., Sorel postmaster, qu. 1487

Chanak Affair. *See* Near East Crisis

Chapel Cove, N.S., breakwater, 941

Chaplin, Mr. James D. (Lincoln)
Agriculture department, salaries, 611
Ammunition, 884, 1741
Apple-grading, 194
Artificial silk, duty, 3489, 3491
Atlanta exhibition, 1465
Canada Colonization Association, 1172
Canadian Manufacturers' Association, and, 1171
Canadian National railways
Express and electric lines bill, 2480
Grand Trunk, gratuities, 1667
Toronto office building, 2481
Civil government estimates, form of, 611
Cold Storage Act Amdt. bill, 2054, 2060
Cold storage companies, 186
Experimental farms, 480
Firebrick, duty, 3481
French treaty, 453, 1977, 1995
Analysis of, 1978
Bronze powder, 1979, 2217
Customs index, 2269-70
Butter, 2273
Cobalt products, 2263
Cotton, 2263
Silks, 448
Wines, 442
Government elevators, 2036
Hamilton-Queenston highway, qu., 813
Harbours and rivers
New Brunswick, 945
Nova Scotia, 4566
Ontario, 981
Quebec, 968
Highway, Canboro-Allanburg, qu. 1139
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1172
Contributions of Canadian Manufacturers' Association, 1164, 1171
Policy, 1171
St. John immigration building, 1457
Italian treaty bill, 2401
Labour department
Staff, 1672, 1678, 1699, 1701
Statistics, 1677, 1682
Technical education, director of, 1674
Lindsay arsenal, 883
Little Anse breakwater, claim of Mr. T. D. Morrison, 4573
Macdonald, Sir John A., reciprocity, 2922
Maritime provinces, dredging, 4569
Military properties, maintenance, 889
National defence
Ammunition, 884, 1741
Dominion arsenal, Quebec, 884, 1741, 1744
Estimates, 1741
Salaries and contingencies, 902
Niagara Central railway, 2480
Patents of Invention bill, 2073

Chaplin, Mr. James D.—*Con.*
Penitentiaries, 774
Point of order, Mr. Caldwell, 3267
Port Burwell harbour works, 983
Printing bureau, 1710
Quebec
Arsenal, 884, 1741, 1744
Wharves, 978
Raisins and dried currants, duty, 3476
Relief of distressed Canadians abroad, 1456
Rolled iron or steel hoops, bands, etc., 3484
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 777
Ste. Anne des Monts pier, 979
Seed grain advances, 3446
Toronto island breakwater, 984
Trade returns, incomplete, 2269
Wedge, Mr. George, qu. 2697

Charges of Management. *See* Finance

Charlottetown public building, 4614

Charlottetown-Pictou steamship service, 2171

Chartered Accountants Association of Canada. *See* Bank Act Amdt. bill

Charters, Bank. *See* Bank Act Amdt. bill

Charters, Mr. Samuel (Peel)
Immigrants
Overcharging at Quebec, 3324
Supplies, 496
Labour Gazette, Mr. Ronald Hooper, 1626
Pugsley, Hon. William, appointment, qu. 1993
Scarfe Varnish works, qu. 1485

Chateau Laurier. *See* Canadian National Railways, Hotels

Chatham, Ont., wharf, 982

Cheese. *See* Dairying Industry

Chemical Industries, Canadian Society, 2069

Chemicals
Freight rates, 1920
French treaty, 1985

Cheque Tax. *See* Budget; Special War Revenue Act Amdt. bill; Taxation

Chevrier, Mr. E. R. E. (Ottawa)
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 362, 546, 554, 556
Mansfield, Mr. William, dismissal of, qu. 4512
Ottawa government workshops, 4619

Chicago
Chicago Drainage Canal, 2993
Diversion of water, qu. 3821
Exhibition, 1454, 1466

Chicago—*Con.*
Fat Stock Show, 1398

Chicoutimi wharf, 950

Chicoutimi-Saguenay county
Postmasters, qu. 3138
Telegraph lines, qu., 3138
Verrault, Mr. Gedeon, qu. 3148

Chidley, Cape. *See* Hudson Bay Railway

Chief Electoral Officer, salaries and contingencies, 4001

Children
Chinese, born in Canada. *See* Chinese Immigration bill
Deaths through fuel shortage, 751, 1657
Immigration of. *See* Immigration
Income tax exemptions for, 1382, 2128, 3038, 4502
Mortality of, 1179
Oleomargarine, effect on health. *See* Oleomargarine
Playgrounds, 3407, 3432

Chili, Senate, constitution of, 1373

Chimes. *See* Parliament Buildings, Tower

Chimney Corner, N.S., wharf, 941

China
Bandits in, 2932
Butter shipments to, 1840, 1853
Canadian trade commissioner, 1840
Cheese shipments to, 1853
Chinese Consul General, immigration 1488
Civilization of, 2486
Conditions in, 2316
Immigration from. *See* Chinese Immigration; Immigration
Lowe, Dr. A. M., capture and maltreatment in, 2695, 2795
Political disturbances, 2325
Trade relations with, 2313, 2316, 2320

Chinese Immigration. *See also* Immigration

Chinese Immigration Bill (Entry limited to diplomatic corps; Chinese children born in Canada; merchants and students) 1r., 768; 2r., com., 2308, com., 2481; 3r., 2489; Senate amendments, 4536
Sections and subjects discussed:
Admission for specified period, 2329
Agreement with China, 2317
Appeal to Minister, 2331
Arrest and deportation, 2334
Canadian officers in China, 2308
Chief controller, Department of Immigration, 2308, 2482

Chinese Immigration Bill—*Con.*
Sections and subjects discussed:
Chinese
Children, 2484
En route, admission, 2488
Landing in violation of act, 2336
Not to leave ship without permit, 2333
Sailors on Canadian vessels, 2334
To register within 12 months, 2333
Women, 2310, 2318, 2484
Representations from British Columbia, 2310
Conductor to furnish list of Chinese persons carried, 2333
Definition, 2308
Deportation, 2488
Entry and landing, 2309
Vancouver and Victoria only, 2327
Evasions, 2315, 2324
Exclusion, 2324, 2482
Head tax, 2312
Identification and registration: certificates, 2331
Immigration confined to certain classes, 2482
Jurisdiction of courts, 2337
Labourers, 2310, 2316
Liability of transportation companies, 2334
Merchants
Definition of, 2317, 2319, 2487
New Westminster Retail Merchants Association, 2320
Students and, 2310
Evasions, 2324
Wives, 2318
Nationality, 2309
Number carried on ship limited, 2333
Offences and penalties, 2488
Officer in China, 2322
Officers in other countries, 2308, 2482
Organizing, unlawful courts, 2337
Passports, 2325
Powers of Governor in council, 2308
Prohibited classes, 2327
Re-entry, 2333
Registered person, 2488
Status, substantiation of, 2487
Students, 2310, 2316, 2324
Violation of act or fraud, 2488
Violation of act, order or regulation, 2337
Wives, 2484. *See also under this title,* Chinese, Women; Merchants

Chisby, Captain, Hudson Bay route, 1052

Chisholm, Mr. A. W. (Inverness)
Eastern harbour improvements, 4569
Margaree River Salmon Fisheries Association, 3369
Pension commissioners, salaries, 3743

Chisholm, Hon. C. P. *See* Disallowance of Nova Scotia Statute

Christie, Mr. Loring C., resignation, 3988

Church, Mr. Thomas L. (North Toronto)
Abbott's harbour, breakwater, 4563
Address, legislation referred to, in, qu. 2612
Agricultural Conditions, report, qu. 2612
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4068
Banking and Commerce Com. report, qu. 2612
Banting, Dr. F. G., recognition of, 703, 4439
Basic industries, assistance, 2822, 3238
Best, Mr. C. H., recognition of, 703
Blinded soldiers, travelling expenses, 693
Board of Commerce, 2583
Budget, 2817; congratulations to Finance Minister, 2817; delay in bringing down budget; tariff not political but economic question; Liberal-Conservative party always protectionist; National policy made Canada great, 2818; protection budget introduced by Minister of Finance; home market; Ontario farmers and protection; Progressive party plank; amendment; industrial conditions preceding adoption of protective policy; tariff stability; Baldwin tinplate industry; loss of due to tariff uncertainty, 2819; government, change of policy; tariff proposals high protection; amendment, Mr. Forke; national policy should be brought up to date; conservation of industries and markets; free trade in potatoes; prices, 2820; eggs, importation from United States; butter; western provinces, conditions in, 2821; houses for harvesters; tendency from free trade and towards protection; industrial conditions in Great Britain; strikes of agricultural labourers; adequate protection of basic industries; unemployment; emigration to United States; industrial possibilities, 2822; wool-combing; hemp industry; skilled workmen going to United States; tariff not responsible for exodus; climate and high taxation; causes of depression; world conditions; high taxation and prices; United States not free trade country; Fordney-McCumber tariff; thirty-five per cent duty on wheat; economy, preaching and practising; deficit in Canada, surplus in Great Britain, France and United States, 2823; Drury government and economy plank; United Farmers of

Church, Mr. Thomas L.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
Ontario; Ontario, increase of expenditure and debt; British budget, reduction in taxation and expenditure; taxation, increase in Canada, reduction in Great Britain and United States; taxation of luxuries and necessities; "free breakfast table;" coal and food prices; postal rates, reduction of, 2824; public debt; inheritance and income tax; income tax, federal and municipal; cigarette duty; sugar duty, 2825; receipt tax; evasion of; cheque tax; provincial amusement tax, 2826; copper bounty; hemp bounty; wool-combing industry; old age pensions; public health; mother's pensions; railway deficit; Canadian National Railways; capital expenditure; President, appointment of; Col. H. N. Balfour and Mr. A. J. Thomas, appointment of, 2827; principle of promotion; Sir Henry Thornton; Canadian Government Merchant Marine, sale of ships; shipping combine; rates; grain-carrying trade; export tax on pulpwood; water powers, export of electrical energy; Canadian coal, freight rate on, 2828; agricultural conditions; Mr. Thomas Bradshaw, evidence before Agricultural Conditions Committee; agricultural conditions in United States; rural credits; rural depopulation; prices, spread between producer and consumer; reciprocity, 2829
Business of the House
Committees, reports, qu. 2612
Private members' day, 1160
Progress of, 2469
Sessional programme, 2469
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Returns, 3399
Sale of ships, qu. 2613, 2828, 2518, 3846
Shipping combines, 3846
Canadian National railways, 2828
Advance $73,000,000, 3619
Management, 3620
Radial railways, sale of, 2475
Rates, 1761
Securities, 4526
Toronto office building, qu. 1663, 2518
Canadian Press Limited, subsidy, 4729
Canadian team at Olympic games, 4707
Capital and labour, 2583
Chicago drainage canal, diversion, qu. 3821
Civil service, underpaid, 4672
Coal. *See also under this title,* Fuel Supply

Church, Mr. Thomas L.—*Con.*
Coal—*Con.*
Freight rate, 2828
Imports, qu. 516
Combines and Fair Prices Act, 2583
Combines bill, 2583, 2634
Combines, prosecutions of, qu. 1662
Copper bounty bill, 3238
Cost of living inquiry, qu. 3703
Deputy ministers salaries, 4672
Drayton-Acworth commission, 1761
Elevators
Edmonton, 4721
Ontario, 2038, 4719, 4721
Emigration to United States, 2822
Employers' liability compensation, 692
Euclid hall and Brant house, hospitals, closing, 4075, 4303
Expenditure on wharves, 4568
Fielding, Right Hon. Mr., congratulations, 4742
Freight rates
Operating costs and, 1761
Railway rates, equalization of, M. (Mr. Clark) 1969
Shipping, Railway Commission control, qu. 2611
Fuel supply
Freight rates, 1268, 2828
M. for a national fuel policy, 1262
Nova Scotia coal, 1269
Special committee, appointment, qu. 617
Transportation, 3200
Grain shipments, 3775
Grand Trunk. *See also under this title.* Canadian National railways
Commitments, qu. 207
Electrification, qu. 283
Halifax elevator, 4721
Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia, 4562
Historic sites, preservation of, 3249, 4707
Housing, legislation, qu. 2517, 2822
Hudson Bay railway
Construction vote, 4681
Motherwell, Hon. Mr., reported statement of, 2774
Hydro electric, power supply, 1266, 1270, 2828
Imperial conference, 4661
Income War Tax Act Amdt, bill, 4493
Judges Act Amdt. bill, 3604
Judges serving on royal commissions, 3604
Medical students, summer employment, 704
Military hospitals, 696, 4075, 4303
Mines and Minerals Com. report, 4743
Moose Jaw election, 2774
National fuel policy, M., 1262
Near East Crisis, 1266
Newsprint, export duty, 1267

Church, Mr. Thomas L.—*Con.*
Niagara forts, preservation of, 4707
Ontario grain elevators, 2038, 4719, 4721
Old age pensions, legislation, qu. 2517, 2827
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3873, 4749
Pensions
British Expeditionary force, 3885
Fenian raid, 3873
Royal commission, report, qu. 2516
South African war, 3873
Postal rates, decrease of, 1779, 2824
Post office salaries, 1780
Prices, high, 2583, 2820, 2822
Proportional representation, 424
Public ownership, 2475, 3622, 3847
Pulpwod, export duty on, 2828
Radial railways, sale of, 2475
Railway excursion tickets, qu. 1485
Redistribution Committee report, qu. 2612
St. Lawrence river waterway, 3773
Power development, qu. 490
United States, negotiations, 3208, 3705, 4513
Shipping combines, 2828, 3846, 3848
Soldiers, destitute, burial of, 695
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, hospitals, closing, 4075, 4303
Soldiers' Comforts Branch, Toronto, 3507
Steamship services
Extension to Great Lakes, 2175
Rates, control of, 2174
St. Lawrence-Great Lakes, ships, qu. 2613
Taxation
High, 2583, 2823
"Taxed to death," 4493
Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner) 1294
Toronto
Customs house, 3277, 3282, 4621, 4624
Postal receipts, 1779
Postal station "A" building, 4624
Post office building, 1780
Soldiers' Comforts branch, qu. 3506
Union station, 4442
Viaduct, qu. 206, qu. 4011, 4441, 4442
Toronto Suburban railway, qu. 280, 2181, 3324
Sale of, qu. 2612, 3399
Unemployment relief, 690
United Farmers of Ontario, 2824
Co-operative stores, 4068
Platform, 4661
Water powers
Electrical energy, export, 2828
National policy, development, 1270
Welland canal construction
Expenditure, qu. 3820
Request for, 3774

Church, Mr. Thomas L.—*Con.*
Woollen industry, legislation to assist, 2823, 2827, qu. 4184
Churches, capitalistic system and, 2725
Churchill, Fort. *See* Hudson Bay Railway
Cigars and Cigarettes. *See* Customs Tariff Items; Inland Revenue bill; Taxation; Tobacco
Civil Rights. *See* Bank Act Amdt. bill; Labour, right to organize; Woodsworth
Civil Service. *See also* Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power); Supply. For individual departments, *See their titles.* For references, generally, *see* speeches on Address; Budget
Act. *See* Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power)
Amalgamation of departments. *See* National Defence
Appointments, 208. *See also under this title,* Commission
After 1911 election, 2920
Grazing inspectors, 3253
Local committee and, 2816
Postal, 1800. *See also* Post Office
Postmasters. *See* Post Office
Promotions and, 330
Returned soldiers, 386, 1797, 1799
Services and, unnecessary, 2969
Soldiers' civil re-establishment, qu. 2297
Temporary employees made permanent, qu. 4814
Year 1922, 3324
Arthur Young Company, cost of, qu. 1137
Bonus, qu. 204, 1664, 1812, 3352
Employees unmarried or without dependents, qu. 1257
Dependents, non-resident, 1811
Dominion arsenal, Quebec, employees, 1751, 1752, 1772
Interim supply bill, 3705
Salaries and, qu. 2179
Vote, 1811
Calder Act, 2926, 3266. *See* also Public Service Retirement Act
Statement of, 3402
Civil service list, publication of, qu. 3134
Classification. *See* Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power)
Commission.
Abolition, proposed. *See* Civil Service Act M. (Mr. Power)
Advice by local committees, 2816
Agricultural produce marketing agent in Great Britain, 4675
"A joke; a farce," 3347
Alleged partisanship, 3347
Anderson, Mr., 1821

Civil Service—*Con.*
Commission—*Con.*
Annual report tabled, 3887
Appointments
British Columbia in, 372
Combines, staff, 2661
Delay in making, 1086, 3292
Fruit inspectors, 3150
Immigration Department
Black, Mr. W. J., 2664
Immigration agents, 1188, 2663
Bowder, Mr., 1199
Chinese immigration officials, 2308, 2482
Ingram, Mr., 2664
Lemont, Mr. Arthur, 1085-6
May, Mr., 2663
Indian affairs
Agents, 2151
Doctors, 2160
Live stock Act, inspectors, 3150
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, 3284, 3290, 3303. *See also* Marshall
Montreal post office, qu. 1361
Postmasters, 1798, 1800, 1801, 1823. *See also* Post Office.
Clementsport, N.S., 1795
Disregarded, 1821-22
Returned soldiers as, 1799
St. Peter's N.S., 1795
Soldier advisers, 3747
Temporary, 2663
Without regard to politics, 3345
Civil Service Act, withdrawal of positions from 561, 914
Commissioners, appointment of, 3348
Cost of, 370, 525, 530
In 1917-1922, qu. 1137
Employees, number of, 370, 3986
And cost, 2970
Temporary, 1385
Employment service, director of, 1676
Examination, 366, 2816, 3986
Exceptions, 1821
House of Commons staff, 2691
Jurisdiction
Positions exempted from, 561, 914
Removal of certain classes from, qu. 278. *See also* Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power)
Technical officers, removal of, 519
Lightkeepers, 3351
Political patronage, 3347
Postmasters, appointments and dismissals. *See* Post Office
Pugsley, Hon. William, appointment, 2502
Purchasing Commission, 4704
Report, 812
Roche, Hon. Dr., 354, 3348

Civil Service—*Con.*
Commission—*Con.*
Salaries and contingencies, 668, 3986
Staff, number of, See under this title Employes
Unconstitutionality of, 2816
Committee of the House. *See* Civil Service Act
Cost, 2756, 3076
Deputy ministers
Committee, report, 562
French-speaking, 1805
Powers of. *See* Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power)
Salaries, 4557, 4667
Dismissals, 856
Appointments and, after 1911 election, 2817, 2920, 3344, 3345, 3349
In 1922, 3324
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, Vancouver office, qu. 2297, 3085, qu. 3137, 3822
Dominion Lands and Parks branch, employees, 3252
Economy in. *See* speeches on Address; Budget
Employees, number of, 2970, 3264
And salaries, 1912 and 1922, 2712
Estimates, preparation of, 3242
Examinations, 366, 2816, 3986
Exemptions, 354, 367
Expenditure, 2785, 2915, 2987, 3027
Reduction in England, 1803
Grant, Dr., 354, 523, 541, 558, 560
Griffenhagen and Associates, 1826
Cost of, qu. 1137
Verrett, Mr. Hector, 1826
History of. *See* Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power)
Hours, 1427
Holidays and, 24
Inside service, employees, 911
Interim supply bill, 3705
"Lady who rides to work in automobile" 1772
List, publication of, qu. 3134
Merit system. *See* Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power)
Murray, Sir George, report, 3343
Offensive partisanship, dismissals for, 285, 3344
Political patronage, 2816, 3344. *See also* Civil Service Act
Positions excluded from Act, 1156
Post Office department
Griffenhagen and Associates, 1826
Postmasters, dismissals. *See* Post Office
Public Service retirement. *See that title*
Quebec and district employees, 387

Civil Service—*Con.*
Reform, 39-40, 409
Reorganization, 24. *See also* Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power)
Griffenhagen and Associates, 1826, 2817
Responsibility, 368
Retiring allowances, Printing Bureau, 3949
Returned soldiers, 1772
Appointments, 386, 1797, 1799
Dismissals, 1772
Salaries, 2805, 3070, 4672. *See also* Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power)
Bonus and, qu. 2179
Revision,, qu. 204, 1794
Statement by Prime Minister, 1811
Total expenditure, qu. 2086
Seasonal or temporary employment, *See* Civil Service Act Amdt. bill
Statistics, qu. 207
Superannuation, 4593. *See also* Public Service Retirement Act
Boville, Mr. T. C., qu. 3135
Calder Act, 2926, 3266
Cost of, 2785
Coulter, Dr. R. M., qu. 3135
Fiset, General Sir Eugene, qu. 3135
Legislation, inquiry, qu. 940, 3266
Statement of Prime Minister, 4593
Technical and professional officials, 367, 815
Temporary employees, made permanent, 1385
Underpaid, 4672
Whitley councils, 1654
Women, employment of, 1772
Work outside regular duties, 1675

Civil Service Act. *See also* Civil Service
Abolition of. *See under this title,* M. (Mr. Power)
Alleged violation of, 1794
M. (Mr. Power) for repeal, 345, 519
Amdt. (Mr. Hughes) for special committee, 534; agreed to on div. 571
Grant, Dr., 354, 523, 541, 558, 560
"Notwithstanding anything in Act" 3276
Special Committee of inquiry, 2970
Appointment of, 936, 986
Membership, change in, 2417
Order of reference, 1256
Pope, Sir Joseph, evidence before, 2970
Reports
First, 1136, 1256
Second, 4248
M. to concur, withdrawn, 4592-3
Privilege, Mr. Martell, 4363

Civil Service Act 1919 Amdt. Bill
(Seasonal or temporary employment)—Mr. German—1r., 666

Civil Service Superannuation and Retirement Act Amdt. Bill
(Repeal of clause permitting additions to term of service) 1r., 2896-7; 2r., com., 3146; 3r., 3147

Civilization, evolution of, 1856

Citizen's Liberty League, 715

Citizenship. *See* Immigration Act Amdt.; Naturalization

Clark, Mr. J. A. (Burrard)
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3093-3126, 3219
British Columbia
Bonded warehouses, qu. 1260, 2404
Licenses, qu. 1866, qu. 1971, 2404
Fishing licenses, M., 1540
Oriental immigration, 507, 1217, 2310
Burrard Inlet bridge, 4709
Business of the House
Private members' day, 1159
Privilege, equalization of rates, 1911
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2404-06
Canadian Air Force, Hudson Bay route, 1748, 1750
Canadian customs officer at New York, 1920, 3274
Chinese Immigration bill, 2310-19
Students, 2314
Creosoted lumber and timber
Duties, qu. 813
Use in British Columbia, qu. 1137
Vancouver Creosoting Company, limited, 3231
Duty on goods passing from one Canadian port to another, 1920, 3274
Equalization of railway rates. *See under* this title, Freight Rates
Firebrick, duty, 3896
Freight rates
Railway rates, equalization of, M. 1284, 1490, 1910, 1914, 1956
Original motion, effect of, 1953
Privilege, 1910
Westward from prairie provinces, 1159
Girrard Bridge Company, charter, 1008
Immigration
Oriental, 507, 1217, 2310-19
Policy, 1217
Liquor
Export, qu. 1260
Warehouse licenses, British Columbia, qu. 1260, qu. 1866, qu. 1971, 2404
Military hospitals, 669, 672
Medical staff, 675

Clark, Mr. J. A.—*Con.*
Military hospitals—*Con.*
Nursing hospitals, 686
New York, Canadian customs officer, 1920 3274
North Vancouver dry dock, 1002
Panama canal, competition, 1920
Pension Act, administration of, 682
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3867-3886
Amdt. death within five years, 3884; agreed to, 3885
Senate amendments, 4745
Pensions
District board of review, 4703
European war and active militia, 3730
Federal appeal board, 4703
Royal commission on, report, 675
Privilege, equalization of railway rates, 1910
Salmon-canning industry, licenses, 1540
Soldiers
Sheltered employment, 694
Unemployment, 695
Vetcraft shops, 695
Stanley park foreshore protection, 1008
United States army, mental tests, 1219
Vancouver harbour bill, 268
Vancouver income tax offices, qu. 912

Classification. *See* Civil Service

Clementsport postmaster, qu. 1363, 1795, 1831, 4534

Clifford, Mr. L. O. (South Ontario)
Campbell, Mr. Orin D., claim, 626

Climate
Emigration and, 2747, 2823
Winter conditions in Canadian Northwest, Nebraska and Iowa, 1423

Closure. *See* House of Commons

Clothing, duty on, 2981. *See also* Budget; Taxation; Textiles

Clyde, The, mechanics from, 1204

Coal. *See also* Freight Rates; Fuel; Mines and Minerals; Natural Resources; Railways
Alberta, 709, 1247, 1262, 1264, 1268, 1275-82, 3424, qu. 4437, 4692
Freight rates on, 1268, 1272, 1275, 1282, 3009, 3781
Suggested rate of $6 per ton, 1276
Heating appliances for, 4629
Shipment
Hudson bay railway, 1055
Ontario, to, 1163
All-British supply, 1268
Anthracite
Duty, 3493
Supply, 1262, 4692
Welsh, 84, 1263, 1267, 3199

Coal—*Con.*
Areas in Canada, 1344
Bituminous, 83
Duty, 1275, 1278
Edmonton Board of Trade, res, 1275
Briquetting, 789, 3206
Brule lake deposits, 4699
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 3807, 3814, 3826
Canadian National railways
Purchases, qu. 1363, 1561, 1564, qu. 4303
Alberta, qu. 4437
United States, qu. 4511
Chimney Corner, N.S., 941
Coke, 1265, 1267, 1268, 1273, 3199
Coke ovens, establishment, 788
Cost of. *See* Cost of Living; Price
Deposits, 2750
Duties and drawbacks, qu. 1994, 2654
Embargo, 1265, 1279, 4394
Export, 1275
United States, from, 1249, 1265, 1277
Freight rates, 795, 1268, 1278, 1280, 1964, 2828, 2875, 3199, 3621. *See also that title*
Mines and Minerals Committee, 4514
Hoppe-Isenberg leases, 2502, 3128, 3146, 3222
Cancellation, 3146
Fiat, issue of, 4442
Hoover, Mr. Herbert, Europe and coal supplies, 1263
Hudson bay region, 1073
Hudson's Hope, possibilities, 3198, 3202, 4699
Imports, qu. 516, 1266, 2828
And production, qu. 490
From United States, 1249, 1277
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1706
Interstate Commerce Commission, investigation, 1279
"Invisible" 1262
Lands, 1344. *See also* Dominion Lands Act
Leases, 3424. *See also* Dominion Lands Act; Petition of Right Act
Disbursements, repayments, 3129
Hoppe-Isenberg. *See under this title,* Hoppe and Isenberg
Lignite, 789
Bienfait briquetting plant, 789, 3206
Duty, 3493
Miners
Importation of from Belgium, 1177
Oriental, 1901
Strikes. *See* Labour, Strikes
Mines, 2785
Mining rights. *See* Dominion Lands Act
Public ownership, 2727, 3205
Mines and Minerals Committee report, 4743
National fuel policy, M. (Mr. Church) 1262
New Brunswick, 804

Coal—*Con.*
Northern Ontario, 1050
Nova Scotia, 83, 800
Freight rates, 3781
Miners' strike, 1627
Ontario, reported discovery, 2512
Peace river district, 1433
Price, 2824, 3198
Production
British Columbia, 1244
Canada, 2780
Provincial revenue from, 2802
Public ownership, 2785, 3205
Railways. *See also* Canadian National Railways
Purchase of in United States, 3493, qu. 4511
Rates on, 1272. *See also under this title,* Freight Rates
Red Deer Valley Coal Operators Association, 1275
Resources, 83, 1264
Scarcity, 254
Substitutes, 3199
Tariff, bituminous coal, 1275, 1278
Transportation, 789, 1264
United States embargo, 1265, 1279, 4394
Welsh anthracite, 84, 1263, 1267, 3199
Quality of, 1279

Coal Tar Derivatives, French Treaty, 1986

Coast Range Steel Company, 2508

Coastal Regulations. *See* Canada Shipping Act Amdt; Freight Rates, Shipping
Suspension of, 4219, 4222, 4231, 4235, 4276, 4290

Cobalt Products. *See* Treaties, French Treaty

Cobden, Richard, British Free Trade, 3050

Cobourg, Ont., breakwater, 981

Cochrane, the late Hon. Frank, Hudson Bay railway, 1033, 1046

Code Napoleon, 1558, 1526

Coke. *See* Coal

Cold Storage. *See also* Cold Storage Act Amdt. bill; Dairying Industry
Canadian-Australian boats, 1848
Co-operative, 2054
Dairying and, 2764, 2978
Eggs, producer and consumer, 1852
Incorporated companies, 2058
Mechanical, 2056
Montreal, qu. 1488, qu. 1633, qu. 2204, 3289

Cold Storage—*Con.*
Municipal, 2054
Plants, 104
Montreal, qu. 2204, 3289
Quebec Harbour Commission, 2055

Cold Storage Act Amdt. Bill
(Subsidy contracts with co-operative societies or associations and municipalities)
Res. 184; 1r., 191; 2r., 271-276; ref. to Com. on Agriculture 276; com., 2054; 3r., 2086, 2199

Collison, Mr. B. W., Rocky Mountains park, 1739

Colombia, Senate, constitution of, 1373

Colonial Status. *See* Imperial Conference; Treaties, Halibut Fishery

Colonization. *See* Agriculture; Building; Farm Homes; Immigration, Canada Colonization Association; Labour; Soldier Settlement

Colt Machine Guns. *See* National Defence

Combines, 145, 3072. *See also* Address; Budget; Canadian National Railways; Combines, Monopolies, Trusts and Mergers Bill; Freight Rates, Shipping; Grain and Grain Trade; Prices; Shipping and Shipbuilding; Transportation
Agriculture and, 2786, 2787
Attorney General vs. Wholesale Grocers, decision, 2521, 2527
Banana trust, 2979
Banking system, 4019, 4047, 4083
Big business, 2603
Big interests, 2559
Great Britain in, 2726
Political parties and, 2855
Binder twine, 4376
British North America Act, amendment, 2592
British Parliamentary Com. on trusts, 2544
British preference, 2989
Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, 2983
Canadian Press, Limited, 4727
Coal situation and, 254
Combines Investigation Act of 1910, 2605, 3073
Prosecutions, 2575
Control, 2725
Co-operative buying and, 3018
Cotton manufacturers, 2534, 3464
Dominion Textile Company, 2563
Duties, reduction of, 2608

Combines—*Con.*
Federal jurisdiction over. *See* speeches on Combines bill
Legislation, 39, 145. *See also* Combines bill
Lumber, 2593
Master Plumbers & Steamfitters' Association, decision, 2593
Milk, 2526, 2559, 2569, 2593
Modern business organization, 2524
Money, 648, 4026
Newspaper, 2555, 2580, 2587, 2591, 2630
North Atlantic and U. K. Conference Eastbound, 2127, qu. 2613
Price-fixing, 2606, 2786
Printing, 1623
Privy Council decisions, 2585
Prosecutions, qu. 1662
Restaurant trust, 2584
Sherman anti-trust law, 2602
Shipping, 1440, 2127, 2174, 2578, 2583, 2584, 2613, 2666, 2828, 2928, 2954, 2960, 3789, 3845, 3848, 4077, 4223, 4226, 4277. *See also* Agricultural Conditions, Special Committee; Freight rates, shipping
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, qu. 2613
Great Lakes, qu. 1362
Statement in Toronto Globe, qu. 1362
Standard Oil Company, 2601
Sugar, 2563, 2576, 2584, 2586, 3069
Tariff and, 2714
Transportation, 1395. *See also* Freight Rates
United Farmers of Ontario, 2584
United Shoe Machinery Company, 2557, 2560
Webb, Mr. Sydney, report, 2545, 2551
Wheat Board, 2547, 2616, 2857
Wheat pool, 2526
Wholesale grocers case, decision, 2051, 2521

Combines and Fair Prices Act, 2521
Appeal Court of Ontario, decisions, 2527
Privy Council decisions, 2527, 2590

Combines Investigation Act of 1910, 2605, 3073
Prosecutions, 2575
Repeal, 2521

Combines, Monopolies, Trusts and Mergers Bill, (Investigation of alleged combines) Res. 938, 987; 1r., 993; 2r., 2519-2609 on division, 2609; com., 2610, 2615, 2659, 3r., 2701; Senate amendments, 3505
Sections and subjects discussed:
Application for investigation, *See under this title* Investigation
Attorney General of Ontario vs. Wholesale Grocers, 2521, 2527

Combines, Monopolies, Trusts and Mergers Bill—*Con.*
Sections and subjects discussed—*Con.*
Big interests, 2584
Combination no crime, 2527
Combine, definition of, 2520, 2525, 2560, 2595, 2615, 2666
Commissioners, appointment of, 2522, 2626
Competition
Control of, 2526
Lessening of, 2526
Complaints, 2521
Contempt of registrar or commissioner, 2660
Criminal legislation, 2559
Counsel
Conduct of investigation by, 2632
Representation by, 2618
Division on M. for 2r., 2609
Documents, 2521
Enforcement of, 4229
Experts, employment of, 2631
Inquiry as to, 496
Inquisitorial, 2527, 2608
Investigation
Application for, 2616
Restricted to British subjects, 2617
To be made by six persons, 2617
Grand Jury system of, amdt. (Mr. Church) 2585
Powers of registrar, 2626
Private, 2522
Under Enquiries Act, 2522
No person excused, 2631
Parliament
Jurisdiction, 2521-2609
Right to investigate, 2666
Power to reduce tariff, 3049
Patents, revocation of, 2522
Prices, fixing of, 2520
Privy Council decision, 2559, 2590
Proceedings in private, 2632
Profits, regulation of, 2558, 2585
Publicity, 2522
Registrar, 2522, 2616
Appointments of 2628, 2660
Power to investigate, 2626
Shall cause inquiries, 2618
To report and minister to decide as to further inquiry, 2626
Regulations, 2665
Report, distribution of, 2632-4, 2659
Re-sale price, 2525
Staff, appointment of, 2660
Tariff, reduction of duties, 2522, 2528, 2561
Technicality not to invalidate proceedings, 2665

Combines, Monopolies, Trusts and Mergers Bill—*Con.*
Sections and subjects discussed—*Con.*
Trade unions not affected, 2666
Witnesses, evidence and production of papers, 2631

Commerce. *See* Board of Commerce; Trade and Commerce

Commercial Agents. *See* Trade

Commercial Intelligence Service. *See* Trade and Commerce

Commissioner of Agriculture. *See* Agriculture; Marshall

Commissions, government by. *See* Civil Service Commission; Government

Committee of Supply. *See* Supply

Committees. *See* House of Commons

Commodity Prices, 1083, 1851. *See also* speeches on Budget; Prices

Commonwealth Club of California, immigration, 1195

Community Clubs. *See* Immigration

Companies Act Amdt. Bills
1. Mining companies, permission to pay dividends out of capital—Mr. German—1r., 435
2. Private company; shares without nominal or par value; capital, etc.—Mr. Copp—1r., 3261; 2r., com., 4208; 3r., 4218; Senate amendments, 4736

Sections and subjects discussed:
Amount of capital required, 4210
Annual meeting, 4215
Annual returns, 4215
Borrowing powers, 4213
By-laws for increase or decrease of number, 4215
By-law to be sanctioned, 4214
Capital
Increase of, 4213
Reduction of, 4213
Change of name, 4211
Commission for securing subscriptions, 4212
Directors
Powers, 4212
Qualifications, 4215
Dividends payable out of wasting assets, 4214
Issue of shares without nominal or par value, 4208

Companies Act Amdt. Bills—*Con.*
Sections and subjects discussed—*Con.*
Meetings of creditors, 4216
Private company may become public company, 4212
Prospectus, requirements as to particulars, 4212
Repeal, 4212
Stock of other companies, purchases, 4212
Subscriptions in return, 4215
Summary to be filed, 4216
When company may be created a private company, 4208

Compensation for Cattle. *See* Animal Contagious Diseases; Live Stock

Competitive Examinations. *See* Civil Service

Conciliation and Labour Act. *See* Labour

Concurrence. *See* Interim Supply; Supply

Condensed Milk. *See* Dairying Industry

Confectionery and Beverages Tax. *See* Budget; Special War Revenue; Taxtion

Confederation. *See also* Maritime Provinces
Charlottetown conference, 1368
Debate, 1367
Intercolonial railway, 1756
Nova Scotia, attitude towards, 1376
Quebec conference, 1368
Senate, nominative or elective, 1366

Conferences, 3411. *See also* Imperial
Disarmament, 2911, 4000
International Labour. *See* Labour

Confidence, Lack of. *See* Lack of Confidence Vote, M. (Mr. Irvine)

Congdon, Mr. Fred T.
Appointment as commissioner, 2710, qu. 3131. *See also* Canadian National railways, Grand Trunk, Gratuities
Correspondence with Justice dept., 2299

Conley, Mr. James, dismissal, qu. 4183

Connaught Park Jockey Club. *See* Race Track Betting

Connaught Place Monument. *See* Monuments and Memorials, Ottawa

Conscription, 2816
"Infamous and anti-Canadian," 3038
Laurier, Sir Wilfrid, and, 3015
Men and wealth, of, 2729

Conseil National des Métiers, qu. 3141

Conservative Party. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget; Political Parties
Administration, 1911-1921, 3038
Agricultural implements duty, 2974
Alleged understanding on Mr. Shaw's amendment to Address, 987
History of party. *See* Proportional Representation
National policy, 3067
"No truck or trade with the Yankees," 3080
Pledges, violation of, 2974
Tariff policy, 3063
Tariff resolution of 1922, 2220

Constituencies, Redistribution of. *See* Redistribution Bill

Constitution, right of Canada to make her own, 1378

Constitutional Development. *See* Address; Budget; Imperial Conference; Lack of Confidence Vote; Treaties; Halibut

Consular Agents. *See* Trade

Consumer. *See also* Address; Budget; Combines; Cost of Living; Prices; Purchasing Power; Taxation
French Treaty and, 3049
Italian treaty and, 3049
Oleomargarine, 3534
Prices. *See also that title*
Meat, 2877
Producer and consumer, 2829, 2972, 3029
Purchasing power, 2812
Raisins and dried currants, duty, 3474
Relief of, 2718
Renovated butter, 4251
Sales tax increases passed on to, 2859, 2804, 2998
Sugar duty, 2987
Tariff and, 2854, 3054
Taxation, 2789, 2801, 4415
Wheat board, 2857

Consumption Tax. *See* Taxation

Contagious Diseases. *See* Animal Contagious Diseases; Health; Live Stock, Health of Animals

Containers, Fruit. *See* Sale and Inspection

Contrecœur wharf, 950-1008

Conventions, Trade. *See* Trade; Treaties, French Treaty, Italian Treaty

Conversion Loan. *See* Loans

Cooke, Mr. Leonard, qu. 2179

Co-operation
Agricultural products, distribution, 1852, 2869
Co-operative buying and selling, 1253. *See also* Markets; Prices
Co-operative association and societies, 3073. *See also* Cold Storage Act Amdt bill
Cold storage, 2054
Failure of, 1419
Co-operative credit associations, 4038
Industrial and financial organizations, 2589
Industrial relations, 2895
Town and country, between, 2972

Co-ordination. *See* National Defence

Coote, Mr. G. G. (Macleod)
Agricultural and manufactured products, prices, 1851
Agricultural conditions, 1407
Agricultural implements, prices, 1407
Alberta
Oil bounty, 2510
Oil-drilling and prospecting, 781
Assignments in bankruptcy, qu. 937, 1412
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4072, 4077-4146, 4140
Interest
Circulation redemption fund on, amdt. 4093, neg. 4093
Maximum rate, amdt. 4125, neg. 4131; 4149, neg. 4149
Issuing of notes, 4092
Shareholders' audit, auditors to report to Minister, amdt. 4090, neg. 4091
Banking and Commerce Committee, proceedings, 4145
Banks and Banking
Cost of living, 1409
Returns, 3264
British preference, cotton goods, 3463
Business of the House, bill not printed, 3974
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, grain shipments, qu. 3263
Canadian National parks, leasing, 3442
Canadian National Railways
Directors, address and occupation, qu. 1973
Hotels, 938
Carvell, Hon. F. B.
Removal of, 3189
Statements of, 1869
Combines, shipping, 2613
Copper bounty bill, 3236, 3240
Cost of living increase, 1408
Crude petroleum bounties 781
Dairying industry, 1851
Dominion Textiles Company, securities and dividends, 3463
Dry Dock Subsidies bill, 3979

Coote, Mr. G. G.—*Con.*
Eggs, price of, 1851
Emigration to the United States, 1412
Experimental farms, 479
Farmers, purchasing power, 1408
Freight rates, increase, 3190
Geological survey, 2508
Grain and grain trade
Government elevator system, 3264
Grain Act, administration
Dockage, 782, qu. 3141
Grain Commissioners, board of
Employees, etc., qu. 2207
Names, etc., qu. 2206
Grain Elevator Commission, qu. 1867
Montreal shipments, qu. 1973, qu. 1974
Shipping rates, M., 2517, 2613
Shortages, complaint by British importers, 1764
Warehousing, qu. 3141
Hansard, subscription rate, 1715
Harbours and rivers, 948
Hemp bounty, 3913
Highwood river, power, 3427
Hoppe-Isenberg leases, 2502
Immigration
Advertising, 1114
Policy, 1407
Immigration Act Amdt. bill 3981
Inflation, inequalities of, 1447
Iron ore, Alberta, 2512
Macarow, Mr. D. C., application to subpoena, 4145
National Gallery, M. to reduce vote, 1018
Ottawa-Hull bridge, 1016
Penman's Limited, securities and dividends, 3463
Printing, Interior department, 3443
Privilege—correction of press report, 2519
Public Works, expenditures by provinces, qu. 3887
Pugsley, Hon. William, appointment, 2494, 2500
Railway Commission, qu. 1973
Carvell, Hon. F. B., 3189
Motherwell, Hon. Mr., statement of, 3188
Statements of, 1869
Robb, Hon. Mr., visit to Australia, 1850
Rugs, purchase of, qu. 1486
Rural depopulation, 1855
Seed grain advances, 3445
Settlers' relief, 3447
Soldier Settlement, 2030
Amounts due Dominion govt., qu. 814
Turkeys, dressed, importation, qu. 1139
Vancouver elevator, qu. 1487
Vancouver harbour bill, 265
War claims, 2498

Coote, Mr. G. G.—*Con.*
Water powers, 3427, 3442
Woollen industry, condition of, 3463

Copp, Hon. A. B. (Secretary of State)
Canada Temperance Act, administration, 2495
Canadian Press Limited bill, 1464
Civil Service
Commission
Annual report, 3887
Salaries and contingencies, 3986
Employees, return showing, 911
Civil Service Act Special Com., report, 4248
Companies Act Amdt. bill, 3261, 4208, 4217, 4736
Dorchester penitentiary, 770
Hazen, Sir Douglas, appointment under Inquiries Act, 2498
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 1384, 2107, 2113, 2182, 2199, 2437-54, 3983
Discretion to Secretary of State, 2447
Judges, 2441, 2446
Justice department, opinion of, 2441
Naturalization Act, M. (Mr. Carroll) 1381
Ottawa-Hull bridge, 1017
Public Archives, 3985
Pugsley, Hon. William, appointment, 2498
Returns, inquiries for, 3324
Secretary of State department
Estimates, 2392, 2494, 3985
War claims, adjustment, 2495
Amdt. (Mr. Stevens) 2503
Investigation, statement of categories, 2500

Copper. *See* Mines and Minerals

Copper Bars or Rods, bounty on, 2703, 2709, 2778, 4369. *See also* Bounties

Copyright. *See also* Trade Marks and Designs
United States, 2289

Copyright Act. *See also* Magazines and Periodicals, M. (Mr. Hocken)
M. (Mr. Rinfret) 495

Copyright Act Amendment Bill
(Compliance with British and international copyright acts.) 1r., 487; 2r., com., 2139; com., 2287; 3r., 2436; Senate amendments, 3154
Sections and subjects discussed:
Amdt. (Mr. Robb) licenses and importation of books, 2291, agreed to on div. 2292
Ref. to, 2344
Authors, memorandum on behalf of, 3155
Berne Convention, 2139, 2288, 2343, 3155
Civil servant, alleged communication to Le Droit D'Auteur, 2140

Copyright Act Amendment Bill—*Con.*
Sections and subjects discussed—*Con.*
Commencement of act, 2145, 2287
Great Britain and, 2140
Le Droit d'Auteur, 2140, 2343
Legislation, history of, 2343
Licenses, importation, 2139, 2287, 2291, 2344
Piracy, 2287
Song writers, 2287

Cordage and Rope
Bounty, 4369. *See also* Hemp
Production in Canada, 2780

Corless, Dr., Hudson bay district, 1040

Corn Laws. *See* Great Britain

Cornwall Canal employees, qu. 3135

Corporations, profits, 1209. *See also* Combines; Immigration

Corsets, duty, 3048

Cory, Mr. W. W. *See* Interior

Cosmos Chemical Company, Port Hope, 2217

Cossar, Dr. George C., immigration, 1471

Cost of Living, 1394, 1812, 2704, 2736, 2835. *See also* Address; Budget; Civil Service Bonus; Combines; Consumer; Immigration; Labour, Unemployment; Prices; Taxation
Banks and, 1409
Budget and, 1410, 1812
Canada and Great Britain, 3468, 3472
Canada and United States, comparison, 3073
Canada, one of most expensive countries, 2715
Charts, 1700
Clerical classes, 3534
Coal, cost of, 1345, 1813. *See also* Coal
Combines and, 2599. *See also* Combines
Consumer and, 2585
Curve, formerly descending now ascending, 3000
Customs and excise duties, 2839
Decrease of, 1700, 1907
Dominion Textile Company, profits, 3465
Dumping clause and, 2535
Emigration and, 2790. *See also* Emigration
"Free breakfast table" 2824
Freight rates and, 1958
Government investigation, inquiry, qu. 3703
Increase of, 1853
Labour Gazette figures, 1812
Liberal platform, 1410
Living within income, 2959

Cost of Living—*Con.*
Members of Parliament. *See* Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill
Michell, Prof., figures, 1700, 1812
Necessity for lower, 1412, 1437
Oleomargarine, 3508-3580
Prices, 1912 and 1922, 1407
Producer and consumer, 2713, 2972
Spread between, 2787
Production, cost of, 2815
Raisins and dried currants, duty, 3474
R. G. Dun & Company, figures, 1812
Special Committee on, 2569
Standard of living, 2959
Statistics, 1684
Tariff and, 2737, 2839, 3048
Reductions offset by sales tax, 3033
Taxation, 2839. *See also that title*
Sales tax, 1813, 2839, 2997
Unorganized workers, 3534
Wages, 2890, 2982. *See also* Labour
Workingman, 2982

Cotton. *See* Textiles; Treaties, French

Coughlan Shipbuilding Company, Vancouver dry dock, 1002

Coulter, Dr. R. M. *See* Post Office

Courtenay Bay. *See* St. John

Craig, Mr. Charles P., qu. 204

Cranfield, Mr. W. T., publicity agent in London, 2927, 2983, 4707

Crawford, Mr., letter to Minister of Immigration, 1396

Crean, Mr. Frank J. B., resources of northern Saskatchewan, 1060

Creditors. *See* Bankruptcy Act

Credits. *See also* Bank Act Amdt. bill; Banks and Banking; Finance; Housing; Loans; Money
Agricultural. *See under this title,* Rural Credit and industry, 626, 645, 650
Douglas credit scheme, 631
Economic problem and, 647
Farm. *See under this title,* Rural
Function and relation to industrial problems
M. (Mr. Irvine) for special com., 626
Amdt. (Mr. Fielding) to refer to Banking and Commerce Com. 645, agreed to, 651
Amdt. (Mr. Spencer) ruled out of order, 643
Improved system, 1252
Monopoly, 648, 4018, 4045
New York loan, April 1922, 2963
Prices and, 4226

Credits—*Con.*
Rural, 639, 640, 1088, 1438, 1907, 2751, 2836, 2869, 2929, 3024, 3060, 3066, 4014, 4016, 4035, 4039, 4041, 4045, 4046, 4066, 4071, 4130, 4144, 4146, 4298
Interest rates, 2962
United States, 642, 2829, 2930
United States system, 4043
Withheld, 3074

Creelman, Dr. George. *See* Immigration, Canada Colonization Association
Imports of farm produce, 1426

Creosoting Industry, 1245, 3234
Creosoted piling, use in British Columbia, qu. 1137
Lumber and timber, customs duty, qu. 813
Vancouver Creosoting Company, 3231

Crerar, Hon. Thomas A. (Marquette)
Banking and Commerce Com., retirement from, 2639
Civil Service statistics, qu. 207
Resignation as leader of Progressive party, 11, 35

Crime. *See* Criminal Code; Justice, Penitentiaries

Criminal Code. *See also* Criminal Code Amdts.
Attorney General vs. Wholesale Grocers, 2051
Board of Commerce and, 2521
Combines, 2521, 2527, 2592. *See also* Combines
Enforcement of, 4229
Guessing competitions, qu. 733
Labour, right to organize, 2890
Race-track betting, 709

Criminal Code Amdt. Bills
1. Capital punishment abolition of (Mr. Irvine) 1r., 180; 1r., second time by error in order paper, 487; explanation of error, 519; opportunity for consideration, inquiry, 1810
2. Scrip frauds. (Mr. Kennedy, Edmonton) 1r., 730
3. Registration of declaration of ownership by proprietors of newspapers (Mr. Jacobs) 1r., 615
4. Opium joints; betting information; age of consent; carnal knowledge; illegal use of badge; appeals (Sir Lomer Gouin) 1r., 1483; 2r., com., 2281; 3r., 2284; Senate amendments, 4733
5. Criminal conspiracy and sedition (Mr. Woodsworth) 1r., 616

Criminal Code Amdt. Bills—*Con.*
6. Publication of evidence in marriage or divorce proceedings. (Sir Lomer Gouin) 1r., 1971; 2r., com., 2053; 3r., 2054

Criminal Matters, procedure, qu. 1974

Crops. *See* Agriculture; Grain and Grain Trade

Cross Benches. *See* McMaster

Cross Point, Que., wharf, 955

Crown Lands. *See* Lands

Crowsnest Pass Agreement, 1563, 1620. *See also* Address; Budget; Canadian National Railways; Canadian Pacific Railway; Freight Rates; Progressive Party
Appropriation of Liberal policy, 2781
Extension, 2741

Crude Oil. *See* Oil; Petroleum

Crude Petroleum. *See* Petroleum

Cuba, trade with, 308. *See also* Steamship Services; West Indies

Cummings Cove, wharf, 945

Cunard Line
Immigration, 1193
Ocean freight rates, 2127

Curie, Monsieur and Madame, discovery of radium, 1287

Currants. *See* Customs Tariff Items

Currency. *See also* Banks and Banking; Finance; Money
Depreciated, 2988, 4027. *See* Money; Purchasing Power
Inflation. *See* Germany, Reparations

Currie, General Sir Arthur, directorships, 4025

Curzon, Lord, of Kedleston, signature of Italian treaty, 2403

Custodians. *See* Bankruptcy Act

Customs and Excise. *See also* Budget; Customs Tariff; Imports and Exports; Special War Revenue Act; Taxation; Trade; Treaties
Average tariff rate 2838
Averages and valuation 90
Bonded warehouses, qu. 1260. *See also* Liquor
British preference. *See that title*

Customs and Excise—*Con.*
Canadian customs officer at New York. *See under this title,* New York
Collections
Cost of, qu. 814
For 1922, 22
Per capita, Canada and United States, 2738
Customs duties. *See also* Customs Tariff
Agricultural and animal products, qu. 1992
Agricultural implements, 2739, 2740, 2743, 2756, 2815, 2848, 2974, 2990, 3033
Automobiles, 2908, 3075
Collections, 1921-22 and 1922-23, 2838
Creosoted lumber and piling, qu. 813
Goods shipped from one Canadian port to another, 2519, 2615, 3272
Goods shipped from Vancouver to Halifax via Panama canal, 2615
Hemp seed, 3474
Lowering, 2221
Nursery stock, 4432
Reduction. *See* British preference; Budget; Treaties, French treaty
Tomato plants, 4432
Wool, 2866
Department
Beckett, Matt C., qu. 283, 816
Blake, Mr. Charles, Brandon, 4513
Deputy minister, salary increase, 4669
Employees, 3282
Estimates, 3272
Halton county officials, 914
Legal work, transfer of, 856
Medicine Hat employees, qu. 3505
Officials, salaries, etc., qu. 3892
Salaries and contingencies, 3272
Depreciated currency clause, 2988
Drawbacks, qu. 1484
Antiseptic surgical dressing, 2655
Artificial silk tops and yarns, 3489, 3896
Barilla or soda ash, 2655, 3502
Copper in blocks or ingots, 2655
Glass tubing, 2655, 3502
Hat sweats, 2655, 3502
Machinery and parts, 2655
Oil, 2655
Oleomargarine, materials for, 3503
Raw materials, qu. 1864
Imported, manufactured, exported, qu. 1259
Steel, coal and woollen goods, qu. 1994
Sugar, 2655
Dumping clause, 2646, 3072, 2988
Sugar, 3046
Excise. *See also* Special War Revenue Act; Taxation
Beer, qu. 518

Customs and Excise—*Con.*
Excise—*Con.*
Beet sugar, 2644, 2706, 2742, 2989, 3229, 4393. *See also* Sugar
Beverages. *See under this title,* Confectionery and beverages
Cigarettes, 2706, 2825, 2850, 2913, 2929, 2979, 2988, 3229, 4392
Cigars and, consumption, qu. 516
516
Smuggling, 3230
Confectionery and beverage tax, revenue, qu. 624, 2644, 2656, 2707, 2979, 3046
Duties, 3026
Payment by consumer, 2839
Irritating taxes, 2858
Payment with postage stamps, 1815, 1820, 2979 3927, 3937, 4435
Revenue, loss of, 1983
Taxation, 3010
Tobacco, duty collected, qu. 1259
Wines, 452, qu. 518, 1977, 2656, 2742, 3036, 3937, 4425
Canadian, 2643, 2710
Hawkesbury, revenue and salaries, qu. 2205
Inspectors, immigration, 1874
Marking Act, 931, qu. 616, 2988
Montreal
Customs house, and revenue 3280
Newsprint, 3046. *See also* Pulp and Paper
New York, Canadian officer at, 1213, 1920, 2419, qu. 2611, 3272
Transfer of goods at, 3272
Printing presses, duty, 2858
Pulpwood, export tax on, 2828. *See also* Export Act
Raw materials, free, 2858
Seizures, qu. 620
Schooner Carrie L. Hirtle, qu. 3323
Toronto
Customs house, 3277, 4621
Revenue, 3277
Valuation for duty, 90, 145. *See also under this title,* Customs duties
Customs Tariff. *See* Customs Tariff Act Amdt. bill; Customs Tariff Items; Tariff

Customs Tariff Act 1907 Amdt. Bill
Res. 2650, 3963; 1r., 3963; 2r., com., 4408; 3r., 4409
Sections and subjects discussed:
British preference, discount of 10 per cent, 2650
Drawbacks, 2655
Reciprocity negotiations with United States, 2650
Resolutions, 2650, 2963
Tariff changes, 2654

Customs Tariff Act 1907 Amdt. Bill—*Con.*
Sections and subjects discussed—*Con.*
United States, duties against, reduction by order in council, 2650

Customs Tariff Items, 3454, 3895
Antiseptic surgical dressings, 2655
Artificial silk, 2645, 2820, 2853, 2931, 2958, 2964, 2990, 3017, 3035, 3069, 3075
Artificial fibre silk fabrics and, 2654, 3492
Manufactures, 2654
Tops and waste or artificial silk fibre tops and waste, 3489
Yarns, 2654, 3035, 3489
Barilla or soda ash, drawback, 2655, 3502
Beverages, 2979. *See also this title under* Customs and Excise
Bisulphate of soda or nitre cake, 2480, 2653, 3895
Boots and shoes, 2999, 3033
Boots, orthopaedic, 2654, 2750
Brass and copper scrap, 2653, 3483
Brass, iron or steel runners, rings, caps, etc. for umbrellas, 3501
Carborundum wheels and stones, 2654, 3500
Casual donations, 2645, 2654
Cigarettes, 2644, 2652, 2706, 2825, 2913, 2929, 2979, 2988
Coal, 2654
Anthracite and lignite, 3493
Composition and plated metal for jewelry and dental supplies, 2653, 3483
Cotton for manufacturers of pneumatic tires, 2654, 3487
Crude petroleum, 2644, 2653, 3035, 3481
Cyanamid or lime nitrogen, 2654
Date when changes become effective, 3504
Dehydrated sulphate of copper, 2653, 3480
Drawbacks, 3501. *See also this title* under Customs and Excise
Artificial silk tops and waste, 3896
Artificials silk yarn, filaments, etc, 3502
Barilla or soda ash, 2655, 3502
Copper for manufacture of wire, 3503
Copper in blocks, ingots, pigs or bars, 2655
Glass tubing, 2655, 3502
Hat sweats, 2655, 3502
Items enumerated in item 236, 3502
Machinery not made in Canada, 3503
Materials used in manufacture of goods enumerated in item 448c, 3503
Oil for manufacture of manila rope, 2655, 3502
Sugar, 2655, 3502
Dumping clause, 2535
Dry red lead, orange mineral, zinc white and white oxide of antimony, 2653, 3034, 3481
Emery and carborundum wheels and stones, 2654, 3500
Firebrick, 2653, 3035, 3481, 3896
Glass tubing, 2655, 3502
Hat sweats, hatters' tips and sides, 2654, 3500
Hemp seed, 2645, 2651, 3017
Iron or steel scrap, 2645, 2653, 3034, 3484
Linen yarn, 3897
Liquorice in rolls and sticks, 2653, 3480
Liquorice paste, 2653, 3017, 3480
Machinery for conversion of fish waste, 2645, 2734, 2946, 3486
Machinery not made in Canada, 2645, 2653, 2655, 3503
Malt flour, 2645, 2652, 3480
Manufactures of artificial silk or artificial fibre silk, 3492
Milk bottles, 3033
Oil used in manufacture of manila rope, 2655, 3502, 3901
Paper caps for milk bottles, 3033
Petroleum, 2644, 2653, 3035, 3481. *See also* Bounties; Petroleum
Porcelain for pumps, 3033
Potatoes, 2651, 2707, 2959, 3017, 3035, 3075, 3474
Printing and photographic presses and type-making accessories, 3486
Printing machinery, 2645, 2653, 2858
Prunes and dried plums, 2651, 3474
Raisins and dried currants, 2644, 2651, qu. 2699, 2718, 2964, 2989, 3017, 3034, 3068, 3474, 3479
Proclamation by Governor in Council, 3474, 3479
Reciprocity with United States, 2649. *See also that title*
Resolutions, 2650, 2963
Rolled iron and steel and cast steel for milling cutters, 2653, 3484
Rolled iron or steel hoops, bands, etc., 3484
Scrap iron, 3034
Silk cloth, woven in the gum, 3489
Silks, 2645, 3046. *See also under this title,* Artificial silk
Spectacle and eyeglass frames, 2653, 3483
Staves of wood, 2654, 3487
Sticks or canes, 2654, 3501
Stumping machines, 2653, 2749, 2955, 3486
Sugar, 2645, 2651, 2744, 2820, 2825, 2968, 2987, 3017, 3034, 3039, 3046, 3069, 3082, 3479
Dumping duty, 2646
Sulphate of copper, 3895
Typewriters and parts, 2653, 3485
Usual coverings containing goods not machinery, 3501

Customs Tariff Items—*Con.*
Value for home consumption, 2535
Velvets, velveteens, silk velvets, plush and silk fabrics, 3488
Well-drilling machinery, 2645, 2653, 3487

Czecho-Slovakia
Senate, constitution of, 1371
Treaty with France, 2219

Dairy Cattle. *See* Live Stock, Accredited herds, Health of Animals

Dairy Industry Act 1914 Amdt. Bills
1. Butter substitutes and re-manufacture of butter. Res. 2518, 3150; 1r., 3154; M. (Mr. Motherwell) that order be discharged, 3329, 3449, agreed to, 3451; notice of M. (Mr. Carroll) for 2r., 3399, 3402
Sections and subjects discussed:
Drafting, 3325
Oleomargarine, 3325
M. anticipating, 3326
Parliamentary counsel, 3325, 3449
2. Butter standard; renovated butter; milk or cream containing fat or oil other than that of milk. Res. 3961, 4251, 1r., 4344; 2r., com., 3r., 4510
Sections and subjects discussed:
Definition, 4510
Establishment of guilt for violation of act, 4510
Minimum standard of fat in butter, 4510

Dairying Industry, 609, 1851. *See also* Address; Budget; Dairy Industry Act; Live Stock; Oleomargarine
Alberta, 1839
Antipodean competition, 2765
Bacteriology, 462
Butter
Adulteration, 3150
British market, in, 2863
China shipments to, 1840, 1853
Compounds, 3152
Disease germs, 3295
Exports to France, 2217, 2273. *See also* Treaties, French Treaty
Freight rates 1961
Fresh, shipment from Enrope, 2273
Grading, 2765, 2864, 3151, 3283, 3297
Imitations of, 3152
Imports 2821, 2959
"Manna" 3152
Oleomargarine and, 386, 3508-81. *See also* Oleomargarine
Pasteurization, 3298
Price, 2821, 3513, 3533
Production, total 1921-1922, 2774

Dairying Industry—*Con.*
Butter—*Con.*
Quality 2863
Poor, 3516
Renovated, 3151. *See also* Dairy Industry Act Amdt. bill
Restrictions, 3153
Salt, too much, 2863, 3297
Standard of fat. *See* Dairy Industry Act
Substitutes, 3150
Weight, 3151
Certified milk. *See under this title,* Milk
Cheese
Acidity and bacteria, 3297
Bacteriology 462
China, shipment to, 1853
Cold storage, 2055
Disease germs, 3295
Grading, 2765, 3283, 3295
Imports, 2959
Prices, 3295
Production, total 1921-1922, 2774
Cold storage, 2978. *See also that title*
Co-operative, 2764
Cow-testing, 3284, 3297
Cream
Fermented, 3151
Pasteurizing, 3283
Dairy branch estimates, 609, 3283
Dairy cattle testing, 1307. *See also* Live Stock, Accredited herds
Dairy produce graders, appointment, 3289
Dairy products and disease germs, 3299
Finch, combined cheese and butter factory, 3284, 3297
French treaty and, 1984
Holstein cow at Agassiz farm, 457, 2769
Leitch, Prof., evidence before Agricultural Conditions Com., 1843
Losses on cheese and butter, 2934
Markets, 2863
Milk
Certified, 3300
Fat or oil content. *See* Dairy Industry Act Amdt. bill
Filled milk, 3152
Fraser Valley Association, 4265
Pasteurizing, 3283
Price of, 2559
Products, imports, qu. 617
Sale of in Toronto, 2731
Supply, monopolies and combines. *See* Combines bill
Modern methods, 2765
Montreal cold storage plant, 3289. *See also* Cold Storage
National Dairy Council of Canada, oleomargarine, 3269

Dairying Industry—*Con.*
Production, total 1921-1922, 2774
Products, grading, 2864
Representative in Great Britain, 3297
Research laboratory, 3297
Ruddick and Wilson, Messrs., trip to New Zealand, 3283, 3288
Supplies, comparison of prices, 2740
Testing system, extension of, 3284
Unprofitable herds, 2863
Value of, 2863
Vancouver Island Milk Producers' Association, 4266
Whey, disease germs, 3299

Daly Building. *See* Public Buildings, Ottawa

Damage to Mortgaged Premises. *See* Canadian National Railways Bills

d'Anjou, Mr. Emmanuel (Rimouski)
Canada's participation in war, 1536
Canadian National railways,, doctors, 814
Grand Trunk arbitration, 1307
Legal expenses, qu. 730
Newspapers and printing companies, 2298

Dartmouth, N.S. pier and dredging, 4568

Davidson Commission. *See* War

Davies, Mr. C. C. (North Battleford)
Canadian National railways branch lines, 4195, 4323
Hudson Bay railway, M. (Mr. Knox) 1051
Oliver-St. Paul branch line railway, 4323
Western provinces, treatment of, 4195
Wheat prices, 1886

Davies, Right Hon. Sir Louis, K.C.M.G., deputy Governor General, 1809

Dawson, Mr. F. G., Prince Rupert. *See* Canadian National Railways, Directors

Daylight Saving
Farmers and, 1427
Montreal post office, qu. 3143
Ottawa, qu. 2612
Parliament, departments and, qu. 2612

Deadman's Island, qu. 1362

Death Rate, 1197

Debates, Official. *See* House of Commons

Debt. *See also* Public Debt; Taxation
Capital levy, 2743
Domestic, 1343
Farmers and, 2768
Federal, provincial and municipal, per capita, 2720, 2721

Debt—*Con.*
Held in foreign countries, 1406
Immigration and. *See* Immigration
Outside of Canada, estimated, 2720
Pyramiding of, 2728
Readjustment of, 2981

Debtor. *See* Bankruptcy Act

Deceased Husband's Brother, Marriage with, Bill—Mr. McMaster, 1r., 1256; 2r., 1836; com., 3r., 1837

Deceased Members, tributes to memory. *See* House of Commons

Dechene, Mr. A. M. (Montmagny)
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3538

Decorations. *See* Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner)

Deep Waterways. *See* St. Lawrence

Defeat of Government Motion. *See* Lack of Confidence, M. (Mr. Irvine)

Defence. *See* National Defence

Deficits. *See* speeches on Budget; Canadian Government Merchant Marine; Canadian National Railways

Deflation. *See* Credit; Finance; Money; Prices; Purchasing Power

Delay in British Mails. *See* Post Office

Delisle, Mr. M. S. (Portneuf)
Grondines wharf, 968
Valcartier camp ground, qu. 2298

Demers, Mr. Amedee, mail contractor, qu. 1868

Democracy, Senate and. *See* Senate, M. (Mr. Denis, Joliette)

Denis, Mr. J. Arthur (St. Denis)
Budget, 3038; sectional and local interests; tribute to Finance Minister, "the man of the hour"; Liberal and Conservative administrations; Conscription Act; extravagance in the name of freedom and civilization; change of government; improvement in financial situation; railway and shipping deficits; balanced budget; taxation, relief from; sales tax; income tax; exemption for children; taxation of dividends; unity of property; confidence in government; amendment, 3038

Denis, Mr. J. Arthur—*Con.*
Immigration
Labour and, 1196
Policy, 1196
Montreal post office,
Inquiry branch, qu. 2516
Promotion examinations, qu. 2298
Morinville postmistress, qu. 1028
Waste paper, disposal, qu. 1028

Denis, Mr. Jean J. (Joliette)
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3091
M. (Mr. Casgrain) 1519
Private members' days, 1158
Senate, M. for elective, 1364

Denmark
Bacon competition, 2864, 2865
Butter competition, 2863
Dairying industry, 3296, 3515
Hog grading, 591
Immigration from, 1096
Land settlement policy, 1406
Oleomargarine, 3515, 3559
Senate, constitution of, 1371

Dennis, Mr. J. S. *See* Immigration, Canada Colonization Association

Dentists, narcotic drugs for. *See* Narcotic Drugs Act

Department of Soldiers Civil Re-establishment Act. *See* Soldiers Civil Re-establishment

Dependency. *See* Pensions, Widowed mothers

Deportation. *See* Chinese Immigration bill; Immigration Act Amdt. bill; Narcotic Drugs

Depression, causes of, 2747. *See* Speeches on Address; Budget; Immigration

Deputy Local Judges. *See* Admiralty Act

Deputy Ministers
Appointment of, 1805
Conference and report, 562
French-speaking, 1805
Responsibility of. *See* Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power)
Retirement and superannuation, 891, 1822-5, qu. 3135, 3342
Salaries, increase, 4557, 4667

Deputy Registrars. *See* Admiralty Act Amdt.

Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees (Mr. George N. Gordon)
Rulings and statements. *See also* Marcil; Speaker

Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees—*Con.*
Rulings and statements—*Con.*
Amendments
Form of, 65-66
Varying nature of grant, 4371
Bills
Amendments
Involving charge upon revenue, 3870, 3888
Proposed in committee, 4371
General argument not permissible on particular clause, 4063, 4073, 4244
Not printed, proceeding, 3968, 3974, 3976
Reading clauses, marginal notes sufficient, 3974
Relevancy, 3238, 3863, 4371
Chair
Criticism of, 2412, 4720
To be addressed, 897
Committee
Anticipation of clause, 4071
Items declared carried, 4704
Relevancy
General discussion permissible, 2414
Newspapers, reading from, 2412
Speeches in, 2137, 2309, 2342, 2414, 2481, 2482, 2624, 2664, 3239, 4025, 4051, 4054, 4058, 4063, 4074, 4191, 4374, 4534
Special, action not reviewable by Committee of Whole 4074
Conversation 4528, 4572, 4581
Debate
Interruptions, 4064
Mover closes, 657, 2602, 4361, 4363
Reference to matter sub judice, 3371
Relevancy, 1407, 1420, 2137, 4025
Debates, Official Report, 1638
Insertion of documents not read, 3174, 3789
Undiscussed item in supply, omission, 1638, 3285, 3292
Estimates, consideration en bloc, 4559, 4614, 4616
Interruptions, cannot prevent if member speaking does not object, 4192
Language, 4238, 4244
Letter reflecting on proceedings of House, 4030
Matters sub-judice, 3371
Member
May ask question but not make speech, 2774
Must confine remarks to section under discussion, 4244
Reflection on 4239
Speaking, not compelled to answer question, 1125, 4064

Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees—*Con.*
Rulings and statements—*Con.*
Member—*Con.*
Speaking not to be interrupted, 1420
Motions
Amendments, 245
Involving charge upon revenue, 3870, 4720
Discussion allowed pending decision, 316
To be in writing, 866
To increase taxation 3935, 3936, 3937
Orders of the day
Explanation in detail not in order, 2255
Reading letters 2254
Questions
Already answered, 3913
Irrelevant 2624, 3863
Supply
General discussion not permissible, 4559
Items
Agricultural Instruction grant, 3285
Classification of, 3287
Consideration en bloc, 4612
Minister not required to give information twice, 3386
M. to reduce item, 1737, 1738
Reconsideration of item by unanimous consent, 609
Relevancy, 486, 594, 608, 778, 888, 898, 1014, 1846, 1902, 2154, 3197, 3250, 3253, 3291, 3293, 3371, 3424, 4558, 4559, 4562, 4566, 4602, 4688, 4699, 4719
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, 3285, 3292, 3293, 3294
Urgency, 4731

Derelicts. *See* Marine and Fisheries, Wrecks

Desbarats, Mr. G. J. *See* National Defence

Descente des femmes, Que. wharf, 955

Descoteaux, Mr. J. F. (Nicolet)
Introduced, 2837

Desertions
Canadian Air Force, 2418
Seamen. *See* Immigration Act Amdt. bill

Designs. *See* Trade Marks and Designs Act

Deslauriers, Mr. Hermas (St. Mary)
Cedar Rapids power, 659
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 379
Electric power, export of, M., 658
Emigration to the United States, 1241
Gaspe, natural resources, 1242
Immigration
Assistance to settlers, 1242
Domestic servants, 1243
Labour, attitude towards, 1241

Deslauriers, Mr. Hermas—*Con.*
Immigration—*Con.*
Lemont, Mr. Arthur, 1243
Policy, 1241
United States from, 1243
Labour, unemployment, 1242
Metagen analysis of, qu. 1867
Monte Grappa, foundering of, qu. 912
Montreal
Harbour master, qu. 1867
Postal station "G," qu. 623
Public Works, chief architect's branch, qu. 2517
Wheat shipments to Montreal, qu. 385

Despatches. *See* Near East Crisis

Destructive Insects and Pests. *See also* Insect Pests
Administration of Act, 595, 3988

Detroit River, regulation of traffic, 3357

Dickie, Mr. C. H. (Nanaimo)
British Columbia fishing licenses, 1546
Canadian products, duty of Canadians to purchase, 1244
Coal production in British Columbia, 1244
Creosoting industry, 1245
Emigration to the United States, 1244
Export Act Amdt. bill, pulpwood, 4353
Free trade, effect of, 1246
Fuel oil importations, 1245
Fuel supply, 1247
Hemp bounty bill, 4390
Hindu franchise, 4661
Immigration
Oriental, 1247
Policy, 1244
Imperial Conference, 4661
Lumber industry of British Columbia, 1245
Nanaimo and Victoria harbours, 1014
Port Renfrew wharf, 1008
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4353
Reciprocity, 1246
Tariff equal to that of United States, 1246
Western provinces, conditions in, 1246

Digby, N.S.
Dredging, 4568
Pier, 942

Direct Importation. *See this title under* British Preference; Treaties, French Treaty

Direct Taxation. *See* Taxation

Directors, Board of. *See* Canadian National Railways, Directors

Directory of government offices, qu. 2085

Disability Cases. *See* Pensions

Disallowance of Nova Scotia Statute, 208, 249, 3097, 4678
Amdt. (Sir Henry Drayton) to M. for Supply, 2347, neg, on div. 2391

Disallowance of Provincial Legislation. *See* Jurisdiction; Legislation

Disarmament. *See also* Great Lakes
Conference at Washington, 2911, 4000

Discrimination. *See* Freight Rates; Railway Act Amdt. bill

Diseases. *See* Health
Cattle, of. *See* Animal Contagious Diseases bill; Live Stock, Health of Animals

Dismissals. *See* Civil Service; Post Office,

Distressed Canadians. *See* Relief

Distressed Seamen. *See* Canada Shipping Act Amdt; Marine

Divisions. *See* House of Commons

Divorces
Number granted, qu. 622
Publication of evidence in marriage or divorce proceedings, 1971

Dockages. *See* Grain; Elevators

Doctors. *See also* Health; Military Hospitals; Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment
Canadian National railways, qu. 814
Charges and standards of living, 2813
Indians, medical service, 2160
Medical and scientific discoveries. *See* Banting; Medical Research; Scientific Research
Narcotic drugs. *See that title*

Doherty, Mr Manning, cattle embargo removal, 2871

Doherty, Right Hon. C. J.
Opinions
Liquor legislation, 2408
Naturalization Act, 2447, 2463-65
Payments to, 1154
Pension, qu. 1029

Doherty Act. *See* Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill

Dollier and Galinee, Fathers, cairn at Port Dover, Ont., 3433

Domestic Loans. *See* Loans

Domestic Servants. *See* Immigration; Labour

Dominion Archives. *See* Public Archives

Dominion Arsenals. *See* National Defence

Dominion Astrophysical Observatory. *See* Interior

Dominion Bureau of Statistics. *See* Statistics

Dominion Canners, Limited, 1420

Dominion Cotton Mills. *See* Textiles

Dominion Elections Act. *See also* Elections; Proportional Representation
Amendments, inquiry as to, 1027
Proportional representation, single transferable vote, 1660, 2181

Dominion Express Company. *See* Canadian National Railways, Express

Dominion Forest Reserves and Parks Act. *See also* Forests and Forestry
(Description of areas 1r., 1256; 2r., com., 2060; 3r., 2086

Dominion Fuel Board. *See* Fuel Supply

Dominion Iron and Steel Company, industrial disputes, 1703

Dominion Lands. *See also* Canadian National Parks and Historic Sites; Dominion Forest Reserves and Parks; Dominion Lands Act; Dominion Lands and Parks; Lands
Alberta, revenue from, qu. 2515
Drainage. *See under this title,* Reclamation
Free land available for settlement, 1087, 1090
Grants to railways, 1353
Grazing lands, 3424
Leases, sale of, 3424
Homesteads. *See also* Dominion Lands Act
Patents in event of death or insanity, 3398
Pre-emption and purchases, qu. 1030
Reversion to Dominion government, 3257
Second. *See also* Dominion Lands Act
In southern Saskatchewan and Alberta, 1353, 3398
Valuation and revision of, 3398
Homesteaders, relief, 3447
Hudson Bay railway, land sales, 1053, 1068
Indian title, extinguishment of, 3398
Interest rates on deferred payments, 1088-9
Pre-emptions and purchased homesteads, qu. 1031
Allocation to Hudson Bay railway, 1353, qu. 2393
Reclamation, 3257, 3428, 3430. *See also* Irrigation

Dominion Lands—*Con.*
Reclamation—*Con.*
Alberta Drainage Company, 3144
Carrot river district, 3431
Kootenay flats, 3431
Lesser Slave lake, 3430
Manitoba and Saskatchewan, 1065
Moose range drainage, qu. 3144, 3259
Waterhen lake district, 3431, qu. 4303
School lands, 3398, 4202
Balance due on purchase price, 1385, 1389. *See also* Dominion Lands Act Amdt.
Reversion of, 3445
Southern Saskatchewan and Alberta, 1353, 3398
Timber, permit to cut, 203, 3398
Unorganized districts, 3258

Dominion Lands Act Amdt Bills
1. Coal lands and mining rights, 1r., 2639; 2r., com., 3149; 3r., 3150
2. Homestead valuations; second homesteads; issue of patents in event of death or insanity; school lands; permits to cut timber; extinguishment of Indian titles. Res. 3398, 3982; 1r., 2r., com., 3983; com., 4201, 4364; 3r., 4369

Sections and subjects discussed
Governor in Council may authorize inquiry, 4206
Issue of patent after death of applicant, 4202
Issue of patent if applicant becomes insane, 4202
No employee to purchase Dominion lands, 4206
Sections set apart as school lands, 4202
Terms of payment for school lands, 4202
Timber limits, areas, 4206
Transfer to another homestead, 4202, 4364

Dominion Lands and Parks, 3938, 4702. *See also* Canadian National Parks and Historic Sites
Appointments, 3252
Cloakey, Mr., 3254
May, Mr., 3254
Drainage, 3257
Moose Range, qu, 3144, 3259
Unorganized districts, 3258
Dwight, Mr. T. W., allowance, 4702
Estimates, 3406
Expenditure, 113
Forest reserves, roads and bridges, 1014
Fortier, Mrs. F. T. E., allowance, 4702
Homesteads, 3251
Manitoba Pulp and Paper Company, 3254
Outside salaries, 3249
Rocky Mountain park
Claim of Hudson Bay company, qu. 2418
Stipendiary magistrate, 1739

Dominion Lands and Parks—*Con.*
Taxes unpaid, 3257
Unorganized districts, improvement, 3256
Wainwright buffalo reserve, 3407. *See also* Buffalo

Dominion Marine Association. *See* Freight Rates, Shipping

Dominion Notes. *See* Finance

Dominion Observatories. *See* Astrophysical; Interior

Dominion Police. *See* Royal Canadian Mounted Police

Dominion Power Board. *See* Water Powers

Dominion Textile Company. *See* Textiles

Dorchester Penitentiary. *See* Justice, Penitentiaries

Doughty, Dr. A. B. *See* Public Archives

Douglas Credit Scheme. *See* Credits

Doukhobors. *See* Immigration

Downie, Mr. Donald. *See* Royal Canadian Mounted Police

Drain Tiles. *See* Taxation, Sales Tax

Drainage. *See* Dominion Lands, Reclamation

Draper, Mr. P. M. *See* Printing Bureau, King's Printer

Drawbacks. *See* Customs and Excise; Customs Tariff Items

Drayton, Hon. Sir Henry L. (West York)
Address in reply, 153. Speech of Mr. Meighen, 153, 154; sales tax; New York loans, 154-155; direct increase of Canada's obligations; surplus of previous years; railway expenditure, 155; Sir Henry Thornton and the railways; National railway board, 156; Intercolonial railway; Mr. D. B. Hanna, 157; Lanark election; domestic loan, 158; cost of placing loans in New York, 158-159; commissions on loans; increase in public expenditure, 159-160; Mr. Shaw's amendment, 160
Agriculture
Agricultural instruction grant, 607
Agricultural produce marketing agent, 4675
Department, salaries and contingencies, 610
Annuities, old age, 1696, 1698
Artificial silk industry, 2659, 2703, 2853. *See also under this title,* Customs Tariff Items

Drayton, Hon. Sir Henry L.—*Con.*
Auditor General, vacancy, 3987, 4355, 4674
Automobile insurance, 3978
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 1314
Bank draft tax, 3925, 3928
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. 3097-3125, 3209-3222
Beet sugar duty, 2657, 2706, 4393
Belle River harbour, 4597 4608
Board of Audit Act, 4355
Botany yarn duty, 3896
British Empire exhibition, 1910, 3949
British preference
Canadian ports, direct importation, 3458
Woollen goods, 3459
Budget
Date of, inquiry, 1163, 1483, 1740, 1868 2128, 2254, 2347, 2469
Protective feature, 3468
Speech, 2657; congratulations to the Minister of Finance; Mr. Fielding's 17th budget; cigarette tax; beet sugar tax; French treaty; raisins and dried currants; tariff stability; United States prosperity, 2657; Canada, condition and prospects; financial situation; railways; debt; deficits; estimates for 1923-24; taxation, 2658; artificial silk industry; hemp bounty, 2659; trade and industry, 2701; comparison with other countries, finances; debt and deficits; budget; tariff, changes in; free trade, 2702; tariff stability; artificial silk industry; copper rods and bars, 2703; hemp bounty; silk; sales tax; cost of living, 2704; receipt tax, 2705; luxuries; cheque tax; income tax; cigarette tax; beet root sugar, 2706; confectionery and beverages; reciprocity with United States; potatoes, duty on; imports and exports, 2707; imports of agricultural products; Fordney-McCumber tariff, 2708; copper bounty; hemp bounty; revenue and expenditure; deficits, 2709; French treaty; taxation of necessities instead of luxuries; political budget; government supporters appointed to Senate and Bench; jobs for political supporters; shipping rates; royal commissions, 2710; timber famine; amendment, opportunity for Progressive party to move, 2711
Reference to, 3074
Buffalo, slaughter of, 3439
Business of the House, 3127
Adjournments at 11 p.m., 1360
Bills, principle, on second reading, 3091

Drayton, Hon. Sir Henry L.—*Con.*
Business of the House—*Con.*
Motion to increase taxation, 3936
Private members' day, 1161
Supply
Calling of, 2295
Undiscussed items not in official report, 3285
Business Profits War Tax bill, 4440, 4489
Canada Colonization Association. *See under this title,* Immigration
Canada, constitutional development, 4466
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill, 3146
Distressed seamen, 3969
Canada Temperance Act, administration, 2495
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, 3814
Advances, 3814, 3824
Coal-carrying trade, 3826
Construction, 3814
Deficit, 3815
Sale of vessels, 3705, 3822
Thornton, Sir Henry, 3817
Canadian National Institute for blind, 694
Canadian National parks and historic sites, 3441
Canadian National railways
Advances
$1,550,000, 4692
$73,000,000, 3789
Audit staff, transfer from Moncton, 575
Balfour, Col., reported appointment, 2794
Branch lines construction bill, 4304-44
Expenditure, appropriation by Parliament, 4329, 4399
Finance, 4319, 4329
Comparison of votes, 1922 and 1923, 3702
Correspondence, M. for, 244
Deficits, 2658
Directors, Talbot, Col. O., 2004, 4525
Grand Trunk
Amalgamation, 56
Ocean ports, 1762
United States terminals, 815
Insurance of mortgaged premises, bill, 2048, 2107
Items, opportunity to discuss, 3703
Management, responsibility and powers, 3616, 3624
Ocean ports, 1759
Operating deficits, 3701
Orders in council, 815
Paris offices, 3611, 3660, 3683, 3701
Pre-audit, 3701
Robb, Mr., 2472
Sales tax, qu. 1157
Securities bill, 4515
Amdt. to refer back, neg. 4732

Drayton, Hon. Sir Henry L.—*Con.*
Canadian National railways—*Con.*
Summary and allocation of vote, 3798
Thomas, Mr. A. J., reported appointment, 2794
Thornton, Sir Henry, responsibility and powers, 3617, 3624
Toronto
Office building, qu. 1994, 3642
Viaduct and union station, 4445
Canadian ports, use of by United States fishermen, 3906
Canadian Press Limited, bill, 1464
Cattle shipment to Great Britain, 4675
Cheque tax, qu. 282, 332, 2706, 3925, 4409, 4423
Amendment, 3933
Enforcement, qu. 492
Chinese immigration bill, 2309
Cigarettes
Consumption of, qu. 516
Duty, 2706, 3229, 4393
Civil government estimates, form of, 668
Civil Service, 1811
Bonus, 1811
Commission
Postmasters, appointments, 1821, 1823, 1827
Salaries and contingencies, 3986
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 350
Civil Service Superannuation and Retirement bill, 3146
Combines bill, 2621-38, 2660-65
Civil Service Act appointments, 2662
Commissioners, appointments, 2627
Registrar, inquiry, 2621
Coal, reported discovery in Ontario, 2512
Commercial union, 3906
Commissioner of Taxation, salary, 3949, 4670
Confectionery and beverages, tax, qu. 624, 2707
Copper bounty, 2709, 3234, 4375
Copyright Act Amdt. bill, 2287, 2288
Cory, Mr. W. W., Deputy Minister of the Interior, salary, 4667
Cost of living, Prof. Michell, figures, 1700
Credits, function, M. (Mr. Irvine) 645
Customs Tariff Act 1907 Amdt. bill, 4408
Customs Tariff items
Artificial silk, 3489
Manufactures, 3492
Tops and waste of artificial fibre silk, 3896
Bisulphate of soda, 3480, 3895
Brass and copper scrap, 3483
Brass, iron or steel parts for umbrellas, 3501

Drayton, Hon. Sir Henry L.—*Con.*
Customs Tariff items—*Con.*
Composition and plated metal for jewelry and dental purposes, 3483
Coverings and containers, 3501
Crude petroleum, 3481
Date when changes became effective, 3504
Dehydrated sulphate of copper, 3480, 3895
Drawbacks
Artificial silk, 3502
Copper for electric wires, 3503
Firebrick, 3482
Liquorice paste, 3480
Malt flour duty, 3480
Printing and lithographic presses, 3486
Raisins and dried currants, 3477
Rolled iron and steel hoops, etc, 3484
Silk cloth, woven in the gum, 3489
Spectacle and eyeglass frames, 3483
Staves of wood, 3487
Sticks or canes, 3501
Stumping machines, 3486
Velvets, velveteens, etc., 3488
Well-drilling machinery, 3487
Wool, botany yarn, 3489
Deputy ministers, salaries
Deputy Minister of Finance, 4670
Increase in, 4667
Destructive Insect and Pest Act, 3988
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 208, 249, 2347-90, 3097
Dominion Lands Act Amdt. bill (Coal lands) 3149
Dominion lands, reclamation, 3431
Dominion lands and parks, salaries, 3249
Dominion observatories, expenditure, 3242
Dominion Power board, 3427
Dredging by government dredges, 4569, 4570
Dry Dock Subsidies Act Amdt., 3980
Electric power, M. (Mr. Deslauriers) 662
Emigration to the United States, 691, 2400
Employers' liability compensation, 692
Estimates
Arrangement of, 610, 668, 1468, 3242
Civil government, form of, 668
Discussion en bloc, 4559, 4588
Supplementary, time of presentation, 4554
Exchequer court judgeship, 2501
Excise taxes, payment with postage stamps, 1815, 3927, 3938
Exhibitions, 1455
Collection of exhibits, 1468
Immigration, attracting, 1466
Experimental farms, 456
Export Act Amdt. bill, 4345
External Affairs department, salaries, 3897
Finance Act Amdt. bill, 4406

Drayton, Hon. Sir Henry L.—*Con.*
Finance department, charges of management, 3987
France, exports and imports, 2004. *See also under this title,* French Treaty
Freight rates
Crowsnest pass agreement, 1960, 2852
Manufactured products, 2855
Railway rates, equalization, M. (Mr. Clark) 1959
French treaty, 443, 456, 2002, 2255, 2299-2303
Agricultural imports, 445
Balance of trade, 2204, 2221
Border states, agreements and concessions, 2219, 2273, 2395
Brandies and wines, 444, 3478
French brandy, Scotch and Canadian whiskies, 3478
Bronze powder, 2002, 2006, 2270
Competition with United States, 443
Embroideries, 2008
Favoured nation, 443, 2271
Luxuries, 444
Sales tax, 2279, 2280, 2299
Silks and silk manufactures, 2255, 2264, 2300, 2397
Treaty of 1907, 2004
United States trade with France, 2277
Velvets, velveteens, etc. 3488
Wines, duty, 438, 444, 3478
Wool, 447
Fruit and fruit containers bill, 2105, 3150
Fuel supply, 802
Georgetown wharf, 4587
Government publications, 811, 1712
Government workshops, Ottawa, 4617
Grain inquiry commission, appeal, 1210
Halibut fishery treaty, 4466
Halifax
Exodus from, 2400
Grain elevator, 4713
Historic events, grants for celebration, 4705
Harbours and rivers
Engineers' reports, 4571
Nova Scotia, 4562
Morrison claim, 4573, 4722
Ontario, 4589
Prince Edward island, 4587
Hawkesbury bridge, 4590
"Hector" celebration, 4705
Hemp bounty, 2659, 2704, 2709, 3912
Highways, Ontario, cost of, 2490, 2493
Hoppe leases, 3128
Housing, loans to provinces, 4705
Hudson Bay railway, McArthur claim, 4686-9
Icebreakers and steamers, 3160

Drayton, Hon. Sir Henry L.—*Con.*
Immigration
Advertising, qu. 518, 1103
Black, Mr. W. J., 2084
Canada Colonization Association, 1480
Salvation army and, 1093
Chinese, 1445, 1447, 2309
Detailed information, 1481
Empire settlement scheme, 667, 1096, 1473, 1480
Estimates, arrangement of, 1468
Medical inspection, 702
Ratio of British to foreign, 1105
St. John immigration buildings, 1457, 1460, 1464, 1908
Salaries and contingencies, 1909
Thornton, Sir Henry, reported statement, 2795
Immigration Act Amdt. bill, 3981
Undesirable classes, 2669
Income tax, qu. 281, 2659, 2706
Income War Tax Act Amdt. bill, 4492, 4495
Indians, 2124
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1361
Inland Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 4393
Cigarettes and beet sugar duties, 3229
Inspection of live stock shipments, 3334
Insulin, patenting of, 2077
Insurance Act Amdt. bill, 3147, 3978
Interim supply bills, 1482, 3705
Interior department, salaries, 1909, 3949
International boundaries, survey, 3247
International bridge at Niagara Falls, qu. 1257, qu. 1864
Irrigation, surveys and inspections, 3430
Italian treaty bill, 2394-2400, 2437
Concessions to border states, 2395
Consideration postponed, 2304
Jugo-Slavia, 2396
Silks, 2397
Johnston, Mr. Alex, salary increase, 4668
Judges Act Amdt. bill, 3604
Labour, strikes in, 1922, 495, 815
Lake Grain Rates commission, 4710
La Société des Artisans Canadiens Français, 1027
League of Nations
Canada's contribution, 3990
Expenses, 3989
Linen yarn duty, 3897
Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill, 3150
Lunenburg harbour, dredging, 4576
Mackenzie district, half-breed claims, 3444
Marketing of grain, M. (Mr. Millar) 300
Marketing of imported goods, qu. 616, 931
Marshall, Mr. Duncan
Appointment, 3317

Drayton, Hon. Sir Henry L.—*Con.*
Marshall, Mr. Duncan—*Con.*
Salary, 608
Visit to Great Britain, 4675
Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur, speech in North Essex, 670
Michigan Central bridge, sales tax, qu. 1257
Military hospitals, 670
Militia Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3975, 3977
Mines and Geological Survey
Estimates, 3197
Explosives division, 2514
Montreal Harbour Commissioners bill, 4508
Morrison, Mr. T. D., Little Anse, 4573, 4722
Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. bill, 2114, 3149.
Naturalization Act, M. (Mr. Carroll) 1381
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2107, 2437
New departmental building, Ottawa, 4617
New York, Canadian customs officer, 3281
Newspaper postage, 4528
Northern Pacific Halibut Fishery bill, 4483
Nova Scotia
Disallowance of provincial legislation, 208, 249, 2347-90, 3097
Miners' strike, 914
Northwest Territories Act, 270
Ontario legal fees, 1155
Opium and Narcotic Drugs, 2114, 3149
Ordnance lands, salaries and expenses, 3443
Pacaud, Mr. Lucien T., 1832
Paradis, Mr. T., claim, 4691
Parliament buildings, 1716, 1719
Estimates, M. to reduce, 1727
Members' rooms, allocation, 1729
Tower, completion of, 1720
Ventilation, 1722
Patents of Invention bill, 2064, 2071, 2083, 2088, 2102
Commissioner, powers of, 2065
Penitentiaries, 706
Pensions
Commissioners, 685
Federal appeal board and district boards of review, 403
Royal commission, expenses, 691
Petition of Right Act Amdt. bill, 3127
Petroleum bounties, 3921, 4392
Pollution of boundary waters, 700
Postage stamps, use for revenue purposes, 1815, 3927, 3938
Post Office Act Amdt. bill, 4528
Post Office department
Coulter, Dr. R. M., retirement, 1822
Estimates, 1778, 1815
Lemaire, Mr. E. J., 1822
Postmaster General, illness, absence, 1821
Postmasters, appointment of, 1821-1827

Drayton, Hon. Sir Henry L.—*Con.*
Post Office department—*Con.*
List of appointments, 1830
Revenue not connected with service, 1815
Rural mail service, Anderson, Mr., 1821
Prince Edward island, terminals claim, 4676
Printing bureau
New building, 1731
Reorganization, 1731
Retiring allowances, 3949
Promissory notes tax, 3925
Provincial rights, bankruptcy, 3097
Public expenditure, 2658
Total $548,750,714, 4554
Public works estimates, 4554
Pugsley, Hon. William, appointment, 2501
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4345
Purchasing Commission, 3950, 4002, 4704
Radiotelegraph service, 2285, 3337
Railway and shipping strikes, 245
Railway statistics, 207
Receipt tax, qu. 282, 2705, 3934, 4423
Revision, 4409
Reciprocity with United States, 2707, 2708
Offer to negotiate, 3906
Redistribution, delay, 2400
Returned Soldiers Insurance bill, 4735
Returned soldiers, emigration, 691
Riordan Company, business tax, 4490
Rural credits, 645
St. John and Quebec railway bill, 3403
St. John immigration building, 1457, 1460, 1464, 1908
St. John river, sawdust pollution, 701
St. Lawrence river waterway, 663, 3427
St. Lawrence ship canal, 3339
Sales tax, qu. 281, 2704, 4409. *See also under this title,* French Treaty
Collections, qu. 938
Exemptions, qu. 491, qu. 708
Imports, 4411
International bridge, Niagara Falls, material, qu. 1257, qu. 1864
Jobber and retailer, 4411
Magazines and periodicals, 4416
M. (Mr. Stevens) for com. of inquiry, 919
Six per cent tax at source, 3938
Senate, elective, M. (Mr. Denis) 1369
Shale deposits, maritime provinces, 2513
Silk. *See also under this title,* Artificial silk; Customs Tariff items; French treaty
Industry in Canada, 2397
Prices, 2397-2400
Sinclair, Hon. J. E., reference, 3012
Soldier Settlement Board; estimates, 1910
Soldiers, vocational training, 686
Spain, trade with, 2397

Drayton, Hon. Sir Henry L.—*Con.*
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 4409. *See also under this title,* Sales tax
Steamship services, 4701
Tariff commission evidence, 2296
Tariff weapon, 3477. *See also* French Treaty
Taxation. *See also under this title,* Receipt tax; Sales tax
Direct results, qu. 281
Income tax, qu. 281, 2659, 2706
Telegraph and telephone lines, 4590
Three Rivers Harbour bill, 3963
Tinplate, 2400
Toronto
Canadian National railways office building, qu. 1994, 3642
Customs house, 3278
Harbour improvements, 4610
Union station, 4325, 4450
Viaduct, 4306, 4325, 4445, 4450
Trade Mark and Designs Act, 2293
Trade returns, incomplete, 2270, 2301
Treaties. *See also under this title,* French, Halibut, Italian
Negotiation of, expenses, 3989
Signing of, 4466
With France and Italy, 9. *See also under this title,* French; Italian
Trent canal improvements, 3647
Unemployment relief, 689
United States
National Reserve bank, 4407
Reciprocity. *See under this title,* Reciprocity
Tariff and emigration, 1092
Vancouver Creosoting Company, 3234
Van Koughnet, Mrs., 4726
War claims, adjustment, 2495, 2497, 2501
War medals, 1744
Welland canal construction, 3761
West Ukrainian republic, 657
Wheat shipments, Quebec, qu. 3820
Wines. *See also* French Treaty
Excise tax on, 3937
Woollen imports, 3469
Woollen industry, protection, 931
Wrangel island, ownership, 3948
Wrecking plant subsidies, 3334

Drayton-Acworth Commission, 4682
Hudson Bay railway, 1062

Dredges and Dredging. *See* Harbours and Rivers; Marine and Fisheries; Public Works

Drugs. *See also* Narcotic Drugs; Opium
Importation of. *See* Narcotic Drugs
Metagen, analysis of, qu. 1867
Scopolamin, 4647

Drummond, Mr. J. D. F. (West Middlesex)
Budget, 2973; tariff; marking of woollen goods; protection fundamentally wrong; congratulations to Finance Minister; budget, violation of election pledges, 2973; tariff issue from 1878 to 1896; appropriation of protective policy by Liberals; Mr. Euler's statement on political platforms; political honour in jeopardy; Prime Minister's pre-election promises conditions unchanged and grievances unredressed; Conservative party, violation of pledges; Mr. Meighen on agricultural implement duties, 2974; "ramparts of gold"; duty increased by increase of price; protection and home markets; agricultural implement industry; duty payment of $265.80 per employee, 2975; Canadian National railways hotel deficits; Progressive party a "menacing enemy"; reasons for agricultural organizations, 2976
Sales tax on Union Jack, 4514
Woollen industry, protection, M. 928, 2973

Drury Government, expenditure and debt, 2824

Dryden, Mr. W. A., trip to South America, qu. 384, qu. 1031, 3294, qu. 3704, 3705

Dry Docks
Esquimalt, 2671, 2682
Kingston, 4563
Vancouver and Victoria, 1002

Dry Dock Subsidies Act Amdt Bill
(Ninety per cent of subsidy payable when seventy-five per cent of work completed). Res 3583, 3979; 1r., 2r., com., 3979; 3r., 3981

Dual Citizenship. *See* Naturalization

Duff, Mr. William (Lunenburg)
Address, 108. The late Hon. Mr. Kennedy; necessity for economy, 108; amendments of Mr. Shaw and Mr. Hoey; the public debt, expenditure at Halifax and St. John, 109; Quebec and Toronto ports, expenditure; Pacific coast ports; naval expenditure during war, 110; Canadian Government Merchant Marine; immigration and emigration; railway freight rates; Crowsnest pass agreement, 111-112; maritime provinces suffering by reason of high freight rates; United States tariff; tariff on fish, 112; national expendi-

Duff, Mr. William—*Con.*
Address—*Con.*
ture, necessity for reduction in militia estimate, 113; loan to Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 113-114; Purchasing Commission; international boat race, 114; votes for agriculture; Hudson Bay railway, 115; Mr. Meighen and the tariff, 116
Agriculture, expenditure on, 115, 117
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4158
British Columbia
Fishing licenses, M. (Mr. Clark) 1542
Salmon canner's licenses, 1547
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bills
Coasting regulations, 4235
Distressed seamen, 3970
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, 111
Advances, 113, 3377, 3799
Competition with subsidized steamship services, 3396
Operating deficit, 3843
Sale of vessels, 3813
West Indies, trade, 3387, 3808
Fish and fisheries
French treaty, canned fish, 452
Sardine fishery, 2518
Tariff on fish, 2518
Trout fishing season, 1686
Grondines wharf, 960
Halibut fishery treaty, signing of, 858
Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia, 942
Hudson Bay railway, 115
M. (Mr. Knox) 1042
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4223-34, 4283, 4293
Lightkeepers' salaries, 3352
Margaree River Salmon Fisheries Association, 3369
Marine and Fisheries
Committee reports
First, 1307, 1384
Second, 1686, 1763
Third, 2983, 3084
Department
Deputy minister's salary, 3373
Salaries and contingencies, 3373
Naval service, 905
Royal Canadian Volunteer reserve, 2897
Royal Canadian navy, 905
Nova Scotia
Harbours and rivers, 942
Miners' strike, use of troops, 897
Secretary of State, estimates, 2392
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4242
Steamship services.
Canadian Government Merchant Marine. *See that head under this title*
Canada-West Indies-South America, 3387
Duff, Mr. William—*Con.*
Thornton, Sir Henry, director Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, 3845
Toronto island breakwater, 984
Trout-fishing season, 1686

Duke and Duchess of York, congratulations to, 2251
Acknowledgment of, 2338

Dumping Clause. *See* Customs and Excise

Dun, R. G. & Co., cost of living, 1812

Duncan, Mr. M. R. (North Grey)
Beckett, Matt C., qu. 283
Malone, Late Lieut-Col. W. P., qu. 206
P. C. 1053, qu. 516

Duncan, Mr. Walter, 1140

Dunning, Premier of Saskatchewan
Budget, 2872

Duties. *See* Customs

East, crisis in. *See* Near East Crisis

East Edmonton District
Res. on immigration, 81
United Farmers of Alberta, 107

East Templeton, Que., wharf, 955

Easter adjournment. *See* House of Commons

Eastern Galicia. *See* West Ukrainian Republic

Eastern Lands Development Company, 626, 1635

Eastern Situation. *See* Near East Crisis

Eaton, T. Company
Comparison of prices with Sears-Roebuck, Chicago, 2739, 2742

Economic Conditions, 1238, 1250, 1393. *See also* Agriculture, Agricultural Conditions; Banks and Banking; speeches on Address, and Budget
Canadian affected by European, 3003
Cost of living and, 1684, 1811-14. *See also that title*
Cycles of prosperity and depression, 1177
Economic group organizations, 3002
Gambling in staples of life, 3058
Immigration and, 1231. *See also that title*
Improvement, 3055
Effected by railways, 1566
Tariff, 3053
Wealth, production of, 1856
Western provinces, 1883. *See also that title*

Economic Conference. *See* Imperial Economic Conference

Economy. *See* Government; Immigration; Public Expenditure

Editorial Committee
Abolition, 1714
Cost, 1669
King's Printer, 1669
Members of, and staff, 1675
Publications, unnecessary duplication, 1714
Saving effected by, 1670
French publications, 1670
Translation and printing, 1489

Edmonton. *See also* East Edmonton
Board of Trade res. on coal duty, 1275
Grain elevator, 4716
Indian school, 2149, 2164-5
Institute of Mining and Metallurgy, 1268
Post Office, theft of $50,000 from, 1142
Soldier Settlement Board, insurance, 3506

Edmundston, N.B.
Bridge, 1014, 2342, 4589
Public building, 4613

Education. *See also* Schools; Universities
Capitalistic control of educational agencies, 2725
Cost of, 2732
Foreigners, opportunities, 1885
Indians. *See that title.*
International Scholarships, 878
Jurisdiction, 882, 1884-5
Opportunities, 2831
School lands. *See also* Dominion Lands
Schools closed on account of financial stringency, 1202
Technical Education Act, 1637

Eggs
Egg-grading plants. *See* Live Stock Acts
Freight rates, 1962
French treaty, export, 1978
Imports, qu. 617, 2959
From United States, 2708, 2821
Inspector, Yukon territory, qu. 2516
Prices, 1841, 1851, 1852

Egypt, British policy in, 4662

Eight Hour Day. *See* Labour

Elections. *See also* Dominion Elections; Proportional Representation
By-elections. *See also* House of Commons
Grenville, 4606
Handwriting on the wall, 2981

Elections—*Con.*
By-elections—*Con.*
Lanark, 157
Moose Jaw
Certificate of Registrar of Supreme Court, 515
Oleomargarine, 3526
Reported statement, Hon. Mr. Motherwell, 1686, 2774, 4683
North Essex, 2013, 2469, 4594, 4606
Fielding, Right Hon. Mr., alleged statement, 2013, 2245
Meighen, Right Hon. Mr.
Alleged statement, 670, 708, 2245
Visit to Belle River, 4594
Election of 1896, 3014
Election of 1921. *See also* Liberal Party
King, Right Hon. Mackenzie, speeches, 3047
Policy proclaimed but forgotten, 1426
Statements and prophecies, 1658
Violation of election pledges, 2973, 3189
Multi-member constituencies. *See* Proportional Representation
Ontario. *See also* Ontario
Issue in, 1420
Proportional representation. *See that title*
Revelstoke and Nelson, bribery, 2941

Elective Senate. *See* Senate, M. (Mr. Denis, Joliette)

Electoral Reforms. *See* Proportional Representation

Electric Lines, sale of. See Canadian National Railways

Electric Power. *See also* Hydro Electric; Lake of the Woods; St. Lawrence River Waterway; Water Powers
Exportation to United States, 1266
M. (Mr. Deslauriers) 658, withdrawn, 666
Export duty, 2828
Power development, St. Lawrence river. *See* St. Lawrence River Waterway; Welland Canal

Electricity
Electrical apparatus, import. *See* French Treaty
House heating by, 3425

Electrification. *See* Canadian National Railways; Railways

Elevators. *See this title under* Grain and Grain Trade

Elliott, Mr. Preston (Dundas)
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3523

Elliott, Mr. William (Waterloo)
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4539
Rural mail carriers, qu. 1259, 1783
Sales tax, 4422
Shire horses from Great Britain, 2207

Elmira-Souris railway, 129

Embargo on Cattle. *See* Live Stock, Cattle

Emigration. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget; Immigration
Doukhobors, 43
Emigration to the United States, 21, 67, 77, 628, 637, 1082, 1093, 1109, 1113, 1128, 1165, 1173, 1178, 1188, 1198, 1206, 1217, 1235, 1241, 1244, 1253, 1319, 1322, 1330, 1338, 1389, 1392, 1403, 1404, 1412, 1414, 1422, 1439, 1845, 1888, 1892, 2400, 2650, 2715, 2743, 2822, 2929, 2970, 3191, 4064. *See also* Taxation
American publications, effect on, 831
Canadians returning, 2743
Causes, 2747, 3004
Climate, 2747
Cost of living, 2790. *See also that title*
Economic conditions, 2727
Taxation, 1319, 2709, 2747
Unemployment and, 1657
Figures, 1917-22, 1093
Halifax, exodus from, 2400
Information bureau to ascertain reason for, 2932
Labouring people, 2727. *See also* Labour
Lumber camps from, to New England States, 1125
Montreal, from, 2216, 2790
Returned soldiers, 691
Sifton, Sir Clifford, 1188
Skilled workmen, 2823
Montreal, from, 2790
Tariff and, 2737. *See also* speeches on Budget
University graduates, 2732
Windsor, Canadians crossing border, 1431
Winnipeg, from, 1975
Winnipeg Free Press, statement, 2790
Young men, 2816
Mennonites, 43, 1239, 1341, 1884
Mexico, to, 1229

Empire Day Ajournment. *See* House of Commons, Adjournments

Empire Forestry Conference, 3410

Empire Settlement Scheme. *See* Immigration

Employers' Liability Compensation

Employment Service. *See* Labour

Enemy Alien Property. *See* Aliens

Enemy Aliens. *See this title under* Aliens

Engineering Standards. *See* Canadian Engineering

England. *See* Great Britain

English River. *See* Lake of the Woods

Equalization of Railway Rates. *See* Freight Rates

Eskimos, Trial of. *See* Justice

Espionage. *See* Labour; Royal Canadian Mounted Police

Esquimalt
Dry dock, 2671
Graving dock, 2682
Naval college, 1744
Navy yard, qu. 1634

Essex By-Election. *See* Elections, North Essex

Estevan Board of Trade, Hudson Bay railway, 1079

Estimates. *See also* Deputy Speaker; House of Commons; Interim Supply; Speaker; Supply
For departments, *see their titles*
Appropriations for railway subsidies, 4521
"Appropriations not required" 1656
Arrangement of, 1468
Canadian National railway expenditure, 4304
Civil government, form of, 610, 668, 780
Discussion
En bloc, 4554, 4558, 4612, 4587
Opportunity for, 4579, 4594, 4614, 4615
Expenditure provided for, 4554
Main, tabled, 331
Obligations
Maturing, 1753
To be incurred, 1753
One-sixth vote for 1923-4, 1482, 1538
Preparation, 2756, 3242
Supplementary
For 1923-4, 1359, 1659, 4536
Further supplementary, 4392, 4536
Lack of information, 4576, 4577
Time of presentation, 4554, 4577, 4594, 4601, 4703, 4420, 4422
Undiscussed items not appearing in official report, 3284

Euclid Hall. *See* Military Hospitals

Euler, Mr. William D. (North Waterloo)
Budget, 2852. Congratulations to Finance Minister; a unique record; criticism of budget; national viewpoint; Canada a hard country to govern; diversified interests make compromise necessary; Liberal tariff platform of 1919, 2852; little confidence in political platforms; artificial and natural silk industries; taxation of luxuries; speech of Mr. Forke; tariff stability; opinion of Mr. H. W. Wood, Alberta; dependence of industry upon agriculture, 2853; difficulties of manufacturers; free trade not possible; tariff for revenue and protection; effect upon consumer; amendment; free trade with England; British preference; reciprocity; charge that government has done nothing for the farmer; Crowsnest pass agreement 2854; claim of Progressives that they forced concession; the two old parties; "holier than thou" attitude of some members; allegation that parties take orders from big interests, 2855; no election contributions; leader of the Government; speech on budget, in 1921; moderate tariff; lack of markets; United States markets, competition of Canadian manufacturers in; United States tariff against Canadian goods, 2856; revenue; tariff reduction; taxation; Canadian farmer a free trader; United States farmer a protectionist; Wheat Board; free trade in raw materials; importance of tariff question magnified; income and luxury taxes, economy; Civil Service; taxation rescinded; system should be carefully worked out; stamp tax; receipt tax; irritating excise tax; cheque tax, 2858; difficulties of collection; public irritation and inconvenience; basic methods of taxation; tariff, income and turnover; sales tax; Canadian National railways; public ownership; revaluation, 2859
Budget speech, reference to, 3070
Buttons, importation, 2214
Canadian National railways
Fixed charges, qu. 708
Public ownership, 2859
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 373
Eastern Canada, conditions, 1222
Free trade, 2466, 2858

Euler, Mr. William D.—*Con.*
Immigration
Policy, 1220
Attitude of labour towards, 1224
Labour Gazette, 1627
Liberal platform of 1919, 2852, 3019
Repudiation of, 2994, 3019
Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill, 2201
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2190, 2444-67
Denaturalization, 2465
Judges, 2466
Nationality, dual, 2444, 2464
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3521
Political platforms, 2853, 2974, 2991
Reference to, 2852, 2974
Sales tax, raw materials, 4421
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 4421
Tariff and immigration, 1222
Western provinces, conditions in, 1221

Europe. *See also* Immigration
Agricultural products, inability to buy, 3004
Coal supplies, 1263
Conditions
Chaotic, 2748
Economic, 3003
Unsettled, 3052
Purchasing power, decrease, 1859
Southeastern, immigration from, 1195
Wheat prices, 3004

European War. *See* Pensions; War

Evans, Mr. John (Saskatoon)
Address in reply, 144. Agriculture the basis of national prosperity; tariff system, 144; anti-combine legislation; customs, valuation for duty, 145; the Tariff Act; protection on flour, 146; dissatisfaction with economic situation in West; British Columbia apples, handling of, 147; class legislation; embargo on cattle, 148; automobiles in Saskatchewan; Crowsnest pass agreement and freight rates, 149
Bank Act Amdt bill, 4046, 4137
Bounties, principle of, 3242
British preference, direct importation, 3451
Budget, 3067. Trade issue; secession talk, 3067; abandonment of free trade by Liberal party; speech of Prime Minister; tariff stability; taxation, burden of; capital; theory and method; venerable protectionist arguments; prices of manufactured and agricultural products; British preference; Canadian ports; 3068; raisins and currants duty; artificial silk duty; copper

Evans, Mr. John—*Con.*
Budget.—*Con.*
bounty; sugar duty; permanent tariff commission; "scientific" tariff protection; class privilege; taxation, passing on; farm products and world conditions; United States farmers and Fordney tariff, 3069; Progressive party, criticism of; discrimination between city and rural dwellers; rural mail carriers remuneration; speech of Mr. Euler; concessions to manufacturers; old parties and big interests; Sir Richard Cartwright on protection; protection, money and moral cost of, 3070; political corruption; legalized robbery; Goldwin Smith; farming methods; paternalism; "Canada for the Canadians;" interest of common people in government, 3071; free trade England; tariff and deficit of Canadian Government Merchant Marine; exodus to other countries; British national debt decreasing, Canadian national debt increasing; bonussed industries; tariff inconsistencies; dumping clause; revenue; combines, 3072; taxation; co-operative purchasing and selling; cost of living; income tax; inheritance tax; luxuries, taxation of; economy; inopportune expenditures; Welland canal; "blind selfishness;" Hudson Bay railway, 3073; Canada hard country to govern; independence not vital; newspaper control; confidence destroyed; class privilege, 3074
Canada Grain Act, administration, 786
Canadian Pacific freight rates and dividends, 1134
Combines bill, 2533
Consumption of intoxicants, qu. 285
Copper bounty, 3069, 3242, 4371
Deportation of British soldier, 2254
Esquimalt navy yard, qu. 1634
Experimental farms, 4632
Export Act Amdt. bill, 4346
Free trade in raw materials, 2858
Freight rates, increase, 1134
Geodetic survey, 3245
Grain dockages and screenings, 786
Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia, 941
Hemp bounty bill, 4381, 4384
Homestead inspectors, 3252
Hudson Bay railway lands, qu, 2393
Immigration policy, 1133
Imperial Shipping Committee, qu. 3137
Income tax, 4501
Indians, 2145, 2147
Reserves, grain production, qu. 1139
Iron and steel bounties, 4381
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4293
Magazines and periodicals, M. (Mr. Hocken) 837, 841
Marketing of grain, M. (Mr. Millar) 295
Oleomargarine, import of materials, qu. 3505
Pulpwood, export of, 4346
Qu'Appelle-Battleford telegraph line, 1017
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 744
Raisins and dried currants, duty, 3069, 3476
Regina Photo Supply Company, sales tax, qu. 518
Rural mail carriers, remuneration, 3070, 3076
Shipping combines, 1134
Steamship service, Canada-West Indies, qu. 937
Telegraph and telephone lines, 1017, 2683
Topographical surveys, 3245
Woollen industry, 3461

Everett, Mr. Howard. *See* Immigration, Canada Colonization

Evidence in Marriage and Divorce Proceedings. *See* Criminal Code Admt. bill

Ewart, Mr. J. S., K.C., Canada's relations with Empire, 314, 1529

Examinations of Masters and Mates. *See* Marine

Exchange. *See also* Great Britain; Finance
Medium of. *See* Bank Act Amdt. bill
Rate, franc, value of, 2009
Unfavourable, 2912

Exchequer Court of Canada
Alien enemy property, 2499
Audette, Mr. Justice, 2502
Judgeship, 2499
War claims, competency to deal with. *See* War Claims

Excise Taxes. *See* Budget; Customs and Excise; Inland Revenue; Special War Revenue Act; Taxation

Excursion Tickets, qu. 1485

Executions, public. *See* Capital Punishment

Exemptions. *See* Civil Service; Income Tax; Taxation

Exhibitions. *See also* Agriculture; Live Stock; Trade
Agricultural fairs, horse-racing, 726, 750
Atlanta, 1465
Belgian, 496, 1467
British Empire, 463, 1454, 1873, 1910, 3949, 4704
Yukon mineral exhibit, qu. 3143
Brussels, 1467
Canadian, travelling in France, 811, 1457, 4711
Chicago, 1454, 1466
Fat Stock Show, 1398
Collection of samples for exhibits, 1468
Commercial, 1467
Des Moines, 1466
Estimates, 1454, 1465
Expenditure in Great Britain and United States, 1465-68
Great Britain, 1467
Horse-racing. *See* Race Track Betting
Immigration, 1454
Maple products, Beauceville, 1810
Royal Show, 1454
St. Petersburg, 1465
Seattle, 1467
Seed and field competitions, 599
Southern States in, 1465
Smith, Mr. Obed, 1467
Staff and salaries, 1455
Tampa, Florida, 1454, 1465
United States in, 1465

Exhibits. *See* Exhibitions

Exodus to United States. *See* Emigration

Expenditure. *See* Public Expenditure

Experimental Farms. *See* Agriculture

Explorations, Arctic, 3944. *See also* Arctic

Explosives. *See* Mines and Minerals

Export Duty. *See* Customs and Excise

Export Act Amdt. Bill (Pulpwood, prohibition, of export) Res. 4012, 4345; 1r., 4355; 2r., com., 4393; 3r., amdt. (Mr. Power), six months' hoist, 4397, neg. on div., 3r., 4397

Exporters' Association. *See* Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill

Exports. *See* Imports and Exports

Express Charges, 2876. *See also* Canadian National Railways; Canadian Pacific

Express Companies. *See* Canadian National Railways

External Affairs, Department of
Christie, Mr. Loring C., resignation, 3988
Employees and cost, 2970
Pope, Sir Joseph, salary, 3988, 4671
Salaries, 3987

Factory and Shop Acts of British Dominions, 1443

Fafard, Mr. J. Fernand (L'Islet)
Eggs, price of, 1852
Geodetic survey, expenditure, qu. 1634
L'Islet wharf, 969
Surveys in prairie provinces, qu. 1866
Topographical surveys, expenditure, qu. 1865

Failures. *See* Bankruptcy Act Amdt.

Fairs. *See* Exhibitions

False Creek Bridge, 3375, 4708

Fansher, Mr. B. W. (East Lambton)
Crude petroleum bounty, qu. 3262
Customs drawbacks, qu. 1484
Raw materials imported, manufactured, exported, qu. 1259, qu. 1864
Detroit river, traffic regulation, 3358
Oil Springs postmaster, qu. 518

Farm Implements. *See* Agricultural Implements

Farm Products. *See* Agriculture

Farmer, Mayor S. J., Winnipeg. *See* Lake of the Woods Regulation Bill

Farmers. *See also* Address; Agriculture; Bank Act Amdt. bill; Budget; Immigration; Taxation
Advice to, 2953
Allegation that government has done nothing for, 2854
Bank shareholders, qu. 1486, 2846
Bankruptcy Act Amdt., farmers, 3211
Banks, treatment by, 2929. *See also* Bank Act Amdt. bill
Burdens of, 2731
Canadian farmer, free-trader, United States protectionist, 2857
City man and, 2869
Comparison with other countries, 2791
Conditions. *See* Agriculture; Immigration
Debts, 1407, 1412, 2768
Earnings, 2813, 3023
Extravagance, 1888
Farmers' Bloc in United States, 2791
Farmers' movement, 2884
World wide, 2791
Farmers' party. *See* Progressive party
Hard times, 1859
Help for needy, 1404

Farmers—*Con.*
Horse-racing. *See* Race Track Betting
Immigration, 1419. *See also* Immigration
Improvident methods, 1423
Income tax and, qu. 1259, qu. 1486
Industries dependent on prosperity of, 2853
Labour. *See that title*
Manufacturers and, 2716
Market, lack of, 2856
National Farmers' Union of England, 2791
National Policy, 2917. *See also* speeches on Budget
Non-continuous employment, 1888
Organizations, 2815
Future of, 2792
Parliament, in, 2787
Profits, 2873
Pulpwood, export of, 4513. *See also* Export Act Amdt. bill
Purchasing power, 1408, 1851
Reciprocity and, 2924. *See also that title*
Tariff and, 2731, 2916, 3066. *See also* speeches on Budget
Taxes, 4224. *See also* Taxation
United Farmers of Ontario, 4608
Work, 1852

Farms
Abandoned, 67. *See also* Address; Immigration; Lands; School.
Credits. *See* Banks and Banking; Credits

Favoured Nation. *See* Treaties, French Treaty, Italian Treaty

Feathers and Ornaments. *See* Treaties, French Treaty

Federal and Provincial Jurisdiction. *See* Jurisdiction; Lake of the Woods Regulation Bill

Federal Printing Company, Labour Gazette, 1621

Federal Representation. *See* Redistribution

Federal Statutes, enforcement, 1142

Federation of Canadian Students. *See* Students

Feeding Stuffs. *See also* Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. Bill; Grain and Grain Trade
Adulteration, 600, 604
Conference of producers and handlers, 600-4
Control, 599
Milled, mixing with bran and shorts, 600
Screenings, 2039. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade, Elevators

Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. Bill
(Regulation of preparation and sale of milling by-products) Res., 4012, 4270, 4272; 1r., 2r., com., 4276; com., 4538; 3r., 4553

Fenian Raid. *See* Pensions

Fertilizers
Administration of Act, 601
Control, 599
Duty, 3486
Fish waste, manufacture into, 2946
Machinery for, 2645, 2734, 2946, 3486
Nitrate of soda, 2307

Feudal System. *See* Labour, Right to Organize

Fiats, Issuing of. *See* Petition of Right Act

Field Crops. *See* Agriculture

Fielding, Right Hon. W. S. (Minister of Finance)
Acknowledgment of congratulations on being called to Privy Council, 4743
Address in reply 89. Mr. Meighen on the tariff; valuation of goods for customs duties, 90; causes of increase in national debt, 91; railways, cost of taking over, 91-93; national ownership expensive; increase in obligations to United States, 93; loans and interest; money borrowed cheaper from United States, 94; late government's borrowings from United States; Mr. Meighen on sales tax, 94; amendments moved by Progressives; resolution of Liberals in 1921; downward revision of tariff, 96; French treaty, 97; wise expenditure true economy, 97-98; business of country cannot be carried on without increase in public debt, 98; amendments not acceptable to government, 99
Agricultural conditions, Great Britain, 1861
Annuities, old age, basis of computation, 1698
Artificial silk, duty. *See under this title* Customs Tariff Items
Auditor General
Office, salaries and contingencies, 3987, 4674
Report, 434
Unprovided items, 4003
Vacancy, 3987, 4355, 4513
Automobiles
Duty, 3075
Insurance 3147, 3977

Fielding, Right Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 1157, 1310, 4013, 4017, 4075, 4078-4131, 4133-4162
Extension of charters for one year, amdt. (Mr. Speakman) 4017
Government inspection, 1310
Mortgages or hypothecs, amdt. (Mr. Kellner) 4133
One vote for each share, 4085
Postponement, amdt. (Mr. Speakman) 4017
Senate amendments, 4508
Bank Act revision
Inquiry, 255, 496, 644, 858
Res. of Alberta legislature, 2084
Bank draft tax, 3928
Bank mergers, 4134, 4139
Banking and Commerce Com. changes, 2926
Beet sugar excise duty, 2644, 3229, 4393
Belle River harbour, 4597
Binder twine, duty and manufacture, 3231, 4388
Board of Audit Act, 4355, 4369, 4733
Bonds, interest rate and income tax, 4494
British and foreign news service, 4712
British preference, 3454. *See also under this title,* Budget
Direct importation by Canadian ports, 3454, 3895
Goods via Hong Kong and Suez canal, 3455
Increase in, 3488
Liberal convention of 1919, 454
Woollen industry, 3459, 3472
Budget
Date of
Announcement, 2469
Inquiry, 1163, 1483, 1740, 1869, 2128, 2254, 2347, 2469
Debate, precedence, 2694
Record established, 2852
Resolutions, changes, notice, 3046, 4163
Speech, 2640. Finances, income and expenditure over ordinary capital and special expenditure, 2640; advances to Canadian National Railways and Canadian Government Merchant Marine; public debt, addition to; expenditure and taxation; additions to debt diminishing; increase since 1914, 2641; estimate of revenue and expenditure for 1923-24; loans, tax reductions, 2642; sales tax, complexity of; imposition of six per cent tax at source; exemptions from, additions to list of, 2643; receipt tax; cheque tax; French Treaty; Canadian wines, duty on; French brandy, 2643; income tax;

Fielding, Right Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Budget.—*Con.*
cigarette duty; beet root sugar; raisins and dried currants; petroleum, 2644; iron and steel scrap; boots or other appliances for deformities; casual donations; machinery; hemp seed; machinery for conversion or fish waste; oil-drilling machinery; stumping machinery; malt flour; printing machinery; artificial silk; British preferential tariff; direct importation through Canadian ports; sugar duties; 2645 sugar, increase in price; speculation; reduction in duty; dumping clause; copper bounty on bars or rods, 2646; bounty on hemp; linen thread bounty; manila hemp bounty, 2647; petroleum bounty; forest conservation; pulpwood; prohibition of export, royal commission; tariff stability; finality, 2648; relations with United States; Fordney-McCumber tariff; offer of reciprocity; reduction of duties by order in council, 2649; the outlook; trade revival in United States; labour, unemployment; prospects of a return of prosperity, 2650; tariff resolutions, 2650
Supplementary statement, 3074. Appreciation of personal references; speech of Sir Henry Drayton; estimates; revenue, estimate of; tariff weapon in trade negotiations with foreign countries, 3074; France and United States; "no truck nor trade with the Yankees"; automobiles; potatoes; artificial silk duty, 3075; economy; expenditures suggested by Opposition; militia; naval service; bounties; Toronto harbour; St. Lawrence waterway; rural mail carriers; Progressive members and expenditure; Hudson Bay railway; civil service; public works, 3076; protectionist budget; tariff reductions; amendment; speech of leader of Opposition; budget, form of; brevity, 3077; "jacking-up" tariff; financial difficulty due to war and railways; responsibility for; budget, balancing of; new taxation; sales tax; public debt, additions to; reciprocity, offer to negotiate, 3078; possible United States view; reciprocity agreement of 1911; permanency, attitude of United States towards, 3079; position of Conservative party in 1911 and at present time; "no truck or

Fielding, Right Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Budget.—*Con.*
trade with the Yankees", authority for phase, 3080; letter of Mr. Fielding and Mr. Patterson to United States Secretary of State; clear-cut issue; Conservative party against trade with the United States; Liberal party stands for reciprocity; defeat of reciprocity agreement in 1911; sentiment towards question to-day, 3081; budget proposals; no new taxes; tariff reduction; British preference; sugar duty; Canadian ports; simplification of sales tax; reception of budget by country, 3082
Statements omitted, presented, 2926
Burrard Inlet bridge, 4709
Business of the House
Adjournment, hour of, 3208
Budget resolutions, proceeding with, 4163
M. anticipating matter appointed for consideration 3327
M. to increase taxation, 3934, 3936
Privilege—Mr. Clark, 1911
Proceeding, 3127
Questions
Answers to, 343
Framing of, 1386
Passed as orders for returns, 939
Resolutions, unusual to call for explanation, 3583
Returns, inquiries for, 2208, 2254
Cattle embargo correspondence, 4295
Rules, M. (Mr. Johnston) for Special Com., 857, 1300
Speaker's rulings, discussion of, 4076
Supply
Amendment to amendment, 1300
Calling of, 2295
Business profits tax
Arrears, 4491
Collections, 1157
Business Profits War Tax Act Amdt. bill, 4440, 4489
Canadian National railways
Advance, $13,099,493.34, 1752
Branch lines construction bill, 4304-37
Expenditure, appropriation by Parliament, 4337, 4398
Finance, 4329
Ocean ports, 1758
Paris offices, 3614
Securities bill, 4012, 4402, 4516, 4732
Expenditure to be voted by Parliament, amdt. (Mr. Meighen) 4527
Responsibility of government, 4696
Canadian Press, Limited, subsidy, 4729
Canadian team at Olympic games 4707

Fielding, Right Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Cattle embargo, correspondence, 4184, 4295
Cheque tax, 332, 2643, 3922, 3925, 3931, 4423
Cigarette duty, 2644, 3229, 4392
Civil Service
Bonus, 1811
Superannuation, 3402
Calder Act, 3266
Civil Service Superannuation and Retirement Act, 2926, 3146
Clair-Fort Kent bridge, 4590
Commercial union, 3909
Complimentary reference to, 2013
Concurrence, 4735
Interim supply, 1482
Confectionery and beverages, tax, 2644, 2656, 3046
Congratulations on being called to Privy Council, 4742
Consumer, taxation and, 4415
Copper bounty, 2646
Bill, 4369, 4370, 4374, amdt. (Mr. McMaster) 4370
Cory, Mr. W. W., deputy minister of Interior, salary, 4667
Credit and Industry, M. (Mr. Irvine) 644
Amdt. ref. to Banking and Commerce Com., 645
Criticisms of foreign budgets, 2804
Customs Tariff Act 1907 Amdt. bill, 2650, 3963, 4408
Customs Tariff items, 3895. *See also under this title,* Budget
Artificial silk, 2645, 3075, 3489
Drawback, 3502
Fabrics, 3492
Tops or waste 3896
Bisulphate of soda, 3480, 3895
Brass and copper scrap, 3483
Coal, anthracite and lignite, 3493, 3495
Composition and plated metals, 3483
Coverings for goods and machinery, 3501
Crude petroleum, 2648, 2644, 3481
Date when changes effective, 3504
Dehydrated sulphate of copper, 3480, 3895
Drawbacks
Artificial silk, 3502
Copper for electric wires, 3503
Hatters sweats, 3502
Machinery not made in Canada, 3503
Oil used in manufacture of manila rope, 3502
Dry red lead, etc. 3480
Fire-brick, 3481, 3896
Hemp seed, 2645, 3474
Liquorice paste, 3480
Machinery for manufacture of fish waste, 2645, 3486

Fielding, Right Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Customs Tariff—*Con.*
Printing and lithographing presses, **2645,** 3486
Raisins and dried currants, 2644, **3474**
Rolled iron and steel, 3484
Silk cloth woven in the gum, **3489**
Spectacle and eyeglass frames, 3483
Staves of wood, 3487
Sticks or canes, 3501
Stumping machines, 2645, 3486
Velvets, velveteens, etc., 3488
Typewriters and parts, 3485
Well-drilling machinery, 3487
Deportation of British soldier, 2255
Deputy ministers, salary increases, 4667
Dominion observatories, expenditure, 3242
Dredging, government dredges, 4570
Dry Dock Subsidies Act Amdt. bill, 3583
Estimates. *See also under this title,* Supply
Civil government, form of, 612
Further supplementary, **1923-4, 3492**
Main, tabled, 331
Obligations maturing, 1753
Preparation of, 3244
Supplementary, 1923-24
Tabled, 3492, 4536
Time of presentation, 4554
Time of presentation, 4420, 4597, 4601
Experimental farms, 486
Export Act Amdt. bill, 4012, 4345, 4393. *See also under this title,* Pulpwood
Fertilizers, duty, 3486
Finance Act 1914 Amdt. bill 255, 4405
Finance dept., charges of management, **3987**
Forest protection and conservation, **2648.** *See also under this title,* Export Act; Pulpwood
M. (Mr. Michaud) 824
France
Exports to, 1997
Fiscal policy of, 1991, 1995
Trade with, 1990, 1995, 1999
French treaty, 331, 436, 456, 1977, **1990, 2815**
Brandy, 2302, 3478
Bronze powder 1998, 2016, 2270
Canned salmon and lobster, 453
Concessions to border states, 440, **2273**
Consideration of
Inquiry, 1740
Postponed, 2128
Direct importation, 2303
Favoured nation, 448, 2271, 2398
Inconsistent laws, 2303
Luxuries, 446
Machinery and parts, 441
Modus vivendi of 1921, 2260
Sales tax and, 2279, 2280, 2299

Fielding, Right Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
French Treaty—*Con.*
Silks, 448, 2266, 2301, 2398
Tabled, 54
Unfair competition, 2300
United States
Preferential treatment 440, 442
Trade with France, 2277
Wines, 1997, 3937
French treaty bill, 2238, 2255-80, 2299-2304, 2347
M. for 2r., 1910, 1990-95
Grants for historical celebrations, 4705
Halibut fishery treaty, 734, 857
Halifax grain elevator, 4714
Hemp bounty, 2647
Bill, 3911, 3963, 4376, 4388
Housing, loans to provinces, 4704
Hudson Bay railway M. (Mr. Knox) 1079
Immigrants complaints of, 3598
Income tax, **1157, 2644**
Agricultural forms, 4498
Exemption for children, 4503
M. (Mr. Archambault) 1384
Fines, qu. 2180
Income War Tax Act 1917 Amdt. bill, 4492
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, **4360**
Inland Revenue Act Amdt. 2655, **3229, 4392**
Cigarettes, 3229
Insurance Act Amdt. 3045, 3147, **3977, 4357**
Insurance branch, salaries, 3987
Interim supply bills. *See under this title,* Supply
Italian treaty, 331
Signature, 2403
Italian treaty bill, 2394-2404
Concessions to border states 2395
Consideration postponed 2304, 2347
Direct importation, 2401
Favoured nation treatment, 2398
Lapointe Mr., visit to Washington, 734, 857
League of Nations
Canada's contribution 3990
Canadian delegation, expenses, 3989
Legislation. *See also under this title,* Business of the House
Hasty, 1376
Indemnity, etc., 4674
Liberal platform of 1919, not bound by, 2994, 3020
Library, joint committee, 615
Linen yarn
Bounty, 2648
Duty 3897, 3899
Little Anse breakwater, Morrison claim, **4575**
Lumber, sales tax, 4419
Lunenburg harbour, dredging, 4577

Fielding, Right Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Magazines and periodicals
M. (Mr. Hocken) 848
Sales tax, 4415, 4421
Malt flour, duty, 2645, 3480
Manila fibre bill, 2657, 3231, 4369
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, cattle embargo, 3317
Merchants' Bank. *See also under this title,* Bank Act Amdt.
Failure, 4155
Inquiry, expenses, 3990
Ministers and officials, travels, 343
National Gallery, 1019
Naturalization Act M. (Mr. Carroll) 1381
Nickle, shipments to Germany during war, 4372
North Essex election, 2013
Nova Scotia steel bounties, 4371
Oleomargarine
Discussion, 3327
Drawback on materials used, 3503
Further legislation, 2927
M. (Mr. Carroll) 1382, 3530, 3561
Sub-amdt. (Mr. Good) point of order, 3571
Orders in Council, repeal by statute, 3504
Parliamentary restaurant, com., 382
Penny Bank of Toronto, 1739, 2052
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3866, 4749
Pensions
Old age, inquiry, 733
Pension Board, Colonel Thompson, 4749
Senators, to, 1376
Petroleum Bounties bill, 2657, 3920, 3963, 4392
Postage stamps used for revenue purposes, 3927, 3938
Prince Edward Island, car ferry claim, 4676
Printing bureau, new building, 1737
Promissory notes, 3924
Proportional representation
Alternative vote, 389
M. (Mr. Good) 413
Public archives, bonus, 4707
Public buildings, new departmental, 1730
Public debt. *See also under this title,* Budget
Additions to, 2642, 3078
Maturing obligations, 3823
Statement, 2926
Public expenditure, 2641, 4422, 4554
Apportionment of, 4560
Public Service Retirement Act, 3323, 3402
Calder Act, 3977
Public Works estimates, 4554

Fielding, Right Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Publicity agent in London, Mr. Cranfield, 2927
Pulpwood prohibition of export, 2648, 4012, 4345, 4393
Royal commission, 2648, 4709
Quebec Savings Bank Act, 4183, 4392
Railway subsidies, 4304
Raisins and dried currants, duty, 2644
Proclamation by Governor in Council, 3474
Receipt tax, 2644, 3935, 4423
Revision of, 4409
Reciprocity with United States
"No truck or trade with the Yankees" 3075, 3080
Offer to negotiate, 2649, 3454, 3474, 3901, 3903, 3907
Permanency, 3079
Reciprocity agreement of 1911, 3079, 3905
Redistribution, Mr. W. M. Ivel, 733
Roof coverings, investigation, 4703
Royal commission on lake grain rates, 2927
Rules of the House. *See under this title,* Business of the House
Sales tax, 3078, 4181, 4409, 4419. *See also under this title,* Special War Revenue Act
Articles used by hospitals, 4432
Complexity of, 2643
Exemptions, 2643, 4431
Imports, 4409
M. (Mr. Stevens) for committee of inquiry, 919
Magazines and periodicals, 4415, 4421
Public libraries, 1871
Six per cent, imposition at source, 2643
Union Jack, 4515
Select standing committees, membership, 382, 615, 2252
Senate
Abolition of, 1376
M. (Mr. Denis, Joliette) 1375
Senators, pensions to, 1376
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4184
Special War Revenue Act 1915 Amdt. bill 2657, 4363, 4409
Cheque tax, 3922
Sales tax, 4181. *See also under this title,* Sales Tax
Six per cent tax at source, 3938
Wines, excise tax on, 3937
Sugar duties, 2645, 3082, 3479
Beet root sugar, 2644, 3229, 4393
Sunny Brae-Guysborough railway, 4320

Fielding, Right Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Supply. *See also under this title,* Business of the House; Estimates
Bills, 4735
Interim supply, one-sixth vote, 1482, 1538, 3705
Committee, notice, 179
Concurrence, 4732
Tariff. *See also under this item,* Budget speech; Customs Tariff items
Amendments of 1920 and 1921, 3020
Attitude on, 2838
Changes proposed, 2651, 3462, 3895
Commission, evidence, 2296
Resolutions, 2650, 3963
Stability and finality, 2648
Weapon, 3074, 3477
Thornton, Sir Henry, reported statement on immigration, 2795
Tomato plants, duty, 4433
Trade returns, incomplete, 2270
Treaties. *See also under this title,* French, Halibut, Italian
Negotiation of, expenses, 3989
Trade, 437
Union bank, position of, 4298
United States
National Reserve bank, 4407
Reciprocity. *See under this title,* Reciprocity
Trade with France, 1991, 1997. *See also under this title,* French Treaty
Vancouver Creosoting Company, 3233
Vimy Ridge memorial, 183, 811
War claims, Vickers company contract, 1746-7
War loans, delivery of dividend cheques, 1804
Ways and Means committee, 2640
West Ukrainian republic, 656
Wheat board legislation, 2928
Wines. *See also under this title,* French Treaty
Canadian, duty on, 2643
Tax on, 3937
Woollen industry, 447, 3459, 3472

Fiji Islands, trade with, 1848

Finance. *See also* Bank Act Amdt bill; Banks and Banking; Budget; Canadian National Railways; Credits; Loans; Public Debt; Public Expenditure
Amortization plan, 2930
Bonds
Guaranteeing. *See* Canadian National Railways
Interest rate and income tax, 4494
Tax-free, qu. 342, 2914

Finance—*Con.*
British debt to United States, 2878
Dollar reserve in Canada, 2879
Canadian National Railways, securities, approval, 4402. *See also that title*
Central gold reserve, qu. 1739
Complicated and confused, 2915
Credit control, 631. *See also* Credits
Department
Boville, Mr. T. C., service and retirement. qu. 3135
Commissioner of Taxation, salary, 3949
Deputy minister, salary increase, 4670
Estimates, 3987
Distress in West, 1890. *See also* speeches on Immigration
Dividends
Taxation of, 281
Watered stock, 2956
Dominion notes, circulation, qu. 1739
Farm loan bonds bought by farmers, 2770
Financial and class rule in politics, 2733
Financial conditions, analysis, 2984
Financial control of government, 2812
Industry and, 4053
Interest rate, 2812. *See also* Bank Act Amdt. bill
New York loans, 154, 155, 2963
Saskatchewan debentures, sale of, 2770
Securities, on which advances made to banks, 4405
Shares, issue of. *See* Companies Act Amdt. bill
World conditions, 2823, 2878

Finance Act 1914 Amdt. Bill, 255
(Advances to banks, bank payments in notes instead of gold or Dominion notes; export of gold, etc.) Res. 4249, 4405, 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 4408

Financial Post, statement as to labour shortage in lumber camps, 1125

Financial Situation, 2658. *See* speeches on Address; Bank Act Amdt bill; Budget; Immigration

Findlay, Mr. J. W. (South Bruce)
Budget, 2883. Long speeches; a budget Conservatives cannot find fault with; Liberal principles, 2883; tariff proposals; amendment; tariff reduction; disappointed hopes; farmers' movement; return to flesh-pots; member for Muskoka; disappointment with budget; 2884; Liberal platform of 1919, repudiation of, 2885

Finger Prints, offenders against Narcotic Drugs Act, 1136

Finland, immigration from, 1085

Finn, Mr. Robert E. (Halifax)
Canadian National railways, terminals, 4716
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 4678
Halifax grain elevator, 4715
Introduced, 3
Prince Edward Island car ferry terminals claim, 4678

Fire Brick. *See* Customs Tariff Items

Fire Prevention. *See* Forests and Forestry
Roof coverings, investigation, 4703

Fiscal Changes. *See* Budget

Fiset, Sir Eugene. *See* National Defence

Fish and Fisheries. *See also* Marine and Fisheries
Asiatics engaged in, 1453, 1540-1, 1555, 1899, 1900, 2443, 4484-5
Naturalization, 2461
Atlantic fisheries, inquiry into, 2983, 3084, 3365
Bait, purchase by American vessels, 3705
Behring sea, 4485
Bounties, report, 911
British Columbia, 3372
Fisheries Commission, 1453
Fishing licenses, 1540
Japanese fishermen, naturalization certificates, 1899, 2443
Canadian ports use of by United States fishermen, 2735, 2940, 3361, 3906, 4480
Canned and pickled fish, inspection, 3367, 3375
Canned lobster and salmon, French treaty, 452
Canned salmon shipped via Panama canal, 2519, 2615, 3275
Cold storage, 2056
Deep sea fisheries, conservation, 3364, 3365
Express rates, 3365
Fish
Cooking, 3366
Culture, 3367
Demand for, 3364
Inspection Act, enforcement, 3367
Preserved, 1984. *See also* French Treaty
Products, imports, 445, qu. 617
Fishery officers and guardians, 3361
Russel, Mr. James, qu. 1868
Fishery protection service, 3361
United States steamer captured by Malaspina, 2207

Fish and Fisheries—*Con.*
Fishing industry, difficulties and handicaps, 2945, 2972, 3002
Fishing interests and reciprocity, 3082
Fishing schooner race, 114, 115, 906
Fishways
Building fishways and clearing rivers, 3362
St. Andrew's dam, 1000
Salmon River, N.B., 3362
White Mud river, 3362
Found, Mr. W. A., Superintendent, 1548
Freight rates, 1953, 1964, 2946
French treaty, 1978, 2235
Halibut, 151
Close season, 4480
Northern Pacific Halibut Fisheries. *See that title*
Treaty, 857, 858, 4132, 4440, 4437, 4664, 4736
Approval of, 4455
Signing of, 734
Hudson Bay, 1064, 1073. *See also* Hudson Bay railway
International Fisheries Commission, 4480
Japanese fishermen, 1453, 1540-1, 1899, 1900, 2443, 4484, 4485
Japanese fisheries association, 1453
Licenses, reduction of 40 per cent, 1540-1
Lobster season, extension of, 2983, 3084
Machinery for conversion of fish offal into fertilizer, 2645, 2734, 2946, 3486
Margaree Salmon Fisheries Association, 2700, qu. 3262, 3367, 3371
Marine and Fisheries Committee
Reports presented
First, 1384
Second, 1686, 1763
Third, 2983
Markets, 2906
Miramichi smelt fishing, qu. 1974
Modus vivendi, 2906, 2940, 3361
Moving pictures, 3365
Norwegian fishermen, 1192
Orientals engaged in. *See under this title,* Asiatics; Japanese
Pacific coast, 2734
Pickled fish, inspection, 3367, 3375
Publicity, 3364
Reciprocity, 3906. *See also that title*
Rivers and streams, sawdust pollution, 701, 3362
Russel, Mr. James, employment, qu. 1868
Salmon canners' licenses, 1540. *See also* Fisheries Act Amdt. bill
Salmon fisheries, Fraser river, 4461
Sardine fishery, 2518
Smelt, regulations, qu. 1868, qu. 1974

Fish and Fisheries—*Con.*
Steveston Fishermen's Benovolent Society, 1900
Tariff on fish, 112-113
Treaty of 1818, 2906
Trout-fishing season, 1686
United States
Fishing vessels, licenses, 911
Markets, 2906
Modus vivendi. *See under this title,* Modus Vivendi
Tariff, 2734, 2940
Schooner, capture of, 2207

Fisher, Prof. Irving, purchasing power, 4666

Fisher, the late Hon. Sydney, 2057
Copyright Act, 2140

Fisheries Act 1914 Amdt. Bill (Salmon canners' licenses) 1r., 4009; 2r., com., 3r., 4207

Fisheries Commission. *See* British Columbia

Fisheries Protection Service. *See* Fish and Fisheries

Fishing Schooner Race, 114, 115, 906

Flags, Union Jack, sales tax, 4514

Flathead District highway, qu. 2085

Flavelle, Sir Joseph, 157, 1612

Flax. *See* Grain and Grain Trade; Linen

Fleming, Sir Sandford, port of Shippegan, 2938

Flexner, Dr., discovery of serum for spinal menengitis, 1287

Flour. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade,
Freight rates, 1914, 2127
French treaty, 1978
Malt flour, duty, 3480
Milling in bond, 2960
Ocean rates, 2127
Discrimination against Canadian, 1906 2761
Prices in Canada and Great Britain, 1906
Protection, 146-147
Reciprocity in, 2993
Shipments
Canadian and United States ports through, 1767
China, to, 1840
Transportation, earnings of railways, 2960

Fontaine, Mr. J. E. (Hull)
Budget, 2814. Congratulations to Finance Minister; public debt; war scandals; administration of Sir Wilfrid Laurier; progress and prosperity, 2814; Borden-Meighen administration; speculation and profiteering; origin of farmers and labour party; democratic policy of

Fontaine, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
present administration; agriculture, condition and encouragement of; French and Italian treaties; Australia, trade agreement with; Turkey, threatened war with; Canada's participation, 2815; financial conditions; economy; European affairs; Canadian policy; immigration policy; emigration to the United States; protection of Canadian labour; Georgian Bay canal; Civil Service Commission, unconstitutionality of; patronage, 2816; dismissals and appointments after 1911; classification; the Griffenhagens; old age pensions; amendment, Mr. Forke; western provinces, contribution of the East to development of; tariff and revenue, 2817
Civil Service Commission, 2816
Old age pensions, 2817

Food. *See* Agriculture; Consumer; Cost of Living; Prices

Food and Drugs Act
Administration, 697
Butter. *See* Dairy Industry Act Amdt. bill

Ford Car. *See* Automobiles

Ford, Henry, Automobile duty, 2908

Fordney-McCumber Tariff. *See* United States

Foreign Markets. *See* Trade; Treaties, French, Italian

Foreign Policy. *See* Imperial Conference; Near East Crisis

Foreign Vessels, registration. *See* Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill

Foreigners. *See also* Aliens; Immigration
Canadian citizenship, value of, 2911
Germans in Peace river district, 1184
Naturalization of. *See that title*

Forest Reserves and Parks Act. *See* Dominion Forests

Forests and Forestry. *See also* Export Act Amdt. bill; Natural Resources; Pulp and Paper; Timber
Aerial patrol, 1748
Alberta, 1778
British Columbia, 1776
Manitoba, 1778
Nova Scotia, 1778
Ontario and Quebec, 1776, 1778

Forests and Forestry—*Con.*
Aeroplanes used in protection work, 1776
Barnjum, Mr. Frank J. D., 821, 2948, 3412, 4348
Campbell, Mr. R. H., Superintendent of Forestry, retirement, 3410
Canadian Forestry Association, grant, 3409
Conservation, 2648, 2947, 2950, 4349. *See also* Export Act Amdt. bill
Development, 2744
Empire Forestry Conference, 3410
Forest fires, 816
Conscription of fire-fighters, 3409
Fires started to make employment, 3409
Relief, 4010
Forest products, exports of, 1776. *See also* Pulp and Paper; Timber
Forest protection, 1776, qu. 2205, 3415
M. (Mr. Michaud) 816
Georgia pine, importation, 3411
Insect pests and fungous diseases, 817, qu. 2178, qu. 2697, 3416
Moose mountain reserve, 3453
Spruce bud worm, 596, 2179
White pine blister rust, 595
Land, clearing by fire, 1185
Moose mountain forest reserve, 3453
Provincial ownership, jurisdiction and responsibility, 3416
Pulp, paper, forest products, export, 2750. *See also* Pulp and Paper; Timber
Reforestation, 3412, 4349
Reserves. *See also* Dominion Forest Reserves
Roads and bridges, 1014
Shelter belts, 459
Spanish River Pulp and Paper Company, aerial patrol, 1776
Tree-planting
Associations, 3415
Prairies, on, 3412
Turtle Mountain reserve, 3413

Forke, Mr. Robert (Brandon)
Address in reply, 34. Thanks to previous speakers for references to himself; congratulations to mover and seconder; resignation of Mr. Crerar as leader of Progressives, 34-35; Canada's position in relation to other countries; trek from country to city, 35; trade treaties; trade expansion 36; co-ordination of National Railways; new board of directors, Sir Henry Thornton, 36; lake freights inquiry; Crowsnest pass agreement, 36-37; immigration; natural resources, 37; farm labourers; tariff and taxation; revision of Bank Act; committee to inquire into agricultural problems, 38; causes of present agricultural depression, 38-39; bill to safeguard interests of consumers and producers; cattle embargo; economy in expenditure, 39; civil service reform, 39-40; redistribution; our national status, recommendations to government, 41
Agriculture
Condition of, 1107, 1852
Co-operation, 1852
Expenditure, 3240
Alberta coal, 794
Bait, purchase by American vessels, 3705
Banff national park, power leases, 3939
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4044, 4097, 4100, 4107
Bank Act revision, inquiry, 858
Banking and Commerce Com., member of, 2639
Bankruptcy Act Amdt bill, 3213
Banting, Dr. F. G., 4438
Barnjum, Mr. Frank J. D., work of, 3412
Belle River harbour, 4606
Bounties, agriculture, 3240
British preference
Canadian ports, direct importation, 3456
Woollen goods, 3460, 3470
Budget
Reported statement on, 2946
Speech on, comment, 2853
Speech, 2711. Congratulations to Minister of Finance; budget disappointing; financial position of country; railway and shipping deficits, 2711; debt; increase in; economy; taxation a billion dollars a year; Britain's example to Canada; limit to tax-paying powers increasing cost of government, 2712; machinery of distribution; parasites between producer and consumer; tariff and tax changes; buying and selling; British preference; trade with Great Britain, 2713; best market for agricultural products, 2714; ocean freight rates; tariff and combines; natural resources; "stability of tariff" Liberal tariff policy; Moose Jaw election, 2714; handwriting on the wall; budget a disappointment to the West; exodus; agricultural and manufactured products, prices; Canada a dear country to live in; high cost of living; manufacturing industries, 2715; production, cost of; taxation of commodities; relations between farmer and manu-

Forke, Mr. Robert—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
facturer; agriculture, position of, 2716; potential wealth of the prairies; immigration, taxation and railway troubles; commercial rivalry; amendment, 2717
Canada Colonization Association. *See under this title,* Immigration
Canada Highways bill, 2340
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, advances, 3798, 3833
Canadian National railways
Appointments, 2472
Branch lines construction bill, 4192, 4338, 4399
Management, responsibility and powers, 3640
Minister's annual statement, 1617
Paris offices, 3646, 3672
Meighen, Right Hon. Mr., reference to, 3672, 3678
Toronto office building, 3641
Cattle boats, conditions, 2613
Cattle shipments to Great Britain, 3641
Vessel space, 1868
Cheque tax, amendment, 3934, 3935
Chilled meat, 463
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 361, 565
Civil Service Commission, salaries, 3986
Coasting regulations, suspension, 4236, 4290
Combines bill, 2579, 2618-36
Discussion, reservation of right, 2520
Copper bounty bill, 3240, 4376
Copyright Act Amdt. bill, 2145, 2346
Cost of living, 1813
Dairy Industry Act 1914 Amdt. bill, 4254
Deceased members, tribute to, 7
Deep sea fisheries, 3364
Depression in England, 1854
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 2386
Distribution, cost of, 1852
Dominion Lands Act Amdt. bill, homesteads, 3983
Duke and Duchess of York, congratulations on wedding, 2252
Economic conditions, wealth production, 1856
Eggs, price of, 1852
Emigration to the United States, 1109
Europe, reconstruction, 4654
Excise taxes, payment with postage stamps, 1820
Experimental farms, 463
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4549
Fielding, Right Hon. Mr.
Complimentary reference, 2013
Congratulations on being called to Imperial Privy Council, 4742

Forke, Mr. Robert—*Con.*
Fishways, 3363
Free trade, 3024
Freight rates
Crowsnest pass agreement, 1617, 1932
Concession forced by Progressives, explanation, 2971
Manitoba-Canadian Northern agreement, 1933
Railway rates, equalization, M. (Mr. Clark) 1932
French Treaty bill, 2012, 2261, 2267
Fuel supply, 794
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 332-3
Georgia pine, importation, 3411
Grondines wharf, 968
Halibut fishery treaty, 4466
Hayes, Mr. John J., dismissal of, 1693
Hudson Bay railway, M. (Mr. Knox) 1047
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1407, 1479
Letter not read by Prime Minister, 1333
Letter to Mr. M. A. Brown, 1333, 1336
Personal explanation, 1105
Detailed estimates, 1464, 1481
Empire settlement scheme, 1464
Hebridean immigrants, treatment of, 3593
Policy, 1105-1110
Imperial Conference, 4654
Indemnity of members, 4241
Indians
Condition of, 2147
Manitoba, 2125
Sioux, 2159, 2160
International boundaries, surveys, 3248
Lack of Confidence, M. (Mr. Irvine) 231
Lake Grain Rates, royal commission, 3507
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4222-32, 4285
Lake of the Woods regulation bill, 4178
Liberal policy, reversal of, 3007
Lightkeepers' salaries and allowances, 3353
Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill, 2201
Lunenburg dredging, 4577
Macphail, Miss, members and party funds 4238
Magazines and periodicals, M. (Mr. Hocken) 845
Merchants' bank, 4297
Moose Jaw by-election, 2714
Delay in return, 2295
Naturalization Acts Amdt. 2187, 2193, 2454
Winnipeg Free Press editorial, 2454
Near East Crisis, 40
Newspapers
Monopoly, 2580
Postage, 4534

Forke, Mr. Robert—*Con.*
Newspapers—*Con.*
Size of, 4534
North Essex by-election, 4606
Northern Pacific Halibut Fisheries Protection bill, 4483
Oleomargarine, inquiry as to legislation, 2519
M. (Mr. Carroll) 3524, 3526
Sub-amdt. (Mr. Good) point of order, 3572
Patents of Invention bill, 2066
Penitentiaries, 771
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3884, 4534
Postal appointments, 1800
Proportional representation, single transferable vote, 2181
Protection and world conditions, 2752
Public buildings, Manitoba, 4629
Public Works Act, tender and contract, 956
Redistribution, intention of government, 4250
References to, 11, 17, 18, 27, 55
Renovated butter, 4254
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 1150
Rural mail delivery, extension, 1790
Sales tax, 4431
Barley flour, 4431
M. (Mr. Stevens) for com. of inquiry, 920
Secretary of State, estimates, 2392
Seed grain advances, 3445
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4238-42
Shipping combine, 4223
Soldier settlement, 2027
Supplementary estimates, time of bringing down, 4555
Three Rivers harbour bill, 3968
Titles, honours and decorations, M. (Mr. Ladner) 1291
Trade barriers, 2214
Tree-planting on prairies, 3412
Union bank, position of, 4250, 4272
M. to adjourn House, 4296
Vimy Ridge monument, 182
War, Canada's participation in, 4655
War claims, 2496
West Ukrainian republic, 656
Woollen industry, protection, M. (Mr. Drummond) 934

Forrester, Mr. William (South Perth)
Linen yarn duty, 3897

Fort Churchill. *See* Hudson Bay railway

Fort Edward, Windsor, N.S., 3406

Fort Frances Pulp and Paper Company, 2573

Fort William
Elevators. *See* Grain and Grain Trade
Grain shipments, 1114
Harbour improvements, 2675, 4610

Fortier, Mr. H. A. (Labelle)
Budget, 2831. War sacrifices; Liberal party heir to burdensome estate; public debt; Canadian National railways; deficits; economy; improved financial situations; borrowings and interests payments; taxation, reduction of; tariff; downward revision; reciprocity, 2831; resources; British preference; introduction and further increase of; French and Italian treaties; friendly relations between France and Canada; Rodin's statue of France; gift of site for Vimy memorial; Canadian National railways, management; President and board, 2832; western settlement made possible by railway construction; British Columbia; Quebec; Transcontinental railway; development of Abitibi region; contribution of railways to development of country; immigration, 2833; land awaiting settlement; provincial land grants; emigration to the United States; natural increase of population; immigrants, recruiting and selecting; choice of location, 2834; repatriation; the future, 2835
British preference, 2832
Woollen goods, 3458
Canada Highways bill, 2341
Canadian National railways, branch lines, 4199
Civil Service Act M. (Mr. Power) 548
Export Act Amdt. bill, pulpwood, 4347
Immigration, 2833
Colonization in eastern provinces, 1134
Policy, 1134
Quebec into, 1104
Labelle country development, 4199
Lack of confidence, M. (Mr. Irvine) 235
Montford railway, 4199
Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. bill, 2119
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 3984
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3543
Patents of Invention bill, 2071, 2098
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4347
Ruling as chairman, 4293
Senate and House of Commons bill, 4244
Titles, honours and decorations, M. (Mr. Ladner) 1296

Fortin and Moffatt, Transcontinental railway claim, 3646

Foster, Mr. A. de Witt, qu. 1633

Foster, Right Hon. Sir George, Hudson Bay railway, 1061

Foster Homes. *See* Immigration, Child

Found, Mr. W. A., Superintendent of Fisheries, 1548

Fox-Breeding Industry, 588, 2763

France. *See also* Treaties, French Treaty
- Agricultural products, 2247
- Balance of trade, 2204, 2221
- Canadian Commissioner General, 4001
- Canadian travelling exhibition in, 811, 4711
- Convention of commerce with. *See* Treaties, French Treaty
- Devastated areas, reconstruction, 2012, 2219
- Exports and imports, 1977, 1997, 2004, 2015, 2210, 2213, 2222
- Fiscal policy of, 1991, 1995
- Franc, value of, 2009
- Franco-German relations, 4652
- Friendly relations with, 2216
- German reparations, 440. *See also* Germany
- Immigration from, 1085, 1173
- Imports from. *See* Imports and Exports; Treaties, French Treaty
- League of Nations, Canada's contribution, 3992
- Paris agency, 4001
- Peace treaty and. *See* Germany, reparations
- President of, letter from, Vimy Ridge memorial, 1538
- Reciprocity treaty with Great Britain, 3050
- Relations with, 2832
- Rodin's statue, 2832
- Ruhr, invasion of, 2748, 2822
- Senate, constitution of, 1371
- Silks, export to Canada, 2397
- Surplus, 2823
- Tariff against Canadian goods, 1999, 2015
- Trade relations with, 1990, 1995, 2218
- Trade treaties with, 437. *See also* Treaties, French Treaty
  - Termination of, 1999
- Vimy Ridge, gift of memorial site, 1538, 2832. *See also* Vimy Ridge
- War losses, 2215, 2256
- Woollen industry, competition, 2958

Franchise. *See also* Dominion Elections
- Amendment to Act, inquiry, 3223
- Equality of citizenship between men and women, 3059
- Hindu, 503, 4640. *See also that title*
- Withholding of, 2456
- Women, to, 408
- Orientals to. See Immigration, Orientals; Naturalization

Fraser River
- Fisheries. *See* British Columbia Fisheries
- Improvements, 1003, 1006

Fraud, obtaining fiats by. *See* Petition of Right Bill

Fredericton experimental farm, 460, 471

Free Trade. *See also* Budget; Copper Bounty bill; Export Act Amdt. bill; Hemp Bounty bill
- Advocacy of in western Canada, 2752
- Agriculture, 1858
- Binder twine, 4379
- Difficulties in the way of, 3010
- Effect of in different sections, 1246
- Free list, goods on. *See* Budget; Customs; Reciprocity
- Great Britain, 1858, 2721, 2752, 2777, 2854, 3012, 3050, 3059, 3847
- Liberal party and, 3068
- Necessities of life, 1230
- No cure for Canada's ills, 2982
- Not a practical question, 2745
- Potatoes, 2820
- Progressive party amd, 1196, 2818, 3030
- Protection and, 2806, 2922
- Pulpwood, prohibition of, 4349
- Tariff stability, 2648
- Tendency towards protection, 2822, 3009
- Theory and practice, 3050
- United States, 1113, 2737, 2746

Freight Cars. *See* Canadian National Railways

Freight Rates. *See also* Address; Budget; Canadian National Railways; Canals; Grain and Grain Trade; Hudson Bay Railway; Railway Commission; Railways; St. Lawrence River Waterways; Transportation
- Adverse. *See* Immigration; Vancouver Harbour bill
- Agriculture and, 1416, 1424
- Alberta, discrimination against, 1957, 1958
- Apples and vegetables, Nova Scotia to Montreal and Toronto, 626
- British Columbia
  - Discrimination against, 1914
  - Equalization, 1911, 1914
- Building materials, 1961, 3036
  - Brick and cement, 3017
- Butter, 1961
- Canada Steamship Lines, Limited. Sir Henry Thornton, 3845
- Canadian National Railways. *See that title*
- Canned goods and fish, 1915
- Cattle export trade, 2127, 2963, 3040

Freight Rates—*Con.*
Cheese, 1961
Chemicals, 1920
Coal, 84, 795, 1264, 1272, 1278, 1280, 1964, 2828, 2875, 3199, 3200, 3621. *See also* Coal; Fuel Supply
Alberta, 1275, 1282, 3009
Excessive, 1345
Increase of 300 per cent, 1277
Maritime provinces, 1813
Red Deer Valley Coal Operators' Association, res. 1275
United States railways, 1266
Coasting regulations, suspension, 4290
Consumers and, 1958
Control of, 4226
Crowsnest pass agreement, 1617, 1620, 1912, 2741, 2836, 2852, 2854. *See also* Lake Grain Rates bill and *under this title,* Railway Rates, Equalization
Charge that Progressives had forced concession, 2854, 2875
Explanation by Mr. Forke, 2971
Discrimination in favour of Western Canada, 3239
Furniture manufacturers, 2855, 2875
Manufactured products, 2855
Railway receipts, decrease of, 3036
Restoration of rates, results, 1620
Saving absorbed by lake shipping companies, 2961
Discrimination, 130, 3195. *See under this title,* Railway Rates, Equalization; *see also* Railway Act Amdt.
Downward revision, 3195
Eggs, 1962
Emigration and, 1440
Equalization. *See also* Railway Act Amdt. bill *and under this title,* Railway Rates
Fish, 1953, 1964, 2946
Flour, 1914, 2127
Discrimination against Canadian, 1906, 2761
Freight classification, 1618, 2876
Grain, 260, 1914, 1960, 1965, 2854, 3194, 3680
St. Lawrence river channel, 3343
High, 2812
Highways and, 1619
Hudson Bay railway 1035, 3779
Immigration and, 1133, 1181
Increase of, 1134, 3190
Iron and steel, 1964
Lake and river, 3776
Fixing, 4284
Lower, demand for, 3024
Lumber, 1961, 2875
Pulpwood, ties and, 3036

Freight Rates—*Con.*
Manitoba, 1932
Canadian Northern agreement, 1939
Maritime provinces, 1963
Mountain scale, 1912
Operating costs and, 1761
Pacific standard tariff, 1914
Potatoes on, 137-138
Prairie scale, 1912, 1915
Railway and shipping, 1051, 1114, 1395, 4226. *See also under this title,* Shipping
Railway Commission
Appeal from, 1912
Hearing, 3190
Railway rates
Attorney General of British Columbia vs. C.P.R. 1916
Equalization of, 1400, 1437, 2868, 3191
British Columbia, terms of union, 1916
Canadian Northern and British Columbia, guarantee, 1917
Control of rates, 1917
Canadian Pacific railway construction of, 1916
Carvell, Hon. F. B., letter to Associated Boards of Trade, 1915
Construction, cost, 1918
Earnings, 1919
Grain, 1921
Long haul, 1920
M. (Mr. Clark) 1284, 1490, 1911, 1914
Ruling of Mr. Speaker, 1284, 1307
Oliver, Hon. John, 1915, 1952, 1955
Operation, cost, 1918
Railway Commission, judgment of June 30th, 1922, 1914
Traffic, density of, 1920
Railway transportation costs committee, evidence, 1919
Railways, qu. 625
Canadian National railways, 3621. *See also that title*
Saving by projected Winnipeg-St. Croix route, 2899
Reduction of, 1101, 1400, 2800, 2868, 3194
Rice, 1915
Shipping, 144, 171, qu. 206, 310, 1395, 4077. *See also* Lake Grain Rates
Agricultural conditions, Special Com. report, 2127
Armstrong bill, 4284, 4290
Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, Sir Henry Thornton, 3848
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, qu. 2613, 3806
Vessels, qu. 3262

Freight Rates—*Con.*
Shipping—*Con.*
Canadian Liner Committee, 2127
Cattle, shipment to Great Britain, 2127, 2963, 3040
Coasting regulations, suspension of, 494, 2959, 4231
Combine, 2578, 2581, 2583, 2667, 2828, 2954, 2960, 4223, 4226, 4277
Control of by Railway Commission, qu. 2611
Discrimination, 4290
Canadian ports, against, 2960
Dominion Marine Association, 2613
Flour, 2127
Freight and passenger, 2174
Grain, 2517, 2828, 4290
Great Lakes and St. Lawrence, 14, 36, 48, 52, 68, 206, 247, 302, qu. 2611
Increase of, 2960
Lake and ocean, 3763
Lake grain rates. *See that title*
Lake Grain Rates Commission, 1395, qu. 2611, qu. 2612, 2710, 3960
Personnel, 4231, 4234
Report, 2885, 4277
Legislation, 3265, 3507
Printing, 2927, 3045
Salaries and expenses, 4710
Live stock, 2133, 2758
New York pool, 3806
North Atlantic and U. K. Conference Eastbound, 2127, 2760
Ocean, 2127
Flour, Canadian, discrimination, 2761
Livestock rates, 2758. *See also* Livestock
Return cargoes, 2714
St. Lawrence river waterway, 3762
"Shipping barons", 2960
Standard Shipping Company, 1704, 4278
Steamship combines, 2667
Subsidized steamships, 2714, 4003. *See also* Steamship Services
Weekly Liner Committee, 2127
Welland canal, 3762
Wolvin, Mr. Roy, 1704
Wolvin, Messrs, 4285. *See also* Lake Grain Rates Bill
Textiles, 1964
Thornton, Sir Henry, 1915, 3848
Transfer charges, 2876
Transportation cost committee, 1944
United States, 2801
Waterways, 1619
Western Canada and, 1887

Freight Rates—*Con.*
Westward from prairie provinces, M. (Mr. Clark) 1158. *See also under this title,* Railway Rates, Equalization
Wheat, discrimination in favour of, 2946

French-Canadians
Bravery and courage, 165, 2935
Deputy Ministers, 1805
Repatriation, 1462
Settlement in New Ontario, 1401

French Language
Difficulties, 1341
Editorial Committee, elimination of French publications, 1670
Immigration officials, Quebec, qu. 4752
Insurance bill, French version, 3147
Magazines and periodicals, 842
References to, 166
Translation and printing, 1489
Bills, 4435

French River improvement work, qu. 620, 2682

French Treaty. *See this title under* Treaties

Frenette. Mr. George, postmaster, St. Jean d'Evangeliste, qu. 2698

Fruit. *See also* Cold Storage Act Amdt.; Treaties, French Treaty
Apples
Imports, qu. 617
New varieties, 2307
Banana trust, 2979
British Columbia, 104, 2763, 2942
Canadian Council of Horticulture, 2307
Combines, 2616
Competition from United States, 2977, 2980
Dehydration of, 4674
Dumping clause, 2988
Estimates, 598
Fiji islands, from, 1848
Foreign
Competition, 2979
Importation, 2979
Taxation of, 2979
Freight rates from Maritime provinces, 626
Fruit-growing industry
Annapolis valley, 104, 2763
British Columbia, 104, 2763, 2942
Depression, 3002
Niagara district, 104, 2225, 2763, 2765
Fruit union of the Okanagan, 2526
Grading. *See* Sale and Inspection of Fruit and Fruit Containers
Grape-growing industry, 2742. *See also* Treaties, French Treaty
Grapes, export, 2270

Fruit—*Con.*
Grape-growing—*Con.*
Price in Niagara district, 2225
Wine manufacture, 1977
Imports of dried and prepared fruit, 445
Insects and pests, 596
Inspection. *See* Sale and Inspection of Fruit
Marketing, 463
Mediterranean, importation, 1636
Pears, new varieties, 2307
Plums, new varieties, 2307
Pomology, experimental work in, 463
Pre-cooling plant, 464, 2056, 2765. *See also* Cold Storage Act Amdt. bill
Prunes and dried plums, 3474
Raisins, imports of, qu. 2699
Duty, 2657, 2718, 3474. *See also* Budget; Customs Tariff items
Sale and Inspection. *See that title*
Trees, new varieties, 2307

Fruit and Fruit Containers. *See* Sale and Inspection

Fuel Oil. *See also* Oil
California and Oklahoma, 1245
Importation of, 1245

Fuel Supply, 84, qu. 203. *See also* Coal; Freight Rates; Mines and Minerals; Natural Resources; Oil; Railways
Adams, Dr. Frank D., coal situation, 1265
Advisory Fuel Committee, 1278, 4691
Anthracite coal, embargo on, 4394
Bermingham, Mr., President Delaware and Lackawana Railway, evidence, 1279
Camsell, Dr. Charles, Deputy Minister of Mines, 1265
Canadian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy, 1268
Central heating plants, 3199
Coal. *See also that title*
Alberta
Freight rate on, 3009
Mines, 3424
Areas in Canada, 1344
Cost, 1700, 3198. *See also* Cost of Living
Duty, 3493
Embargo on United States, 1279
Freight rates, 2828, 2875
Imports, qu. 516, 2828
Production and, qu. 490
Offset by exports of electric energy, 1266
Mines, 2785
Canadian, 1247, 1344
Prices, 3198
Substitutes for, 3199
Welsh, 3199
Coking. *See also* Coal, Coke

Fuel Supply—*Con.*
Coking—*Con.*
Coke-ovens, establishment of, 788
Municipal plants, 3200
Dominion Fuel Board
Salaries and expenses, 3197
Statement of work and suggestions, 3199
Exploitation, 1344
Federal Advisory Fuel Committee, 1274, 3198
Freight rates, 1919, 2855, 2875, 3199, 3200
Fuel testing, 789, 3197
House construction, 3203
Hudson's Hope, possibilities, 3198, 3202, 4699
Industrial and scientific research, 788
Interstate Commerce Commission, investigation, 1279
Investigation, 3427
Lignite
Bienfait briquetting plant, 789, 2509, 2512, 3206
Lignite Utilization Board, 387, 2515
Mines and Minerals Committee
Suggested reference to 1271
Report, 4436, 443
M. (Mr. Church) for a national fuel policy, 1262
Amdt. (Mr. Carroll) for reference to Mines and Minerals Committee, 1271
Suggested amendment of, 1284
Oil shale deposits, 2513
Peat
Alfred peat plant, qu. 1487
Experiments, 790, 3199
Joint Peat Committee, 387
Public ownership and, 3200, 3205
Pulverized fuel 3199
Resources, 1264
Shortage, deaths of children from, 751, 1657
Sifton, Sir Clifford, on, 1265
Smith, Mr. George Otis, export of coal from United States 1265
Special committee, appointment of, qu. 617. *See also under this title,* Mines and Minerals
Steam, 789
Thornton, Sir Henry, evidence, 1919
Waters powers, 3203

Fundy. *See* Bay of Fundy

Fungus and Insect Diseases. *See* Insect Pests

Furness Withy Company, ocean rates, 2127

Furniture
Crowsnest pass agreement, 2855, 2875
French Treaty, 1982, 1989
House of Commons, qu. 1138

Furs
French treaty, 1981
Sales tax, 2742

Galicians. *See* Immigration

Gallipoli Peninsula. *See* Near East Crisis

Gambling. *See also* Criminal Code Amdt.; Race Track Gambling
Futures, in, 3058
Staples of life, in, 3058
Stock exchange, 3058

Game. *See* Dominion Lands and Parks

Gardens, absence from farm homes, 1423

Gaols. *See* Justice, Penitentiaries; Capital punishment at. *See that title*

Garbage Feeding. *See* Hog Cholera

Gardiner, Mr. Robert (Medicine Hat)
Agricultural conditions, 1903
Agricultural exports, 1904
Audibility of debate, 4580
Bacon, Canadian prices, 1905
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4095, 4096
Bank officials, as insurance agents, 4095
Belle River harbour, 4601
Business of the House
Bills, distribution, 4276
Bills not printed, 4185
M. that Committee rise, 4185
Business profits tax, arrears, 4491
Canada Colonization Association, 1878
Canada Highways bill, 2342
Canadian Forestry Association, grant, 3409
Canadian National Railways, branch lines, 4321
Coal leases, 3424
Copper bounty bill 3436
Cost of living, reduction, 1907
Deputy Postmaster General, appointment, 1806
Exhibitions, 1454
Experimental farms 470-486
Exports and imports, 1841
Farm credits, 1907
Farm mortgages 1841
Farmers, competition with world, 3236
Flour, price in Canada and Britain, 1906
Grain and grain trade
Adulteration of Canadian grain at United States ports, 3650
Grain commissioners, board of, 787
Grain samples for exhibitions, 1454, 1455
Grazing
Lands, southern Alberta, 3424

Gardiner, Mr. Robert—*Con.*
Grazing—*Con.*
Leases, 3426
Hanna-Medicine Hat branch line, 4321
Highways, Alberta, 2342
Hogs, grading, 590
Horses, market for, 590
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1878
Expenditure, 1908
Policy, 1903
Indemnity of members, 4237
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4205, 4276
Land valuation, 1878
Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill, 192-3
Lunenburg harbour, 4580
Mackenzie district, half-breed claims, 3409
Manitoba, agricultural conditions, 1906
Medicine Hat customs employees, qu. 3505
National parks
Banff, electric light plant, 3435
Water power leases, 3939
Natural resources of western provinces, 3424
Oil
Leases, 3423
Monitor district, 2514
Speculation in claims, 3423
Postal appointments, 1801, 1806
Postmasters, 1809
Railway mail service, 1801
Canadian National and Canadian Pacific railways, 1791
Saskatoon-Edmonton, 1790
Rural depopulation, 1906
Rural mail delivery, 1801
Seed inspection, weed seeds, 197
Seed Purchasing Commission, 601
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt bill, 4185, 4237-4246
Amdt. six months' hoist, neg. 4246
Settlers
Relief, 3448
Transportation facilities for, 2172
Soldier settlement, 2024
Land valuation, 1878
Salvage cases in Quebec, 2029
Steamship services, 2171, 2172
Inspection of, 2178
Stockyards, discrimination, 192
Stumping machines, duty, 3486
Tariff, agricultural conditions and, 1907
Tree-planting association, 3415
Water power leases, 3422
Western provinces, conditions in, 1903

Garland, Mr. E. J. (Bow River)
Advisory Fuel Committee, 4691
Agricultural conditions, 1201

Garland, Mr. E. J.—*Con.*
Alberta
Coal resources, 801, 1275, 4692
Insolvent farmers, 1202
Arctic expedition, new ship, 4702
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4069, 4078-4126
Business and powers of banks, amdt., agency, 4093, withdrawn, 4094
Interest rate, 4125
Bank mergers, 4237
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3211
Banks and banking
Pressure on farmers, 1202
Profits, 1209
Buffalo, slaughter of, 4702
Business of the House, private members' day, 1158
Cahill, Mr., speech on immigration, 1209
Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, war claims, qu. 3142
Canada-West Indies steamship service, 3378, 3383, 3809
Amdt. to reduce, 3395, neg. 3398
Trade agreement, 3392
Canadian Forestry Association, grant, 3414
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, advance, 3824, 3838
Canadian National railways
Advance of $1,550,000, 4694
Branch lines bill, 4308-22, 4694
Hanna-Warden-Loverna railway, qu. 4436
Canadian Pacific railway
Dividends, 1203
Net earnings, 1130
Canned salmon, shipment via Panama canal, 2519, 2615, 3275
Coal. *See also under this title,* Alberta
Alberta, shipment to Ontario, 1163
Bituminous, duty on, 1275
Combines bill, 2616
Commodity prices, increase in, 1084
Copper bounty bill, 3238, 3241
Credits, function, Mr. (Mr. Irvine) 647
Customs duty on goods shipped from one Canadian port to another, 2519, 2615, 3275
Dairy Industry Act 1914 Amdt. bill, 4253
Dominion Lands and Parks, salaries, 3251
Dredging, maritime provinces, 1011
Emigration to the United States, 1206
Employment service, director of, 1676
Esquimalt dry dock, 2673
Experimental farm buildings, 4630
Exports, agricultural machinery and farm products, 814
Farmers and bankruptcy, 3211
Farming equipment, 1088
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt bill, 4540

Garland, Mr. E. J.—*Con.*
Fish culture, 3371
Fishing schooner race, 115
Fuel and power resources, 801, 3427
Fuel supply, M. (Mr. Church) 1275
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 327
Government publications, distribution, 1715
Grain, Canadian, adulteration at United States ports, 3649, 3962
Hamilton public building, 4628
Hanna-Warden and Loverna-Warden branch lines, 4308, 4322, 4436
Harbours and rivers, 1001
Hector celebration, grant, 4705
M. to reduce, 4706
Historical celebrations, grants for, 4706
Homestead inspectors, 3251
Hoppe and Isenburg leases, cancellation, 3146
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1208
Agreement, signing of, 1976
Empire settlement scheme, 1204, 1205
Immigration, population, natural increase, 1871-1921, 1207
Literature, misrepresentations, 1203
National railways and, 1121
Policy, 1200
Sifton, Sir Clifford, statement, 1204
Steamship companies and, 1201
"The Unseen Hand," 1201
Total expenditure on, 1208
Indemnity of members, 4242
Indians
Blackfeet reserve, 2148
British Columbia, 2163
Chieftainship, 2148
Greater production, 2150
Prices charged to, qu. 3142
Interest, 4107, 4125
International boundary, survey and demarcation, 3248
Irrigation, surveys and inspections, 3430
Land leasing, 1101
Lightkeepers' salaries and allowances, 3352
Marine biological board, 3371
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, salary, 3352
National monument, Connaught place, Ottawa, 1021
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 3985
Northwest territories, new ship, 4702
Peguis, Saulteaux Indian chief, monument, 4704
Penitentiaries, 770
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3870
Pickled fish, inspection of, 3367
Plamondon, Alberta, dredging, 1013
Political patronage, 3347

Garland, Mr. E. J.—*Con.*
Port Colborne elevator, 4690
Prince Edward Island, car ferry claim, 4678
Printing bureau, 1710
Proportional representation, single transferable vote, 1660
Public buildings
Maritime provinces, 4614
Saskatchewan, 4629
Radiotelegraphy, 3374
Renovated butter, 4253
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 776
Royal Mail Packet Company's boats, 3390
St. Lawrence ship channel, 3341
Sackville public buildings, 4613
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4184, 4242
Deduction for non-attendance, 4242
Steamship services, 4702
Canada-West Indies, 3378, 3383, 3395, 3809
Subsidies, grants and bonuses, 3414
Toronto seed branch building, 4621
Water powers, development of, 3422
Welland canal, lumber imports for, qu, 1867
Western wheat crop and taxes, 1220
West Indies
Steamship service, 3378, 3383, 3395, 3809
Trade with, 3395

Garland, Mr. W. F. (Carleton)
Caraquet railway, purchase price, qu. 1258
Coal imports and production, qu. 490
Daylight saving, Ottawa, qu. 2612
Ottawa-Pembroke highway, qu. 2085
Soldier settlement, farms in Carleton county, qu. 1031

Gasoline. *See also* Oil
Price of, 2547
Short measure, 810

Gaspé Peninsula
Forest fires, relief, 4010
Natural resources, 1242
Railway facilities, 4186, 4197, 4307
Steamship services, 2176

Gauvreau, Mr. C. A. (Témiscouata)
Business of the House
Private members' day, 1159
Wednesday evening sittings, 1163, 1995, 2518
Canadian National railways
Intercolonial pensioners, passes, qu. 2418
Superannuation, qu. 2418
Civil service superannuation, qu. 940, 3266
Forest fires, relief, 4010
Labrador gold rush 1995, qu. 2696
Lightkeepers' salaries, 3351

Gauvreau, Mr. C. A.—*Con.*
Macphail, Miss, members and party funds, 4238
Printing, Joint Committee on, Reports
First, 1156
Second, 2252, 2295
Third, 3261, 3581
Fourth, 4009, 4436
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4238

Gélinas, Mr. J. N., postmaster, St. Barnabé Nord, 1830

Gendron, Mr R. M. (Wright)
Public Works paymaster, qu. 1257

General Election. *See* Elections, Election of 1921

Geneva, International Labour Conference, 1441, 1539. *See also* Labour

Genoa Conference
Tariffs
Economic warfare, 3053
Stability, 3053

Geodetic Survey
Expenditure, qu. 1634, 3073. *See also* Mines; Surveys
Investigation, etc., 3245

Geological Survey. *See also* Mines; Surveys
British Columbia, 2504
Estimates, 2504, 3197
Expenditure by provinces, 2508
New Brunswick, explorations in, 2504
Overlapping, 2508
Revenue, 2510

George, Little, deportation of, qu. 1704

George, Right Hon. David Lloyd. *See* Lloyd George

Georgetown wharf, 4587

Georgian Bay
Canal. *See* Canals
Ports, grain handling, qu. 620

Georgetown-Montague railway, 128

German, Mr. W. M. (Welland)
Civil Service Act 1919 Amdt bill (Seasonal or temporary employment) 666
Companies Act Amdt. bill, 435
French treaty, wines, 452, 2225
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2184
Redistribution, Welland county, 667
St. Lawrence river waterway, 3762
Water powers, 3784
Sales tax, 4414, 4427, 4431
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 4414
Welland canal construction, 3762, 3784

Germany. *See also* France
Canadian Pacific railway shares, 2496
Franco-German relations, 4652
Franco-Prussian War indemnity, 3070
Immigration from, 1094
Nickle, shipments to during war, 4371
Reichsrat, constitution of, 1372
Reparations, 2498, 4653, 440, 4053
Investigation by Hon. William Pugsley, qu. 4753. *See also* Pugsley
M. (Mr. Woodsworth) for withdrawal of of Canada's claims, 280, 311, 330, 332
Rhineland, cost of occupation, qu. 2696
Ruhr valley, occupation by France, 2748, 2822
War claims. *See also that title*
Investigation, qu. 1486, 2946
Wool-combing industry, 2866

Gervais, Mr. Théodore (Berthier)
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4243
Personal explanation, 4249

Gibeau, Mrs., postmistress, Morinville, 1028

Girl Guides, grant, 114, 3954

Girrard Bridge Company, charter, 1008

Gladstone, Right Hon. W. E., British tariff reduction 3050

Glanders. *See* Live Stock, Health of Animals

Gold. *See also* Mines and Minerals; Labrador
Export of prohibited 4249, 4405
Gold standard, 4249, 4405, 4666. *See also* Bank Act Amdt. bill

Golf Course, Jasper park, 3435

Good, Mr. W. C. (Brant)
Acland, Mr. F. A., 1675
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 1314, 4034, 4063, 4066, 4078-4103, 4141-59
Amdt., bank charters extended for one year, 4141, neg. on div. 4147
Charters, terms of, 1314
Montreal Standard, editorial, 4142
Point of order, 4055
Shareholders' audit, 4088
"Sincerity and integrity" 4067
Banking and Commerce Committee, proceedings, 4142
Banting, Dr. F. G. annuity, 4676
Bees, suppression of foul brood in, 4675

Good, Mr. W. C.—*Con.*
Board of Audit bill, 4369
British preference
Canadian ports direct importation, 3456
Manufacturing industries, and, 3472
Business of the House
Bills not distributed, 4104
Private members' day, 1160
Supply, M. to postpone, 3669
Cadet services, 883
Canadian National Railways bills
Branch lines construction, 4401
Securities, 4526
Capitalistic system and labour organizations, 2895
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 568
Civil Service patronage, 368
Class antagonism, prevention of, 1233
Combines bill, registrar, inquiry, 2624
Commercial union, 3906, 3911
Conversion loan, qu. 386
Co-operation, industrial relations, 2895
Copper bounty bill, 4374
Credit and industry, M. (Mr. Irvine) 645
Dairy Industry Act Amdt. bill, 4252, 4263, 4270
Dehydrated sulphate of copper, duty, 3480
Dehydration of fruits and vegetables, 4674
Deputy ministers' salaries, 4673
Estimates, method of discussion, 4614-6
Experimental farms
Buildings, 4630
Overlapping, 4633
Export Act Amdt. bill, pulpwood, 4396
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4272
Fertilizers, duty, 3487
Foreign relations, 4659
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 341
Health of animals, 4676
Hemp bounty, 3913, 4390
Hindu immigrants, franchise, 4660
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1118
Hindu, 1120
Policy, 1116-1120
Imperial Conference 4640-4666
Agenda, opportunity for discussion, 4660
Confidential matters, 4660
Preferential tariff, 4661
Imperial Economic Conference, 4659, 4666
Agenda, 4250
Interest rate, 4131
International questions, opportunity for discussion, 3998
Joint industrial councils, 1655

Good, Mr. W. C.—*Con.*
Labour
Cheap, 1118
Estimates, reduction in, 1643
Gazette, editor, 1671, 1675
Lack of Confidence, M. (Mr. Irvine) 220, 222
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4227
Land, vacant, taxation of, 1104, 1118
League of Nations, 3998
Linen yarn duty, 3900
Liquor exports and imports, 3704
Macphail, Miss, members and party funds, 4239
Manila fibre bounties, 4369
Merchants' bank, investigation, 4068, 4156
Money, purchasing power of, 4666
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll)
Sub-amdt. (Mr. Good) that legislation be submitted before end of session, 3567
Point of order, 3571
Petroleum bounty, 3916, 3918
Powell River Paper Company, 2895
Privilege, question of veracity, 2181
Proportional representation, 427
Lord Bryce, 391
M. for alternative vote in single-member constituencies, 388
Multi-member constituencies, M., 389
Protection and industries, 3472
Public debt, maturing obligations, 3822
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4396
Race-track betting, M., 494, 709, 764
Railways and canals dept., salaries, 3195
Raney, Hon. W. E., letter from, 2181
Reciprocity with United States, 3905
Offer to negotiate, 3908
Renovated butter, 4252, 4263, 4270
Rideau Hall expenditure, 4627
Rural mail carriers, names and addresses, 3144, 3264
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4239
Stationery, embossed, 1716
Tariff stability, 3054
Toronto
Casualty clearing station, 4621
Seed branch building, 4621, 4622
Typewriters and parts, duty, 3485
Unearned increment, appropriation by state, 1119
United States tariff, 1119
White, Mr. James, salary, 4667
Woollen goods, prices, 3463

Good roads. *See* Highways

Goods, Marking of. *See* Imports and Exports

Goodspeed, Mr. F. C., St. Croix harbour, 2900

Gordon, Mr. George N. *See* Deputy Speaker

Gordon, Sir Charles, director Bank of Montreal, 4022

Gosse-Millerd Canning Company, Vancouver, shipments, 2519, 2615

Gouin, Hon. Sir Lomer (Minister of Justice)
Admiralty Act Amdt. bill, 1080, 2051, 2204, 3318
Alien enemy property, claim against United States, 3823
Appeals from convictions for indictable offences bill, 4250
Attorney General of Ontario vs. Wholesale Grocers, decision, 2052
Bankruptcy Act
Administration, 780
M. (Mr. Casgrain) 1523
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 2252, 3085-3127, 3209-21
Farmer and, 3211
Senate amendments, 4201
Bonded liquor warehouses, 2404
Brenner, Meyer, release from penitentiary, 1975
British Columbia liquor law administration, 2423
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2284, 2404-16, 2419-23
Capital punishment, 769
Criminal Code Amdt. bills
Betting information, 1483, 2281
Opium joints, etc., 2281
Publication of evidence in marriage or divorce proceedings, 1971, 2053
Directorships, 4024
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 2355
Good, Mr., statement with regard to Hon. W. E. Raney, 2182
Guessing competitions, 733
Hoppe-Isenberg leases, 3128
Judges Act Amdt. bill, 3264, 3452, 3604
Justice
Administration of, Yukon territory, 705
Department, estimates, 705
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4230
Lake of the Woods Regulation Act repeal bill, 2885, 4163, 4179, 4185
Liquor, government control, 2406
Litigated matters, expenses, 779
Northwest Territories Act Amdt. bill, 180, 270
Senate amendments, 2050
Pecuniary claims convention, 779
Penitentiaries, 706
Estimates, 770

Gouin, Hon. Sir Lomer—*Con.*
Petition of Right Act Amdt. bill, 2639, 3127
Fiats, 3224
Race-track betting. *See also under this title,* Criminal Code Amdt. bills
M. (Mr. Good) 738, 743
Royal Canadian Mounted Police
Legal adviser, 778
M. (Mr. Woodsworth) for disbandment, 1147
Naturalization, 778
Pensions, 776
Reorganization, 776
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4236-48
Tariff stability, ref. to, 2819
Washington, visit of Canadian ministers to, 3823
Yukon Act Amdt. bill, 4247
Yukon territory, administration of justice, 705

Gould, Mr. O. R. (Assiniboia)
Accredited herd system, 587
Agricultural conditions in West, 1357
Agriculture, assistance to, 3237
Annual drill, 4636
Artificial silk duty, 3452
Australia, land settlement, 1389
Automobile accidents, 3958
Belle river harbour, 4610
Bienfait briquetting plant, 3206
British and foreign news service, 4713
Budget, 2951; congratulations to Finance Minister; last two budgets disappointing; Liberal promises and performances; tariff planks of 1896 and 1919; broken pledges, 2951; reciprocity; Liberal platform of 1919, duties upon implements of production; appeal to the West; speeches of the Minister of Agriculture; curtain lectures to Progressives, 2952; agricultural conditions; municipal taxation, non-payment; advice to farmers; more work and mixed farming; Canada a great exporting country; charge of extravagance unfounded; utterances of Mr. Motherwell, 2953; combines; lake freights; terminal elevators; Price, Waterhouse & Company report; elevator profits; income tax; unearned income, 2954; harbour facilities; free sites to elevator companies, Fort William; land speculators; stumping machines; tariff on implements of production and necessaries of life; amendment; special committee on the

Gould, Mr. O. R.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
tariff; tariff revision; permanent tariff commission to investigate industries, 2955; the "say-so" of tariff beneficiaries; watered stock, dividends; debt; direct taxation; government ownership, 2956; bounties; flax industry; hemp industry; special privileges; oleomargarine; protected industries; Progressive party and power, 2957
Business profits tax, 4489
Canada Grain Act, administration, 4710
Canadian National parks and historic sites, 3408
Canadian National Railways
Branch lines construction bill, 4198, 4325
Paris offices, 3679
Public ownership, 3679
Canadian National Safety League grant, 3953, 3958
Cheque tax, 3932
Chief Electoral Officer, salaries, 4001
Combines bill, 2627
Copper bounty bill, 3235, 3241, 4375
Dehydrated sulphate of copper, duty, 3480
Deputy ministers
Perquisites, 4669
Salaries, increase, 4669, 4673
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 2386
Dredging, Fort William and Port Arthur, 3341
Emigration to the United States, 1389
Esquimalt dry dock, 2673
Experimental farms, 468, 4632
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4271, 4273
Free trade, Progressive party and, 1196
Freight rates, Railway Commission, 1762
French treaty, 442
Fuel supply, 799
Grain and grain trade
Grain commissioners, salaries, 4710
Grain unsold, 273
Marketing of grain, M. (Mr. Millar) 296
Mixing of grain, 1388
Royal commission to inquire into, 1210
Wheat in farmers' hands, Saskatchewan, 1975
Harbours and rivers, Manitoba, 4589
Health of animals, 577, 587
Hector celebration, 4636
Hemp bounty bill, 4382
Hudson Bay railway, M. (Mr. Knox) 1079
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1357, 1878
Child, 1470

Gould, Mr. O. R.—*Con.*
Immigration—*Con.*
Policy, 1356, 1387
Publicity, special writers, 1874
Income tax, agricultural forms, 4498
Income War Tax Act 1917 Amdt. bill, 4498
Indians, agricultural production, 2162
Interest rates on land payments, 1088
Labour Gazette correspondents, 1627
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4235
Liberal platform of 1919, 2853
Linen yarn duty, 3900
Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill, 2201, 2203
Maritime provinces, public expenditure, 4586
Military hospitals, 673
Moose mountain
Forest reserve, insect pests, 3453
Indian reserve, qu. 706
Pleasure resort, 3408
Municipal taxation unpaid, 2768
Parliament buildings
Estimated and actual cost, 1725
Tower, 1722
Passports, issuing of, 4707
Peebles-Lampman branch railway, 4325
Petroleum bounty, 3920
Prices of binders and labour, 1886
Printing bureau, new building, 1738
Protection
Applications for, 3235
Granted without investigation, 3489
Public expenditure, apportionment of, 4559, 4560
Pugsley, Hon. William, appointment, 2503
Pugsley, and Meighen, Messrs., exchange of compliments, 2503
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4709
Purchasing Commission, 3951
Raisins and dried currants, duty, 3475
Reciprocity
Agreement of 1911, 2854
Agricultural implements, 3499
Boots and shoes, 3499
Coal, 3499
Riordan Pulp and Paper Company, business profits tax, 4491
St. John, N. B., visit to by members of parliament, 2503
St. Lawrence river waterway, 3788
School lands
Balance due on purchase price, 1389
Unpaid taxes, 4205
Seed inspection, 197-8
Shipping combine, 4235
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, salaries, 669
Steamship subsidies, 4004
Topographical survey, towers, 2512
Trade commissioners, 1840

Gould, Mr. O. R.—*Con.*
Tuberculosis in cattle, 587
Welland canal construction, 3788
Western provinces, conditons in, 1357, 1388

Government. *See also* Legislation
Appointment of supporters, 2710
Burdensome and costly, 2719
Business principles applied to, 2806
Canada a difficult country to govern, 2796, 2852, 3002, 3023, 3074
Capitalistic hold upon, 2726
Civil government, retrenchment, 2964
Commission, by, 428, 4037, 4039
Committees, by, 2979
Cost of, 1153, 2785, 2805, 2968, 3027
Increasing, 2712, 2756
"Cuckoo" 3451, 3510
Decentralization of, 66
Departments, increase in cost of, 2970
Difficulties of, 2796
Duplication and overlapping of services, 2805
Economy, 2816, 2823, 2825, 2831, 2842, 2921, 2950, 2959, 2963, 2969, 3043, 3073, 3076, 4236
Indemnity of members, 4236
New methods of, 2914
Public departments, consolidation, 3341
Taxation unaccompanied by, 2997
Financial control of, 2812
Group government, 1427
Senate and, 1378
Supply, amdts. to, 1299
Inconsistency, 2990
Invisible, 2812
Irresponsible, 2979
Offices, directory of, qu. 2085
Officials, travels of, qu. 283, qu. 343
Order in Council, by, 4354, 4487. *See also* Orders in Council
Policies, review of, 407,409
Resignation of. See Lack of Confidence Vote
Responsibility of, 2805
Retrenchment, 2805
Too much from Ottawa, 3434

Government Ownership. *See* Public Ownership

Government Printing. *See* Printing

Government Publications. *See also* Editorial Committee; Printing
Agricultural, 598, 1428
Distribution of, 1712, 3266
Fisheries, 3364
Interior department, 3443

Government Publications—*Con.*
Mines and Geological Survey, 3197
Printing, 811
Reduction in number and volume, 1671
Waste in, 1734
Waste paper sold, 1713
Judge Snider's report, 1714
Governor General
Address, acknowledgement of, 1256
Expenditure, 4627
Governor General's cars, repairs, 4691
Royal assent, 4755. *See also that title*
Speech on opening of Parliament, 2; travels in western Canada and Yukon; improvement in economic conditions; trade conventions with France and Italy; Canadian National Railways consolidation; Great Lakes shipping; anti-combines and trusts legislation; cattle embargo; abundant harvest; immigration publicity campaign; Bank Act revision; redistribution; Postal Conference; Vimy Ridge site, 2-3
Speech on prorogation, 4756
Vimy Ridge memorial, 2, 1631
Governor in Council, judicial or administrative power, 1912
Grading of Seeds. *See* Seed Inspection
Graham, Hon. George P. (Minister of National Defence; Minister of Railways and Canals from April 28, 1923.)
Address in reply, 54; The late Minister of Railways, 54; new members; Mr. Forke, 54-55; the railway problem, mileage of Canadian National railways; value of property; employees, 55; history of acquisition and amalgamation, 55-63; Canadian Northern, acquisition, 55-57; Grand Trunk Pacific, 58-59; Grand Trunk acquisition, 59-60; amalgamation under one board of directors, 60; formal transfer of Grand Trunk, 60-61; amalgamation of Canadian National and Grand Trunk, 61; purchase of rolling stock, 61; establishment of headquarters, 62-63
Advisory Fuel Committee, 1278, 4692
Agriculture estimates, form of, 610
Alaskan, wreck of, 3173
Ammunition, 884, 1740, 1741
Appointment as Minister of Railways and Canals, 2295
Atherley bridge, 3648
Baie St. Paul-St. Urbain railway, 4197
Belle river harbour, 4599, 4606
Bridges, international and interprovincial, 2342
Graham, Hon. George P.—*Con.*
British mails, delay in, 2694
Brockville rifle range, 889
Bruederheim branch line railway, 4316
Business of the House
Motions, anticipatory, 3327
Privilege, Mr. Clark, 1911
Questions
Involving lengthy answers, 622
Passed as orders for returns, 939, 4303
Placed on order paper without members' knowledge, 939
Unanswered, 4455
Supply, calling of, 2296
Cadet services, 877
Canada Highways Act Amdt. bill, 2253, 2338, 2469, 2470. *See also under this title,* Highways
Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, Sir Henry Thornton, 2983, 3208, 3845
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Advances, 3377, 3798, 3824, 3841
Deficits, 3816
Earnings and expenditure, 3399
Lease of freighters, 3848
Negotiation for sale of ships, 1976
Canadian National Railways, 55-63
Advances
$73,000,000, 1619, 3610, 3650
$13,099,493.34, 1764, 3376
$1,550,000, 4692
Statements of appropriation, 1922-23, 1923-24, 3789
Annual statement of minister, 1558
Audit staff, transfer from Moncton, 575
Balfour, Colonel, reported appointment, 2794
Branch lines construction bill, 3265, 3646, 4188, 4197, 4303-4344, 4397, 4694
Expenditure, appropriation of by Parliament, 4400
Finance, 4319, 4330
Rejection by Senate, 4695
Chicago, traffic originating at, 1760
Coal. *See also under this title,* Fuel
Bituminous, duty, 1278
Maccan and River Hebert mines, 1027.
Correspondence, inquiry for, 244
Dominion Express Company, contract, termination, 2473
Employees' pension, 288
Estimates, 1619
Opportunity to discuss, 3703
Expenditure, 4304
Express business and sale of electric lines bill, 2392, 2470, 2479
Radial railways, sale of, 2479, qu. 2612
Freight cars, interchange, 4697

Graham, Hon. George P.—*Con.*
Canadian National Railway—*Con.*
Express and electric lines—*Con.*
Freight rates, 1620. *See also under this title,* Freight Rates
Coal, on, 1278, 1280
Grand Trunk, 58-60
Gratuities to directors and officials, royal commission, 1665, 1976
Ocean ports, 1760
Providence, 1762
United States, 1762
Hanna, Mr. D. B., retirement of, 1666
Hudson Bay railway and, 1067
Insurance of mortgaged premises bill, 1635, 2048, 2105
Insurance, rates of, statement, 2106
Intercolonial, 1760
Pensions, 3196
Management
Non-interference with, 2472, 3670
Responsibility and powers, 3615, 3654
Maritime region, boundaries, 1754
Mileage, 55, 3197
Moncton and Buctouche railway, 3646
Ocean ports, 1760
Operating deficits, 3701
Paris offices, 3208, 3611, 3626, 3650, 3681, 3682, 4514
M. (Mr. Stevens) 3670
Pre-audit, 3701
Public ownership, 2475, 3670, 4198
Railway Commission and, 666
Regions, boundaries of, 1754
Retiring allowances to officials and directors, 1484
Robb, Mr., 2471
St. John station, 3646
St. John terminals, 2481, 4311
Securities bill, 4515
Thomas, Mr. A. J., appointment, 2794
Thornton, Sir Henry, 3670, 3675
Appointment
Agreement tabled, 574
Correspondence, 495
Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, 2983, 3208, 3845
Toronto
Approaches and terminals, 4198
Office building, 1664, 3629
Viaduct and union station, 4326, 4336, 4452
Toronto Suburban railways, sale of, qu. 2612
Transcontinental
Conditions and prospects, 3681
Fortin & Moffatt, claim, 3646
Quebec port and, 3681

Graham, Hon. George P.—*Con.*
Canadian National Railway—*Con.*
Transcontinental—*Con.*
Unification, 1666, 3196
Chinese immigration bill, 2332
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 550
Civil Service
Postmasters, appointments, 1823, 1827
Returned soldiers, 1773
Copper bounty bill, 4373
Credits, M. (Mr. Irvine) 645
Demers, Mr. Amedee, contract, 1977
Deputy ministers, French-speaking, 1807
Desbarats, Mr. G. J., 3342
Electric power, exportation, M. (Mr. Deslauriers) 665
Estimates, civil government, form of, 610, 668
Excise taxes, payment with postage stamps, 1818
Fiset, Sir Eugene, retirement, 3342
Forest preservation, 3416
Freight rates
Coal, 1278, 1280
Comparison, 1620
Crowsnest pass agreement, 1930
Equalization, 3192
Railway rates, M. (Mr. Clark) 1925
Fuel supply, 793
Advisory fuel committee, 1278, 4692
Interstate Commerce Commission, investigation, 1279
M. (Mr. Church) 1278
Gaspe peninsula, railway facilities, 4197
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 280
Governor General's cars, repairs, 4691
Grande Prairie railway, 4200
Grants to military and rifle associations, 889
Haileybury armoury and post office, 4616
Highways. *See also under this title,* Canada Highways Act
Bradford-Barrie, 2489
Canada Highways Commissioner, staff, 2489, 3173
Federal grant, 519
Hamilton-Brantford, 2492
Ontario, 2490
Statements
Summary of projects under agreement, 2491
Tabulated, 3174
Hudson Bay railway,
Canadian Air force, 1749
Construction vote, 4681
Dominion lands, sale of, 1068
Feasibility of route, 1068
M. (Mr. Knox) 1066

Graham, Hon. George P.—*Con.*
Hudson Bay railway—*Con.*
McArthur, J. D. & Co., refund, 4687, 4690
Port Nelson Terminal, 3647
Repair of second 118 miles, 1070, 4198
Turning first sod, 1069
Welland canal and, 1068, 3779
Work this year, 4310
Hydro electric power, radial railways, 2475
Immigration, Canadian National railways and Canada Colonization Association, 3633
Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island employees, pensions, 3196
Inverness railway, 4198
Isle Perrot bridge, 3646
Kent Northern railway, 4197
Lack of Confidence, M. (Mr. Irvine) 236
Lindsay arsenal, 883
Militia Pension Act Amdt. bill, 1740, 2053, 2086
Moncton-Buctouche railway, 3646, 4197
Murray Bay-Nairn Falls railway, 4197
National Defence
Ammunition, 884
England from, value and quantities, 1740
Quantity on hand, 1741
Annual training, 859
Cadet service, 877
Canadian Air Force, 1748
Camp Borden, 1749, 1775
Central repair shops, 1750
Equipment, 1778
Forestry protection work, 1776
Mail carrying, 1775
Operation, maintenance, repairs, 1774
Clothing and necessaries, 883
Department, salaries and contingencies, 901
Dominion arsenal, Quebec, 1740-4
Bonus to employees, 1751, 1772
Expenditure, 1744
Estimates, 859, 1740
Grants to rifle associations, 889
Military districts, reduction of, 868
Military properties, maintenance, 889
Militia expenditures, statement of, 1747
Officers retired, 890
Permanent force, 892
Schools of instruction, 900
Staff
Pay, 891
Reduction, 1773
Naval service, 902
Department of National Defence and, 3342
War claims, adustment of, Llandovery Castle, 1745
North Essex by-election, 4606

Graham, Hon. George P.—*Con.*
Nova Scotia miner's strike, use of troops, 868, 893
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3571
Pacaud, Mr. Lucien T., 1833
Paradis, Mr. T., claim, 4691
Petition of Right Act Amdt. bill, 3127
Postmaster General, absence through illness, 1816, 1826
Post Office
Department
Deputy postmaster general, appointment, 1805, 1807, 1826
Estimates, 1778, 1815
Excise taxes, payment in postage stamps, 1815
Printing, 1818, 1820
Revenue not attribuable to postal service, 1815, 1818, 1820
Salaries, 1780, 1794
Staff, reductions 1824
Hayes, Mr. John J., dismissal of, 1687
Letter carriers, bonus, 1784
Mail contractors, 3144
Mail service, 1778
Postal rates
Reduction of, 1780
Special delivery, 1873
Postmasters
Appointments held in suspension, 1832
Clementsport, 1797
Woodbridge, 1823
Railway mail service, 1783, 1786, 1801, 1805
Rural mail service
Anderson, Mr. C., 1823
Carriers, 1784, 3264
Compensation for loss, 1833
Legal holidays, 1804
Names and addresses, 3144
Routes, spur lines, 1826
Statistics of, 1801
Western provinces, 1802
Extension, 1790
Saskatoon, accommodation, 1785
Toronto
New building, 1780
Revenue, 1780
Prince Edward Island railway
Car ferry terminals claim, 4676
Pensions, 3196
Railway employees, death of, 3196
Public buildings
Ontario, 4615
Saskatchewan, 4629
Public ownership of railways, 3670, 4198
Radial railways, 2475
Toronto street railway, 2475

Graham, Hon. George P.—*Con.*
Public Works, expenditure, apportionment, 4578
Pugsley, Hon. William, appointment and salary, 3043
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 3417
Royal commission, 4709
Railway Commission, 3188
Annual report, 1659
Carvell, Hon. F. B., alleged statement of Mr. Motherwell, 3188
Constitution and work of, 3192
Railways and Canals
Bell, Major Graham A., 3195
Estimates, 1764, 3173, 3376, 3760
Salaries, 3195
Surveys and inspections, 3648
Returned soldiers, Civil Service, 1773
Rideau canal, 4691
Royal Canadian navy, 903. *See also under this title,* Naval Service
St. John and Quebec railway bill, 3403, 3145
St. Lawrence river waterway, 665
Agreement with United States, 3772
Provincial undertakings, 3782
St. Lawrence ship canal, 3647
Sunny Brae-Guysborough branch line, 4316
Thornton, Sir Henry. *See also under this title,* Canadian National Railways
Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, director, 2983, 3208, 3845
Reported statement on immigration, 2795
Toronto
Harbour improvements, 4578
Street railway, 2475
Union station, 4326, 4336, 4452
Viaduct, 4325, 4336, 4452
Trent canal improvements, 3647
Triplets, bonus for, inquiry, 3146
Troops, use of in labour troubles, 868, 893
Unrest, alleged in Western Canada, 4514
War claims adjustment, 900
War medals, 1744
Warlike stores, 900
Water powers, jurisdiction, 665
Welland canal construction, 3761, 3771, 3778
Hudson Bay railway and, 1068, 3779
Request for, 3073, 3772

Grain and Grain Trade. *See also* Address; Agriculture; Budget; Freight Rates; Lake Grain Rates
Additional outlets for, 53
Alberta production, 1435
Bankers and, 4048
Bank liens upon seed grain and crop, 4102
Barley flour, sales tax, 4431
Canada Grain Act
Administration, 781, 2035, 4709

Grain and Grain Trade—*Con.*
Canada Grain Act—*Con.*
Appeal, 781
Manitoba Court of Appeal, decision, 1210
Licenses, 2299
Litigation, 2045
Canadian National Railways, 3680. *See also that title*
Cargoes, loading of. *See* Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill
Cheque tax charged back to farmers, 3039
Comparative rates on, 78
Crop of 1922, 20
Dockages. *See under this title,* Elevators
Drought, effect on grain production, 3429
Elevators. *See also under this title,* Marketing
Commission, qu. 1867
Co-operative, 2043
Dockages, 782, qu. 1661, 2039, qu. 3141, qu. 3505, qu. 4300
Earnings, 2042
Edmonton, 4716
Facilities, 53. *See also* Vancouver Harbour bill
Fort William and Port Arthur, qu. 4132
Georgian Bay, qu. 620
Government, 2036, 3264
Grain Growers', 2675
Halifax, 4713, qu. 4751
Lethbridge, 4716
Montreal, qu. 385, qu. 1663, 1768, 1974, 3767
Short weight, complaint of, 2037
Multiplication of, 1400
Ontario, 2038, 4716, 4719
Overages, 494, 782, 2039
Port Arthur, qu. 4132. *See also under this title,* Terminals
Screenings, purchase of, qu. 2612, qu. 2697, qu. 3131
Port Colborne, qu. 1029, 4690
Public ownership, 2956
Quebec, 2903, 3768, 4233
St. Croix, 2903
Saskatchewan co-operative, 2779
Screenings, 782, qu. 1484, qu. 1633, qu 1661, qu. 1739, 2042, qu. 2613, qu. 2697, qu. 3131
Seed supplied by. *See* Seed Inspection
Terminal, 3821
Abuses. *See under this title,* Marketing
Fort William and Port Arthur
Dockages, screenings and scalpings, 782, qu. 1484, qu. 1739, 2254, 2867
Sale of, qu. 1633
Free sites, 2955
Maintenance, 810

Grain and Grain Trade—*Con.*
Elevators—*Con.*
Terminal—*Con.*
Montreal, 1768
Price, Waterhouse, report, 2954
Profits, 2954
Vancouver, 1057, qu. 1487. *See also* Vancouver Harbour bill
Addition to, qu. 517, qu. 621
Dockages, 782
Improvement, 2033
Weights, difference in, 2037
Warehousing, qu. 3141
Exports, 2748
Flax, weed seeds and, 4378
France, pre-war production, 2247
Freight cars, shortage of, 4697
Freight rates on, 1914, 3194. *See also* Freight Rates; Hudson Bay Railway; Vancouver Harbour bill; Welland canal
Shipping. *See* Lake Grain Rates bill, *and under this title,* Shipment
French treaty, 455, 2006. *See also* Treaties, French treaty
Gage case, 2592
Gambling in futures, 3058
Grain
Adulteration of Canadian at United States ports, 3649, 3764, 3961
Combine, 4048
Commission. *See under this title* Marketing
Loading at Canadian ports, 3974. *See also under this title,* Shipment
Mixing, 1388, 3764
New varieties, introduction, 483
Samples for exhibitions, 1454
Surveys, qu. 4131
Unsold, 273, 1975, 2748, 2773
Grain Act. *See under this title,* Canada Grain Act
Grain Commissioners, board of, 53, 2036
Commissioners, residence of, 787
Dockage and screenings, 782
Elevator screenings, inquiry into, 2254
Employees, etc., qu. 2207
Lake grain rates, 4218
Names, occupations, etc., qu. 2206
Personnel, 4221
Salaries, 4709
Grain Growers' Guide, Mr. Shaw, 987
Grain Inquiry Commission, 1763, 4710
Lawyers, employment of, 4710
Scott, Mr. D'Arcy, 4711
Handling of. *See* Vancouver Harbour bill
Hudson Bay railway 1032
India, wheat production, 1840

Grain and Grain Trade—*Con.*
Indian reserves, grain production, 1139, 2156
Injustice to western farmers, 1114
Inquiry into trade, etc. 48, 301. *See also under this title,* Marketing
Insect pests and fungous diseases, 2774
Inspection. *See under this title,* Marketing
Lake Grain rates. *See* Freight Rates, Shipping; Lake Grain Rates Bill
Royal commission on, report, 2885
Liverpool Corn Trade Association, shortages, 1764
London Corn Exchange, adulteration, 3649, 3961
Mandscheuri barley, introduction of, 483
Manitoba Court of Appeal, decision, 1210
Marketing, 53. *See also* Hudson Bay Railway; Markets
Costs, 68
M. (Mr. Millar) for commission of inquiry, 288 agreed to as amended, 311
Shipment and, 494
Markets, 1410
Grain unsold, 1975, 2748, 2773
Milling and baking tests, 463
Millfeeds. *See* Feeding Stuffs Act
Montreal
Grain shipments, qu. 1973, 1974
Shortages, 1764
Oats
Acreage and production, 2934
Price, 1388
Ocean freights. *See* Freight Rates, Shipping
Overages, 494, 782, 2039. *See also under this title,* Elevators
Overhead, 1400
Pooling, 1400
Prices. *See also* Immigration; Prices
Comparison with United States. *See under this title,* Marketing, M. (Mr. Millar)
Royal commission recommended, 1209
Sample market at Winnipeg, qu. 345, qu. 494
Screenings. *See under this title,* Elevators, *and also* Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill
Seed. *See* Seed Inspection
Seed grain advances, 3444, 3447
Amount outstanding, 3444
Municipal indebtedness for, 3446
Seed purchasing commission, qu. 279
Shipment, 1032, 2854, 4193, 4714. *See also* Lake Grain Rates bill *and under this title,* Wheat
Canadian and United States ports, 1756, 1767, 1768, 3764
Adulteration, 3649, 3764, 3961
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, qu. 3263, 3812

Grain and Grain Trade—*Con.*
Shipments—*Con.*
Canals, utilization of, 2808, 3763
Congestion, 3767
Quebec, 3768
Cost of, 2808, 2044
Discrimination against Canadian ports, 2960
Diversion to United States railways, 2898
Elevators. *See under this title,* Elevators
Facilities for, 730
Improvement of, 2745
Great Britain, to, qu. 1867
Halifax, from, qu. 1484
Hudson Bay railway, 4681. *See also that title*
Lake, 2959. *See also* Lake Grain Rates
Montreal, to, qu. 385
Pacific coast, 3769
Panama canal, 1921
Portland, St. John and Halifax, from, qu. 1484
Prince Rupert, 151-2
Royal commission on lake rates. *See* Freight Rates, Shipping
St. Lawrence river waterway, 3342, 3763
Shipping rates, 2517, 2613. *See also* Freight Rates
Vancouver, by, 257, 1057
Volume of, 2757
Welland canal, 3763
Wheat, Quebec, qu. 3820
Shortages
Complaints by British importers, 1764, 2037
Transportation, 19, 69, 77, 4222. *See also under this title,* Shipment
United Grain Growers, Calgary, 1408
Warehousing. *See under this title* Elevators
Western grain route. 69, 1924. *See also* Vancouver Harbour bill
Wheat
Bounty on, 1196
Bushels required to purchase agricultural implements, 1912, and 1922, 1408
Canada greatest wheat export country, 2780
Canada third in acreage and production, 2934
Central European competition, 2396
Exports, 2750, 2774, 2780, 2843, 3062. *See also* Imports and Exports
French treaty, 1978
Hard, 2873
Markets, 3068
Marquis III, introduction of, 483
Pool, 2526

Grain and Grain Trade—*Con.*
Wheat—*Con.*
Prices, 628, 1101, 1886, 3004. *See also that title*
Production, 68, 265, 1405, 4224
Reciprocity in, 2993
Rust, 595
Saskatchewan, in farmers' hands, 1975
Screenings as feed for lambs, 2867
United States tariff against, 2823. *See also* United States, Fordney-McCumber tariff
Wheat-growing as permanent operation, 1423
Wheat stem saw-fly, 2774
World competition, 2781
Wheat board, 409, 2548, 2592, 2836, 2857, 3235
Correspondence, 626
Legislation, extension of, 2696, 2740, 2927
Order in council, 2696, 3045
Proceedings under act of 1922, 1636
Profits, 3239
Progressive party and, 3030
Winnipeg sample market, qu. 345, qu. 494

Grain Board. *See* Wheat Board

Grain Commission. *See this title under* Grain and Grain Trade

Grain Growers' Guide reference to, Mr. Shaw, 987

Grain Inquiry Commission. *See* Grain and Grain Trade

Grand Jury System
Abolition of, 2695, 3272
Combines, 2585

Grand Manan, island of
Breakwaters, 945
Population, 2172
Steamship service, 2172

Grand River, Que. wharf, 958

Grand Trunk. *See this title under* Canadian National Railways

Grand Trunk Pacific. *See this title under* Canadian National Railways

Grant, Dr. W. L., Civil Service, 354, 523, 541, 558, 560
Letter to Dr. Roche, 355

Granville, Earl, Canadian Pacific Railway, 1916

Granville Island, taxation, qu. 1485

Grape-Growers. *See* Fruit; Treaties, French Treaty; Wines

Grapes. *See* Fruit

Grasshoppers. *See* Insect Pests

Gratuities. *See* Canadian National Railways, Grand Trunk

Grazing Leases. *See* Dominion lands; Interior

Great Britain. *See also* British Preference
Agricultural conditions, 1861, 2755
Agricultural labourer's strike, 2822
Agricultural products, markets for, 2869
Agricultural representative in, 3291, 4675
Agriculture and free trade, 1858
Ammunition received from, 1740
Baldwin, Right Hon. Stanley, budget, 2824
"British policy" 4652
British preference. *See that title*
Budgets of Chancellor of the Exchequer, 2984, 3001
Canada's relations with. *See* Canada's Participation in War; Imperial Conference; Near East Crisis; Treaties
Capital levy, 2722
Cattle
Embargo, 2871
Markets for, 208, 2871
Shipments to. *See* Live stock
Coal exports, 1263
Conditions in, 2748
Copyright legislation, 2140
Corn laws, abolition of, 1858, 3007
Anti-Corn law league, 1859
Bright, Mr. John, 3013
Peel, Sir Robert, 3050
Prosperity, return of, 3020
Dairy representative in, 3297
"Dangerous agitators from," 3033
Debt
Per capita, 2956
Reduction, 3072
United States to, 2879, 2918
War, 24, 2986
Deportation of Irish men and women, 3158
Depression in, 1854
Dumping ground, 2822
Empire Forestry Conference, 3410
Exchange, refund, 2641, 2658
Exhibitions, 1454, 1467. *See also that title*
Federation of British industries, 2726
Foreign policy, 165. *See also* Near East
Free trade, 2752, 2777, 2854, 3072, 3012. *See also under this title,* Corn Laws
Progress of movement, 3050
Rents, and, 1862
Grey, Earl, 1418
Halibut Fisheries Treaty and, 1308, 4457
House of Lords, constitution of, 1374
Immigration from, 1084, 1218. *See also* Immigration

Great Britain—*Con.*
Immigration—*Con.*
Prepaid passages, 2611
Imports and exports, 2928
Income tax. *See under this title,* Taxation
Industrial revolution, 2723
Liberty of the subject, 3158
National Farmers' union, 2791
National Labour party, policy, 2721
Naturalization. *See* Naturalization Act Amdt. bill
Near East crisis. *See that title*
Necessities of life, taxation, 2789
Parliament, history of. *See* Lack of Confidence
Postal rates, decrease of, 1779
Precedent, 2788
Protection, 2752
Proportional representation, 392
Railways, 1618
Reciprocity treaties with France, 3050
Rural depopulation in, 1854
Shipbuilding, 3072
Surplus, 2823
Taxation, 2796
Expenditure and reduction, 2749
Income tax, 2881, 2986
Exemptions for children, 1383
Reduction, 2913, 3072
Luxuries, 3069
Necessaries, 2754
Reduction of, 2712, 4493
Trade Mark and Designs Act, 2294
Trade with, 3072. *See also* British Preference
Unemployment in, 1205, 2754, 2822
War debt, 24, 2986. *See also under this title,* Debt
Woollen industry, competition, 2958

Great Lakes
Disarmament
Correspondence with United States, M. (Mr. Meighen), 244, 247, 494
Tabled, 1307
Diversion of waters, qu. 3821
Shipping rates on. *See* Freight Rates, Shipping; Lake Grain Rates
Subsidized Steamship services, suggested extension, 2175

Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Waterway. *See* St. Lawrence River Waterway

Great Lakes Transportation Company, lease of freighters to, 3848

Great War Veterans Association
MacNeil case. *See* Disallowance of Nova Scotia Statute

Great War Veterans Association—*Con.*
Oleomargarine, 3547
Pensions. *See that title*
Petition, 4535

Greece
Grecian loan, qu. 623, 2010

Greenway, the late Hon. Thomas, Hudson Bay railway, 1061

Grenville by-election, 4606

Grey, Earl, Canada and the Empire, 1418

Griffenhagen and Associates. *See* Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power)

Grimmer, Mr. R. W. (Charlotte)
Budget, 2898. British preference, increase of; Canadian ports; Canadian National Railways, 2898; railways and transportation; ports, development of; United States, railways, ports and commerce; Passamaquoddy bay, "greatest natural harbour on Atlantic coast; Canadian National Railways, ocean terminals; "Canadian export trade routed by United States ports; Senate committee's report; diversion of grain traffic; Winnipeg-St. Croix direct route; saving in transportation costs; Admiral Sir W. F. W. Owen, report, 2899; Commander Compbell, report; Captain Henry Mowat, report; Hon. Robert Rogers; examination of St. Croix harbour; Mr. E. C. Swan, report; Mr. F. C. Goodspeed, report; 2900; Messrs. Fillies, Kenney and Elliot, master mariners, reports; St. Stephen, industrial centre; advantages of St. Croix from railway point of view; Mr. D. F. Maxwell, statement of mileage, 2901; St. Croix as winter port; small cost of development; construction of railway across state of Maine, 2902; gradients; St. John Journal editorial, 2903
Canadian National Railways, 2898
Talbot, Mr. O., director, qu. 707, qu. 1031, qu. 1258
Harbours and rivers, New Brunswick, 945

Grisdale, Dr. J. H. *See also* Agriculture department
Cattle shipment, 3040
Salary, 610

Groceries. *See* Prices

Grondines wharf, 959

Grosse Isle. *See* Health, Quarantine

Grosses Roches, Que., wharf, 968

Group Government. *See* Government

Group Representation. *See* Proportional Representation

Guarantee. *See* Railways

Guessing Contests, qu. 733. *See also* Criminal Code Amdt. bill

Guthrie, Hon. Hugh (South Wellington)
Admiralty Act Amdt. bill, 2051
Ammunition, 884
Annuities branch, advertising, 1641
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3217
Bankruptcy Act, M. (Mr. Casgrain) 1500
Canadian National Institute for Blind, 693
Canadian National railways, Paris offices, 3633, 3693
Cold Storage Act Amdt bill, 2057
Copyright Act Amdt. bill, 2139, 2288
History of legislation, 2140
Le Droit D'Auteur, 2141
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 2382
Dominion Forest Reserves and Parks Act, 2060
Dominion Fuel Board, 3198
Dredging
Expenditure, 4590
Maritime provinces, 1009
Estimates, time of presentation, 4577
Field crop competitions, 603
French treaty, 2227
Advantages and disadvantages, 2238
Border states
Agreements with, 2231
Concessions to, 2402
Favoured nation treatment, 2232, 2234
Manufacturers and, 2236
Pianos and organs, 2237
Revenue loss through, 2235
Rubber, manufacturers of, 2237
Sewing machines, 2237
Summary of, 2232
Trade results, 2230
Treaty of 1907, 2229
Fruit industry, 598
Fuel supply, 797, 3198
Grand Manan, breakwaters, 945
Grondines wharf, 959
M. to reduce item, 963
Harbours and rivers
Expenditure, 949
Nova Scotia, 944, 4576
Ontario, 981

Guthrie, Hon. Hugh—*Con.*
Industrial Disputes Investigation bill, 2061
Irrigation Act Amdt. bill, 2139
Italian treaty bill, 2402
Labour
Employment Offices Co-ordination Act, 1630
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1627, 1629, 2061
Strikes, 1628
Troops, employment of, 893, 1627
Technical Education Act, 1638
Labour Gazette, correspondents, 1626
Lindsay arsenal, 883
Linen yarns, 3897, 3898
Lunenburg harbour dredging, 4576, 4591
Amdt. to reduce amount, 4577, neg. 4580
Marshall, Mr. Duncan
Appointment, 3314
Political partisanship, 3315
Militia Pension Act Amdt. bill, 2053
Murray Bay wharf, 973
National Defence
Annual training, 859
Arsenal, Quebec, bonus to employees, 1751
Estimates, 859
Nova Scotia strike, use of troops, 893, 1627
Pay of staff, 890
Permanent force, 892
Salaries and contingencies, 901
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2108, 2111, 2182
Ottawa-Hull bridge, 1015
Patents of Invention bill, 2069, 2074, 2078, 2080, 2130
Public Works
Dominon Archives, building, 1730
Dredging, 1009, 4590
Public Works Act, tender and contract, 956
Quebec riots, 893
Society of Chemical Industries, 2069
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment department, amalgamation, 3893
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment Act Amdt. bill, 3892
Soldier Settlement Board, Moss Mr. H. H. compensation, 2030
Supplementary estimates, lack of information, 4576, 4577
Trade and Commerce
Estimates, increase, 2033
Staff, 2031
War claims, adjustment of, 1745
Llandovery castle, sinking, 1746
Vickers Company contract, cancellation, 1746
War medals, 1743
Yarmouth harbour, dredging, 1011

Gypsum Lands. *See* Disallowance of Nova Scotia Statute

Hackland, Capt. J., Hudson Bay route, 1064

Haggard, Sir Rider, immigration, 1206

Hail Insurance. *See* Insurance

Haileybury, armoury and post office, 4615

Halbert, Mr. Robert H. (North Ontario)
Agricultural publications, 598
Crowsnest pass agreement, 2855
Eight-hour day, 1650
Farming, investment to start, 1415
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4275, 4538
Hog grading, 591
Immigration
Farm labourers, 1416
Policy, 1415
Tariff and, 1416
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3554
"Plutocrats and profiteers" 1417
Senate, elective or nominative, 1378
Toronto, expenditure on public buildings, 4621

Half Breed Claims. *See* Dominion Lands Act Amdt. bill; Mackenzie

Halibut Fishery Treaty. *See this title under* Treaties. *See also* Northern Pacific Halibut

Halifax
Camp Hill hospital, qu. 3506
Duties on goods shipped from Vancouver via Panama canal, 2519, 2615
Exodus from, 2400
Grain
Elevator, 4713, qu. 4751
Shipments from, qu. 1484
Immigration building, 4612
Importation through port of. *See* British Preference; Treaties, French, Italian
Naval college, 1744
Naval stores at, 110
Ocean terminals, qu. 4510, qu. 4713, 4751
Port, development of, 109
Quarantine station, 4612
Rockhead hospital, 4613

Halifax-Cape Breton steamship service, 2173

Halifax-Newfoundland steamship service, 2173

Halton County customs officials. *See* Customs and Excise

Hamilton
Harbour commissioners, qu. 912
Public building, 4628

Hammell, Mr. W. J. (Muskoka)
Automobile accidents, 3959
Bracebridge harbour, 4612
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4546
Muskoka harbour improvements, 4612
Redistribution committee, 1660
Reference to, 2884

Haney, Mr. M. J., purchase of steamer Murray Stewart, 3354

Hanging. *See* Capital Punishment

Hanna, Mr. D. B. *See also* Canadian National Railways
Director, Canada Steamship Lines, 3208
Dismissal of, 157
Insurance companies, interest in, 2050

Hanna-Medicine Hat branch line. *See* Canadian National Railways

Hansard. *See* House of Commons, Debates

Hanson, Mr. Richard B. (York-Sunbury)
Ammunition, 887
Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt bill, 2048
Annual drill, 859, 863
Arichat wharf, qu. 2180
Atlantic Fisheries Commission, inquiry, 3365
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4140
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3087-95
Blondin, Mr. C. E., Pierreville, dismissal, qu. 4511
Bonds, interest rate and income tax, 4494
Boudrot, Mr. Edward E., dismissal, qu. 2613
Bridges, New Brunswick, 2342
Business Profits War Tax Act Amdt. bill, 4489
Campbellton wharf, 945
Canada Highways bill, 2339
Canadian National Railways
Audit staff, Moncton, transfer, 574
Branch lines construction bill, 4186, 4189, 4309-22
Coal purchases, qu. 4303, qu. 4511, qu. 4752
Directors, board of, 60
Dominion Express Company, contract, 2473
Express and Electric lines bill, 2471
Fredericton bridge, 3645
Grand Trunk ties, tenders, qu. 3821
Insurance of mortgaged premises bill, 2048
Operating divisions, earnings and expenses, qu. 2298
Paris offices, 3638, 3683
Canadian ports, use by United States fishermen, 3361

Hanson, Mr. Richard B.—*Con.*
Capital punishment, 768
Caraquet and Gulf Shore railway, qu. 204
Carleton county, execution in, 778
Cheque tax, 3931
Chinese immigration bill, 2337
Civil Service
Bonus, 1811
Dismissals, 856
In 1922, 3324
Civil Service Act, violation of, 1794
Coal. *See also under this title,* Canadian National Railways
Cost of, 1813
Railway rates on, 1272, 1813
Congdon, Mr. F. T., K.C.
Administration of Yukon territory, 2299
Appointment as commissioner, qu. 3131
Deep sea fisheries, 3364
Descheneaux, Mr. P., lightkeeper, qu. 4512
Digby harbour, dredging, 4568
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 208, 2375, 2379
Dominion arsenals, 887
East Sandy Cove, 4571
Eastern Harbour, dredging, 4569
Edmundston public buildings, site, 4613
Fishways, 3362
Fuel supply, M. (Mr. Church) 1271
Geological survey, exploration, 2504
Gorman, Mr. L. F., salary, 3360
Grand Manan, breakwaters, 945
Harbours and rivers
New Brunswick, wharves transferred to Dominion, 946
Nova Scotia, 4562
Hayes, Mr., Canadian National Railways, 2471
Hazen, Sir Douglas, appointment, 2498
Highway bridges, international and interprovincial, 2342
Hudson Bay railway, 4310
Construction vote, 4683
Icebreaker Mikula, qu. 1384
Immigration
Child, 1471
Policy in New Brunswick, 1086
Income War Tax Act 1917 Amdt. bill, 4494, 4502
Indians, 2154
Agent at Perth, N. B., 2154
Intercolonial inclusion in Canadian National, 13
International bridges, 2342, 3647
Isle Perrot bridge, 3646
Joggins breakwater, 943
Kent Northern railway, 4189

Hanson, Mr. Richard B.—*Con.*
Labour
Employment bureaus, private, 1630
Labour Gazette, printing, 1712
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4232
La Societe des Artisans Canadiens Francais, 1027
Leblanc, Louis, qu. 285
Lighthouse and lightkeepers
Descheneau, Mr. P., qu. 4512
Maintenance and repairs, 3353, 3354
New lights, 3357
Salaries and allowances, 3352
Little Anse breakwater, Morrison claim, 4573
Magdalen islands wharves, 974
Mail contracts
Sporting mountain, qu. 707, 856
Trois Pistoles, Quebec, 4302
Margaree river salmon fisheries, 2700, qu. 3262, 3367, 3371
Marine agencies, 3351
Marine signal service, 3358
Maritime provinces coal, freight rates, 1813
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, 2615
Meteorological service, 3360
Miramichi smelt fisheries, 1974
Moncton and Buctouche railway, qu. 203, 3646
Morrison, Mr. D. W., 1489
Murray Bay wharf, 973
Murray Stewart, purchase, qu. 203, 3354, 3359
National monument, Connaught place, 1020
Naturalization Act Amdt. bill, 2186
Navigation, aids to, 3357
Nova Scotia, harbours and rivers, 941
Ontario government savings office, qu. 1488
Parliament buildings, 1727
Patents of Invention bill, 2072, 2087
Permanent force, 892
Pilotage
Administration of, 3358
Steamer Eureka, 1364
Port Greville breakwater, 944
Postmasters
Appointments and dismisals, 4534
Angouleme, qu. 3139
Chicoutimi-Saguenay, qu. 3138
Clementsport, N. S., qu. 1363, 1795, 1797, 4534
Frenette, Mr. George, St. Jean d'Evangeliste, qu. 2698
Herbertville, Que., qu. 3139
Labarre, Que., qu. 3138
Larouche, Que., qu. 3137
Pierreville, Que., qu. 4511
St. Bruno, Que., qu. 3140
St. Joseph d'Alma, qu. 3140

Hanson, Mr. Richard B.—*Con.*
Postmasters—*Con.*
St. Peter's, N.S., 1795
Morrison, Mr. D. W., qu. 1488, 1489
Sorel, qu. 1487
Tadoussac, qu. 3139
Post Office Act Amdt. bill, 4534
Post Office department, administration, 1817
Printing bureau, 1710
Public buildings
New Brunswick, 4613
Ontario, 4615
Pugsley, Hon. William, appointment, qu. 1486, 2498, 2504
Rimouski wharf, 977
Rural mail delivery, extension, 1802
Russell, Mr. James, qu. 1868
Ste. Anne des Monts pier, 979
St. John and Quebes railway, 4309
Sale and Inspection of Fruit bill 2105
Sales tax, exemption of hospital supplies, 4432
Senate, M. (Mr. Denis, Joliette) 1369
Smelt-fishing regulations, qu. 1868, 1974
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment bill, 3746
Soldiers Settlement Board, staff, 2020
Sunny Brae-Guysborough branch line, 4316
Telegraph lines
Chicoutimi county, qu. 3138
St. Charles-Peribonka, qu. 3262
Trueman, Mr. W. H., K.C., Winnipeg, appointment to Bench, 1868
Verrault, Mr. Gedeon, dismissal qu. 3140
War claims, 2498
Wharfage tolls, 975
Wrangel island, ownership, 3360

Harbours. *See* Ports; St. Lawrence River Waterway. For individual harbours, *See* Harbours and Rivers
Advances to. *See* Montreal, Quebec, Three Rivers, Vancouver, Harbour Commission bills

Harbours and Rivers, 993, 4554. *See also* Public Works, Dredging
Alberta, 1001, 4589
British Columbia, 2671
Canoe wharf, 1005
Esquimalt dry dock, 2671
Fraser river improvements, 1003-07
Generally, 1002
North Vancouver dry dock, 1002
Port Renfrew, 1008
Salmon arm, 1006
Vancouver. *See also that title*
Stanley Park, 1008
Victoria. *See that title*

Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
Day labour, 950, 956
Expenditure, 83, 947
Generally, 1009
Manitoba, 993, 4589
Red River, 1000
St. Andrew's dam, 1000
Selkirk, 1000
Wanipigow (Hole river), 1000
New Brunswick, 945, 4587
Campbellton, 945
Cummings Cove, 945
Generally, 946
Grand Manan, 945
Head Harbour, 2900
Passamaquoddy bay, 2899
Portage river, 950
St. Andrew's, 2899
St. Croix, 2899
St. John. *See that title*
Salmon river fishways, 3362
Wharves transferred to Dominion government, 946
Nova Scotia, 941, 4554, 4635
Abbott's harbour, 4563
Advocate, 4560
Annapolis Royal, 941
Arichat, qu. 2180
Bass River, 4563
Battery Point, 4563
Black Point, 941
Broad Cove marsh, 4564
Burlington Centre, 4564
Canada Creek, 4564
Canso, 941
Cape St. Mary, 941
Cariboo Island, 4564, 4567
Chapel Cove, 941
Cheverie wharf, 4567
Chimney Corner, 941
Culloden, 4567
Dartmouth, 4568
D'Escousse, 4568
Digby, 942
Dredging, 4568
East Sandy Cove, 4570
Eastern Harbour, 4569
Ecum Secum, 4571
Five Islands, 4571
Fruid's Point, 4571
Generally, 942
Gillis Point, 4571
Grand Narrows, 4572
Half Island Cove, 4572
Halifax. *See that title*
Hampton, 4572
Haulover, 943
Inverness, 4572

Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
Nova Scotia—*Con.*
Joggins, 943
Judique, 943
Leitche's Creek, 943
Little Anse, claim of Mr. T. D. Morrison, 4722, 4572
Little Harbour, 4575
Livingstone's Cove, 4576
Lockeport, 943
Lunenburg, 4576
Dredging, amdt. (Mr. Guthrie) to reduce item, 4577, neg. 4580
Malagash, dredging, 4580
Margaree, 4581
Margaretville, 4581
Meteghan, 4581
North Ingonish, 4582
North Sydney, 4582
Nyanza wharf, 4582
Ostrea Lake, 943
Parrsboro, 4583
Pembroke, 4584
Pictou, 4584
Beach light, 4583
Piper's Cove, 4583
Point Aconi, 4583
Port Beckerton, 4583
Port Greville, 944, 4583
Port Lorne, 4584
Portugese Cove 4584
Riverport, 4584
Round Hill, 4584
Sandford, 4584
Scotch Cove, 4584
Scott's Bay, 4584
Shaw Bay, 4585
Shelburne, 4585
Sheet Harbour West, 4585
Sheguindah wharf, 2690
Ship Harbour, 4586
Smith's Cove, 4585
Sonora wharf, 4585
South Lake, 4585
Summerville, 4586
Windsor, 4586
Yarmouth, 944
Ontario, 2690, 4588, 4594
Bayfield, 981
Belle River, 4594, 4638
M. (Mr. Meighen) to reduce, 4600, neg. 4610
Belleville harbour commissioners, dismissal, qu. 490
Big Bay Point, 981
Blind River, 981
Bracebridge, 4612
Chatham, 982

Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
Ontario—*Con.*
Cloud Bay, 982
Cobourg, 981
Fort William, 2675, 4610
French river improvement works, qu. 620
Generally, 982
Grassmere, 4612
Jackson's Point, 4589
Kincardine, 982
Little Current, 982
Meaford, 983
Midland, 983
Owen Sound, 2690
Port Arthur, 2675, 4610
Port Burwell, 983
Port Elgin breakwater, 2690
Port Maitland, 4589
Rondeau, 983
Southampton, 984
Toronto, 2678. *See also that title*
Prince Edward Island, 945
Beach Point, 4586
Georgetown wharf, 4587
Quebec
Bryant's Landing, 950
Cap de la Madeleine, 950
Chicoutimi, 950
Contrecoeur, 950, 1008
Cross Point, 955
Descente des Femmes, 955
East Templeton, 955
Generally, 968
Grand River, 958
Grondines wharf, 959
M. (Mr. Guthrie) to reduce item, 963
Grosses Roches, 968
La Malbaie, 968
Lanoraie, 969
Lavaltrie, 969
L'Islet, 969
Matane, 970
Montreal. *See that title.*
New Carlisle, 973
Peribonka, 973
Piche Point, 973
Pointe a Elie, Magdalen islands, 974
Point au Pic, Murray Bay, 973
Pointe aux Trembles, 974
Pointe Shea (Amherst) 977
Quebec harbour. *See that title*
Repentigny, 977
Rimouski, 977
Claim of Messrs. Raymond and Talbot, 4588
Riviere du Lievre, 978
Roberval, 978
St. Alexis, 980

Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
Quebec—*Con.*
Ste. Anne des Monts, 979
St. Charles, 980
St. Jean d'Orleans, 980
St. Michel de Bellechasse, 980
St. Omer, 980
Ste. Petronille, 4588
Three Rivers, 3399, 3963. *See also that title*
Ville Marie, 981
Saskatchewan, 1001, 4589
Wharfage tolls, 975
Wharves, revenue, 976
Winter ports, 2902

Harington, Sir Charles. *See* Near East Crisis

Harness, duty on, 3048

Harris, Mr. Joseph H. (East York)
Agricultural instruction grant, 608
Agriculture department, salaries, 611
Alderson claim, hog cholera, 582-3
Budget, 2804. Congratulations to Finance Minister; Bank Act revision; tariff; former criticism of minister; irritating taxation; sales tax; increase passed on to consumer; application to foreign and domestic goods, 2804; encouraging the middlemen; dilemma of the Minister of the Interior; free trade and protection; cost of civil government; balanced budget; Civil Service salaries; duplication and overlapping of services; retrenchment; ship of state drifting; Liberal party near rocks of destruction; immigration policy, 2805; government on business principles; tariff stability, protection and free trade; indigenous industries; wood production; reciprocity with United States; a begging request; parliamentary speeches; brevity, 2806; shipment of cattle to British markets; Transcontinental railway; Winnipeg-Quebec route; shipping facilities; Canadian Government Merchant Marine boats for cattle trade; St. Lawrence river waterway, parliamentary discussion of, 2807; talk of secession in western provinces; breezes blowing in the mulberry trees; national and imperial unity, 2808
Canadian National Railways
Bank accounts, qu. 205
Directors, inspection trip, qu. 489
Special train, qu. 489
Experimental farms, 467, 472

Harris, Mr. Joseph H.—*Con.*
Feed inspection, 602
Harbours and rivers, Ontario, 4589
Health of animals, 582
Hog cholera, 582
Jackson's Point wharf, 4589
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, Stornoway, 2181
Montreal harbour commissioners, advances, qu. 812
Pugsley, Hon. William, appointment, qu. 4753
Retired farmers, income, 1118
Stewart, Mr. James, qu. 205
Toronto viaduct, qu. 517
Trade commissioners, 1840

Hatfield, Mr. Paul L. (Yarmouth and Clare)
Public Works Act, tender and contract, 958

Hatters Bands, etc. *See* Customs Tariff Items

Haulover, N.S., wharf, 943

Hawkesbury, government revenue and salaries, qu. 2205

Hayes, Mr. John J., dismissal from Calgary post office, 1687, 1868

Hazelton telegraph line, 150

Hazen, Sir Douglas
Appointment under Inquiries Act, 2498
Hudson Bay railway, 1061

Health. *See also* Housing; Immigration; Indians; Tuberculosis
Advancement of, 2827
Children, mortality of, 1179
Dairy products and disease germs, 3299
Death rate, 1197
Department of
Estimates, 697, 2170
Food and Drugs Act, administration, 697
Honey and Maple Products Act, administration, 697
Housing Act, administration, 2171
Institutions for sailors, 2167
Legal adviser, 777
Maple products, 1810
Marine hospitals, 2167
Opium and Narcotic Drugs Act, administration, 697
Pollution of boundary waters, 700
Proprietary or patent medicines, 700
Quarantine, 702
Grosse Isle, number of vessels calling, 2168
Halifax building, 4612
St. John, Partridge island, 1021, 4613
Tracadie lazaretto, 4613

Health—*Con.*
Department of—*Con.*
Salaries and contingencies, 2170
Sick mariners' dues, 2167-8
Dominion Council of Health, women members, 3649
Medical research, standardizing and testing laboratories, 703
Immigration, medical inspection, 702
Oleomargarine and, 3558
Pharmaceutical preparations, country of origin, qu. 3261
Venereal diseases, 705

Health of Animals. *See* Animal Contagious Diseases; Live stock

Healy, Mr. A. F. (North Essex)
Belle River harbour, 4594, 4608
Canadian Press Limited, 2555, 2630, qu. 3703
Franchises, granting of, 4728
Combines bill, 2555, 2621, 2630
Registrar, appointment of, 2630
Introduction, 1135
Newspaper combines, 2630
North Essex election, visit of Mr. Meighen to Belle River, 4594

Hearst Publications. *See* Magazines and Periodicals, M. (Mr. Hocken)

Hebert River coal district. *See* Coal

Hebridean Immigrants. *See* Immigration

Hector Celebration, grant to Scottish Pioneer Association, 4636, 4705

Helium, discoveries
Macallum, Dr., 4439
McLennan, Professor by, 703

Hemp
Belfast, 3032
Bounty, 2647, 2659, 2704, 2709, 2778, 2823, 2827, 2957, 2958, 2964, 3018, 3031, 3911, 3963
Binder twine, 2780
Extension of time, 3911
Duty, 3017
Industry, establishment of, 3031
Seed, for agricultural purposes, 3474
Free entry of, 2645, 2651

Hemp Bounty Bill
Res. 3911, 3914, 3963; lr., 3963; 2r., com., 4376; 3r., 4391
Advances to be repayable, amdt. (Mr. McMaster) 4376, neg. 4391

Henderson, Right Hon. Arthur, class rule in politics, 2733

Herbertville, Que., postmaster, dismissal, qu. 3139

Herschell Island, Eskimos, trial. *See* North West Territories Act Amdt.

Hides, imports, qu. 617

High Commissioner in London
Empire settlement board, agreement, 1476
Grain shortage, complaint of British importers, 1764
Imperial Shipping Committee, qu. 3137
Office building, 4629
Pacaud, Mr. L. T., representative on Pacific Cable board, 1832
Relief of distressed Canadians abroad, 1456

Highland Battalions. *See* Hector Celebration

Highways. *See also* Canada Highways Act Amdt. bill
Alberta, 2342
Appropriations under act of 1919, 2338
Banff-Windermere, 3437, 3584
Bradford-Barrie, 2489
British Columbia, 2941, 3186
Unemployment, 3032
British Columbia-Washington state, 2941
Buckhorn lock roadway, 4691
Canada Highways Commission, 2489
Campbell, Mr. A. W., C.E., 3173
Staff, 3173
Canboro-Dunville-Welland-Allanburg, qu. 1139
Cariboo road, 3032
Cost per mile, 2491, 3176
Depot Harbour roadway, 4691
Dundas street, qu. 708
Effect on railway traffic, 1619
Estimates, 2489, 3173
Federal contribution to, 2489
Grants
Federal inquiry, 519, qu. 623
Ontario, to, qu. 620
Hamilton-Brantford, qu. 624, 2492
Hamilton-Queenston, qu. 813
Hope-Princeton, 2342
Indian reserves, passing through, 2153
International, 2941
Bridges, 2342
Isle Perrot bridge, 3646
Jasper Park, 3435
Lachute-Arundel, 4313
Manitoba, 3184
Meaford-Clarksburg, 4565
Millbrook reserve, 2124
Montreal-Hull, 2341
Montreal-Mont Laurier, 2341, 4313
New Brunswick, 3182

Highways—*Con.*
Nova Scotia, 3183
Ontario, 3177
Grant, qu. 620
Projected, 624
Ottawa-Pembroke, qu. 2085
Pacific highway, 2341
Prince Edward Island, 3184
Quebec, 3180
St. Margaret's Bay road, qu. 3135
Saskatchewan, 3185
Statements
Cost per mile, 3176
Summary of projects under agreement, 2491
Types of roads, 3174
Toronto-London, qu. 708
Waterton lakes, qu. 2085
Yukon, 3943

Hindus. *See also* Immigration, Oriental Immigrants, franchise, 503, 4077, 4640-53

Hirtle, Carrie L., schooner, qu. 3323

Historic Sites. *See* Canadian National Parks and Historic Sites; Canadian National Parks and Reservations bill; Monuments and Memorials

Hoboes, products of unemployment, 1194

Hocken, Mr. H. C. (West Toronto)
Annuities, old age, 1697
Banff-Windermere highway, opening, 3584
Belle River harbour, 4597
British mail, delay in, 2639, 2695
Business, difficulties of, 1419
Canadian National Railways
Branch lines construction bill, 4190
Paris offices, 3279
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 529
Combines bill, 2522
Co-operative associations, 1419
Deputy ministers, salaries, 4558
Dominion Canners, Limited, 1420
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4274
Fuel supply, 794
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth), 335
Hamilton harbour commissioners qu. 912
Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia, 4563
Hemp bounty, 3911
Hudson Bay railway, 4192
Immigration
Hebridean immigrants, 3590
Policy, 1418
International Joint Commission, 3427
Kitchener local improvements, 1022
Labour, hours, 1842

Hocken, Mr. H. C.—*Con.*
Magazines and periodicals
Canadian, encouragement of, M., 826, 855
Sales tax, 4415, 4421
Marvale, wreck of, 3333
Midland post office, qu. 623
Montreal harbour commission, qu. 1137
National Monument, Connaught place, 1021
Navigation, aids to, 3333
Newspaper combines, 2522
Paper, prices in Canada and United States, 829
Peat experiments, 794
"Plutocrats and profiteers," 1418
Post Office department
Appointments and retirements, 1826
Ross, Mr. George, retirement, 1825
Progressive party and tariff, 1421
Proportional representation, 388
Public ownership of railways, 4190
Public Works department, patronage, 946
Quebec harbour commissioners, qu. 1136
Radio direction finding, qu. 3820
St. John harbour commissioners, qu. 911
St. Lawrence river waterway, 2780
Sales tax, 4414
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 4414
Tariff
Immigration and, 1418
Reduction of, 1421
Toronto
Customs house, 3279
Harbour improvements, 2679
Seed branch building, 4624
Union station, 4444
Viaduct, 4444
Vancouver harbour bill, 264
Vancouver harbour commissioners, qu. 912
Welland canal construction, 3780

Hodgins, Mr. A. L. (East Middlesex)
Cold Storage Act Amdt. bill, 186
Dryden and Marshall, Messrs., trip to South America, qu. 1031
House of Commons furniture, purchase of, qu. 1138

Hoey, Mr. R. A. (Springfield)
Address in reply, 63. No reference in speech to tariff revision, 63; rapid deflation in price of foodstuffs; market for surplus farm products; Canadian agriculturist to-day feeding Europe, 64; Canadian representation in the United States; foreign policy bound up in that of United States; conference of provincial representatives on revenue; amendment, 65

Hoey, Mr. R. A.—*Con.*
Assiniboine river, damage by floods, 999
Authors' Association of Canada, copyright, 3155
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4038
Bank robberies, 776
Binder twine, prices, 4377
Brandon, damage by floods, 999
Cadet services, 877
Canada Grain Act, administration, 781
Canadian grain, adulteration of, 3961
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 565
Civil Service, exempted positions, 367
Copper bounty bill, 3235
Copyright Act Amdt. bill, 3155
Dominion Elections Act amdt. 1027
Experimental farms, 462
Farm homes, 1215
Grand jury system, abolition of, 3271
Hemp bounty, 3912, 4377
Hopkins, Mr., and reciprocity, 3010
Hudson Bay railway, 461
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1215
Policy, 1213
Story of an immigrant's struggle and success, 1216
Inheritance tax, 2803
Institutionalism, over, 1214
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4225, 4227
Lake Grain Rates Commission, 4710
Lake of the Woods regulation bill, 4175
League of Nations, 142
Manitoba
Agricultural economic conditions, 1213
Institutions and services in excess of present need, 1214
National monument, Connaught place, Ottawa, 1021
Proportional representation, 406, 418, 424
Reciprocity with the United States, 2854, 3905
Rural credits, 4039
Settlement schemes, 1089
Shipping combine, prosecution of, 4077, 4227
Taxation commission, 4039
Wanipigow dam, 1000
Western provinces, conditions, 1213

Hogs. *See* Livestock

Holland
Butter, competition, 2863
Economic organization, 1857
Immigration, from, 1085, 1095, 3591
Imports and exports, 1977

Home Building. *See* Building; Housing

Homesteads. *See* Dominion Lands Act

Honey and Maple Products Act, administration, 697, 1810

Hong Kong, goods imported via Suez canal and, 3454

Honorary Advisory Council. *See* Research

Honours. *See* Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner)

Hooper, Mr. Ronald, Labour Gazette, 1625-6

Hoover, Mr. Herbert, Europe and coal supply, 1263

Hopkins, Mr. E. N. (Moose Jaw)
Budget, 2980. First speech in House of Commons; limited vision of new members; Canada's destiny; Moose Jaw district; selection of wheat by millers; high tariff bears unduly on the West, 2980; interests of the East and West; recapitalization and adjustment of debts; sharing of war burdens, 2981
Introduction, 2417
Moose Jaw income tax office, qu. 2699
Reciprocity, attitude towards, 3010

Hoppe and Isenberg Leases. *See also* Dominion Lands Act (Coal Leases); Petition of Right Act Amdt. bill
Cancellation of, 3146, 3222
Fiat, issue of, 4442
Investigation into, 3128

Horse Power. *See* Electric Power; Water Power

Horse-Racing. *See* Race Track Betting
Information. *See* Criminal Code Amdt. bills

Horses. *See* Live stock

Horticulture. *See also* Fruit; Insect Pests
Canadian Council of, 2307
Garden and grass seeds, purity of, 601
Gardens, absence from farm homes, 1423
Nursery stock, 1990
Pomology, experimental work in, 463
Seed testing. *See* that title

Hospitals. *See also* Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment; Health
Camp Hill hospital, Halifax, qu. 3506
Marine, 701, 2167
Military, 669
Closed, 669
Brant House, Burlington, 4075
Euclid House, Toronto, 4075

Hospitals—*Con.*
Military—*Con.*
Nursing hospitals, 686
Repairs and improvements, 4629
Staffs, 675
Sydenham, qu. 386, 626
Transients, treatment of, 673
Sales tax, 4432
Soldiers, maintenance cost, qu. 812
Standardization, 2934
X-Ray plates, coverings, duty, 3501

Hotel Scribe, purchase of. *See* Canadian National Railways

Hotels. *See* Canadian National Railways

Hours. *See* Civil Service; Labour

House of Commons. *See also.* Deputy Speaker; Speaker
Acoustics, 1721, 2446. *See also under this title,* Audibility of debates
Members, speaking, to occupy central position, 1721
Adjournments
Ascension day, 2518
Ash Wednesday, 254
Easter, 1162, 1483
Eleven o'clock, 1360
Empire day, 2795, 2983
Hour of, 3208, 3261
King's birthday, 3323
To await action of Senate on bill, 4754
To discuss matter of urgent public importance
British Columbia fishing licenses, M., (Mr. Clark), 1540
Hebridean immigrants, M. (Mr. Speakman) 3584
Powell River Paper Company, M. (Mr. Neill) 2886
Union Bank, M. (Mr. Forke) 4296
Twelve, midnight, 4672
Amendments. *See under this title,* Motions
Audibility of debates, 645, 976, 2446, 3327, 4572, 4580, 4593
Baker, the late Colonel G. H., M.P., memorial, 435, 730, 1256, 1991
Bills
Alterations in, 3325, 3451
Not printed, proceeding with, 3968, 3974, 3976, 4185
Preparation and form of, 4007
Principle discussed on second reading, 3091
Private, suspension of rules, posting, 4248
Third reading by consent, 4141
Business of the House, 179, 250

House of Commons—*Con.*
Business of the House—*Con.*
Amdt. to amdt.
Mr. Crerar, session of 1922, 1300
Right of party not official opposition to move, 1299-1307
Budget debate, precedence, 2694
For to-morrow, 3750
Government orders to have precedence Monday and Wednesday, 1158
Legislation
Distribution between Senate and House of Commons, 4007
Pending, qu. 2517, 2795, 3265
Announcement, 3452
Inquiry, qu. 2612
Post Office estimates in absence of minister, 1314
Private members' days, 1158
Progress of, 2469
Supply. *See also under this title,* Supply
Calling on Mondays and Tuesdays, 2295
Relevancy, 4720
By-elections, 99. *See also* Elections and, *under this title,* Vacancies
Grenville, 4606
Moose Jaw, return, delay, 2295
North Essex, 4594
Chamber
Acoustics. *See under this title,* Acoustics;
Conversation, 4528, 4572
Lighting, 1728
Closure, 1301, qu. 1867, 3667, 4598
Canadian Government Merchant Marine vote, 4598
Committees, For proceedings and reports, *See titles* of the several committees
Expenses of, 2691
Reports
Inquiry, qu. 2612
Not debatable in advance of presentation, 1906
Right to consider questions not referred to, 3266
Select Standing, 3, 199
Changes in membership, 382, 486, 435, 615, 811, 857
Special, cost of, 2979
Contingencies, 2691
Debate
Audibility of. *See under this title,* Acoustics; Audibility
Speeches
Brevity, 2806
Length of, 2883
Debates, Official Report of
Abolition, 1734
Committee, 202

House of Commons—*Con.*
Debates, Official Report of—*Con.*
Distribution, 1715
Estimates, 2691
Insertion of documents not read, 1830, 3174
Pages missing from bound copy, 887, 1081
Questions passed as orders for returns, 939
Revised edition, inquiry, 122
Undiscussed items in supply, 1638, 3284, 3292
Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms, 3
Divisions
Address in reply
Amendment (Mr. Hoey) neg. 178
Amdt. to amdt. (Mr. Shaw) neg. 177
Bank Act Amdt. bill
Bank charters, extension, amdt. (Mr. Good) 4141, neg. 4147
Interest, maximum rate, amdt. (Mr. Shaw) 4148, neg. 4148
Interest, maximum rate, amdt. (Mr. Coote) 4149, neg. 4149
Merchants' Bank investigation, amdt. (Mr. Bird) 4150, neg. 4161
Officers, right of association, amdt. (Mr. Woodsworth) 4161, neg. 4161
Budget
Amdt. (Mr. Forke) neg. 3082
M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. of Ways and Means agreed to, 3084
Canadian National Railways bill (Branch lines) amdt. (Mr. Meighen) to 3r., neg. 4401
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) for repeal; amdt. (Mr. Hughes) for Special Com. agreed to, 571
Combines bill, M. (Mr. Mackenzie King) for 2r., agreed to, 2609
Copyright Act Amdt. bill, M. (Mr. Robb) for concurrence in amdt. agreed to, 2292
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, amdt. (Sir Henry Drayton) to supply neg. 2391
Export Act Amdt. bill (Pulpwood) amdt. (Mr. Power) six months hoist, neg. 4397
French Treaty bill, M. (Mr. Fielding) for 2r., agreed to, 2250-51
Lack of Confidence vote, M. (Mr. Irvine) neg. 243
Lake of the Woods Regulation bill M. (Sir Lomer Gouin) for 2r., agreed to, 4180
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) to permit manufacture, importation and sale
Amdt. (Mr. Kay) to remove suspension of prohibition, agreed to, 3581

House of Commons—*Con.*
Divisions—*Con.*
Oleomargarine—*Con.*
Sub-amdt. (Mr. Good) that government submit legislation before prorogation, neg. 3580
Proportional representation, M. (Mr. Good) neg. 434
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) neg. 766
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) for disbandment of, neg. 1152
Titles, Honours and Decorations, M. (Mr. Ladner) neg. 1299
Documents, distribution of, 1712
Estimates, 2691. *See also that title;* Supply
Discussion
En bloc 4554, 4558, 4587, 4612
Opportunity for, 4579, 4594, 4614-15
Furniture, purchase of, qu. 1138
Hansard. *See under this title,* Debates, Official Report of
House of Commons Act Amdt. *See* Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt.
Indemnity of members, 4674. *See also* Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill
Proposed reduction 2915, 2967, 3043
M. (Mr. Leader) 1153
Senate and House of Commons Act, proposed changes, 4007, 4008. *See also that title*
Internal Economy Commission, 3
Joint Committee of both Houses on matters of common interest, 4007. *See also* Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt.
Appointment, 2794
Message from Senate, 2611
Report, 3887
Language, unparliamentary. *See* Deputy Speaker; Speaker
Law, the late Bowman B., tablet, 1020
Leaders, latitude allowed, 3401
Legislation. *See under this title,* Business of the House
Letters
Quotation from by private member, 4599
Signature withheld, 4599
Library of Parliament, salaries, 2691
Members
Alleged reflection on, 4237
Attendance, 4007, 4008, 4236. *See also* Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt.
Coaching each other, 405
Deceased, 10, 102, 166
Blackadder, Dr. Edward, 4-8, 102

House of Commons—*Con.*
Members—*Con.*
Deceased—*Con.*
Kennedy, Hon. W. C., 4-8, 10, 102, 166, 281
Lafortune, Mr. D. A., 4-8, 281
Stewart, Hon. J. A., 4-8, 435
Indemnity of. *See under this title,* Indemnity
Labour, reference to by Sir James Lougheed, 3033
New, election and introduction of
Benoit, Mr. A. J., 3
Descoteaux, Mr. J. F., 2837
Finn, Mr. R. E., 3
Healy, Mr. A. F., 1135
Hopkins, Mr. E. N., 2417
Preston, Mr. R. F., 3
Rheaume, Mr. J. F., 3
Roberge, Mr. Eusebe, 3
Robichaud Mr. J. G., 3
Party funds, and, 4237
Relationship with constituents, 3021
Sessional attendance. *See* Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill
Stenographers, qu. 518
Votes, 4237
Motions. *See also* Deputy Speaker; Speaker
Amendment to amendment
Proposed change in rules, 856, 1299
Right of party not official opposition to move, 1300
Precedence, 3451
To keep place on order paper pending Speaker's ruling, 1285
Orders for returns. *See under this title,* Returns
Orders of the day. *See* Deputy Speaker; Speaker
Pairs. *See under this title,* Divisions
Parliamentary counsel, Dairy Act Amdt. bill, 3325, 3449
Privilege
Bancroft, Mr.—Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner), 1308
Béland, Hon. Mr.—Reported statement of Mr. Meighen in North Essex election, 708
Carroll, Mr.—Com. on Agriculture and Colonization, 3266
Clark, Mr.—Equalization of railway rates, 1910
Coote, Mr.—Correction of newspaper report, 2519
Good, Mr.—Question of veracity, 2181
Irvine, Mr.—Hebridean immigrants, 3649
Martell, Mr.—Civil Service Committee report, 4363
Shaw, Mr.—Grain Growers' Guide, 987

House of Commons—*Con.*
Privilege—*Con.*
Sutherland, Mr.—Redistribution Committee, 1660
Questions
Answers and, 1385
Inquiry as to, 940
Lengthy, 939
Passed as orders for returns, 938, 940, 1139, 1385, 4303
Placed on order paper without member's knowledge, 939
Unanswered, 4455
Representation. *See* Redistribution
Restaurant, expenditure, 2692
Returns
Alleged incomplete, 1307
Inquiry for, 1212, 1636, 2208, 2254, 2394, 2640, 3324, 3508, 3962, 4184, 4295, 4513
Tabled, 3399
Rules
Closure, 1301, qu. 1867, 3667, 4598
Special committee to consider, M. (Mr. Johnston) 856, 1299
Suspension of, private bills, 4248
Wednesday, hour of meeting, Rule 2, 1
17C, Thursdays and Fridays, 2640
Senate and, Joint Committee. *See* Senate
Sergeant-at-Arms, estimates, 2691
Session
Economy in length of, 132, 133
Waste of time in, 143, 144
Sittings. *See also under this title,* Adjournments
All night, 4672
Late, 4599
Midnight, 4579, 4672
Mornings, 4132, 4249
Saturday, 2694, 3452, 4132
Wednesday, 99
Change in hour of meeting, 1
Evening, 1163, 1995, 2518, 2694
Speaker's rulings. *See also* Speaker
Discussion of, 4013, 4076
Speeches. *See under this title,* Debate
Staff
Members' stenographers, qu. 518
Organization, 4592
Salaries, 2691
Translators, Arsenault, Mr. H. P., 2691
Supply
M. to postpone proposed resolution, 3667
Voting in, 4610, 4611
Vacancies. *See also under this title,* By-elections
Cape Breton North and Victoria, 1763, 2469
Moose Jaw, 615
Nicolet, 2178

House of Commons—*Con.*
Votes and proceedings, questions passed as orders for returns, 939

House of Lords, constitution of, 1378

Housing. *See also* Building; Labour; Returned Soldiers
Assistance for, 2987
Building trades and, 1812
Farm homes, 1178, 1215
Farm labourers' dwellings, 1215, 1240, 1406
Harvesters, 2822
Housing Act, administration, 2171
Legislation, inquiry, qu. 2517, 2518
Loans to provinces, 4558, 4603, 4704

Howat, Mr. Alexander, detention at border, 2296, 2393, 2347, 2419, 2469, 3155

Hudson, Mr. A. B. (South Winnipeg)
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4082
Budget, 3060. Congratulations to Finance Minister; reciprocity with United States; sugar duties, reduction in; tariff stability; review of fiscal system; national policy and its results; comparison of imports 1879 and 1923, 3060; new inventions, standards and wants; imports increasing in spite of high tariff; United States, Fordney tariff; iron ore and smelting industry; Canada not a self-contained country; imports must be paid for by exports; products of farm, sea and forest; manufactured products, export of, 3061; United States market; free admission of boots and shoes and farm implements; Canadian manufacturers, after 40 years protection not able to compete; folly to encourage new industries by artificial means; new duties and bounties; sectionalism; solidarity of the West; tariff and unjust tax; wheat production; producers get no benefit from tariff; Liberal platform of 1919; no hope of tariff planks being carried out; vote against government tariff proposals, 3062
Manitoba Court of Appeal decision, grain trade, 1211
Rules, 1301. M. (Mr. Johnston) for special com. on
Tariff proposals, vote against, 3062, 3084

Hudson Bay
Fort Prince of Wales, preservation, 1041
Resources. *See* Hudson Bay railway

Hudson Bay Company
Claim to Rocky Mountain park, qu. 2418
Navigation of Hudson bay and strait. *See* Hudson Bay railway

Hudson Bay Railway. *See also* Canadian National Railways, branch lines; Vancouver Harbour bill; Welland Canal
Agricultural resources. *See under this title,* Resources
Appropriation of land for, 1053, 1068, 1074, 1353, qu. 2393
Canadian air force, 1748
Climatic conditions, 1072
Coal, transportation of, 1055, 1073, 1283
Cochrane, Hon. Frank, statement by, 1071
Commercial feasibility. *See under this title,* Feasibility
Commission to inquire and investigate, 3005
Comparative distances, 1034, 1070
Competition with Canadian National Railways, 1041, 1050, 1056, 1058, 1067, 1973-4
Construction, 4680
Correspondence, 208
Discontinuance of, 1062, 2747
Deficit, operating, 1560
Drayton-Acworth commission, 1062, 1761, 4682
Expenditure, 1033, 3073, 3076, 4192, 4198. *See also* Welland canal construction
Public and, 3005
Experiments, 461
Feasibility, 1033-70, 1749, 2878, 2939, 3005
Anderson, Captain, 1038, 1042, 1044, 1057, 1064
Bartlett, Capt, 1047
Bell, Dr., report, 1052
Bernier, Capt., testimony, 1072
Chisby, Capt., report, 1052
Crean, Mr. Frank J. C., report, 1060
Foster, Right Hon. Sir George, 1072
Gordon report, 1038
Hackland, Capt. J., statement, 1064
Investigation by Canadian air service, 1749-50
Kennedy, Capt. William, report, 1052
Low, Mr. A. P., report, 1072
MeKenna, Mr. J. A. J. report, 1063
Manitoba legislature, com., report, 1052
Pritchard, Capt. William, report, 1052
Reid, Capt John, 1046
Test of, 1069
Tyrrell, Mr. J. W. report, 1072
Wakeham report, 1038
Finance, 1053
Dominion lands, appropriation for, 1053, 1068, 1074, 1353, qu. 2393
Lash, late Mr. Z. A., 1053
Oliver, Hon. Frank, statement, 1053
Fishery resources. *See under this title,* Resources
Fort Churchill terminal. *See under this title,* Terminals

Hudson Bay Railway—*Con.*
Foster, Right Hon. Sir George, 1061, 1072
Freight rates, 3779. *See also that title*
Graham, Hon. George P., statement in 1916, 1071
Grain, transportation and marketing, 1032-80, 4681. *See also that title*
Greenway, the late Hon. Thomas, 1061
Hazen, Sir Douglas, 1061
History and condition of, 1040, 1076
Hydro-electric power, 1065
James Bay railway, 1036, 1049
Lake of the Woods Regulation bill, 4170
Land sold for qu. 283. *See also under this title,* Finance
Laurier, Sir Wilfrid
Announcement of project at Niagara Falls, 1047
Statement, 1066, 1071
London Times 1059
Macdonald, Hon. E. M., 1062
McArthur J. D. & Co. claim, 4686
Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur, letter to Melfort Journal, 1062
Military aspect of, 1057
Monthly Trade Review, London, editorial, 1036
M. (Mr. Knox) for consideration of Senate report, 1032; agreed to "on division," 1080
Motherwell Hon. Mr., reported statement at Moose Jaw, 1686, 2774, 4683
Obstacles to success of, 2939
Policy, 2878
Port Nelson. *See under this title,* Terminals
Postponement of, 2951
Press statement as to cost—correction, 2296
Priority of undertaking, 1073, 1079
Progressive party and, 3030
Rail removals qu. 203
Reclamation of land in Manitoba and Saskatchewan, 1065
Repair, 1070, 3647, 4198, 4680
Resources Hudson bay and region, 1039, 1064, 1072
Agricultural, 1065
Crean Mr. Frank J. C., report, 1060
Fishery, 1064, 1073
Lower, Mr. A. R. M. report, 1065
Melville, Mr. C. D. report, 1064
Sifton, Sir Clifford announcement of project at Brandon, 1047
Surveys and gradings, 4310
Terminals, 1071
Bartlett, Captain, 1063
Fort Churchill, 1039, 1043, 1063
Hazen Sir Douglas, statement, 1063

Hudson Bay Railway—*Con.*
Terminals—*Con.*
Port Nelson, 1032, 1037, 1039, 1043, 1063, 1069, 3647
Dredging, 1012
Reid, Hon. J. D. statement, 1063
Thornton, Sir Henry, 4683
Turgeon, Hon. Senator, 1071
Trips through Hudson strait to Port Nelson, qu. 4011
Utility of, 1076
Waterpowers, 1065
Welland canal and, 1054, 1068, 3779. *See also that title.*
West, interest in scheme, 1035
Work this year, 4310

Hudson Bay Route, feasibility of. *See* Hudson Bay railway

Hudson's Hope, coal possibilities, 3198, 3202, 4699

Hughes, Mr. J. J. (King's P.E.I.)
Address in reply 123. Financial question; social and industrial unrest, 123; transportation and the railway problem, 126; contrast between government railways and Canadian Pacific, 127; Prince Edward Island railway, 128; decrease in population of Prince Edward Island, 129; representation of Prince Edward Island on government commissions, 130; discrimination in freight rates, potato-growing; immigration; the eight-hour day, 131; hours of railway station agents, 132
Budget, 2919; Multiplicity of counsel; mild criticism of budget from opposition benches, 2919; taxation and debt; responsibility for; increase of expenditure by Conservative administration; civil service dismissals and appointments; war prices; 50 per cent of war expenditure wasted or stolen, 2920; Liberals associated with late government; purchase of medical supplies through middleman; Conservatives preach economy but propose no specific reduction, 2921; reciprocity with United States; offer by Sir John Macdonald; election campaign of 1891; statement of Mr. Blaine; protection and free trade; balance of trade; imports and exports, 2922; international trade, profit and loss; artificial trade barriers; trade commissioners and subsidized steamship services; war blockade; selling without buying 2923; defeat of reciprocity in 1911; world-wide free trade not attainable; high tariff unprofitable; revenue necessities; farmers and reciprocity, 2924; legislation in advance of public sentiment; Liberal platform of 1919; progressive opposition, amendment, 2925

Hughes, Mr. J. J.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 531
Amdt. to refer to special committee, 534
Labour, right to organize, 2893
Morning and Saturday sittings, 4132
Powell River Paper Company, 2893
Proportional representation, 419, 423

Humphrey, Mr. L. W. (West Kootenay)
Budget, 2940. Congratulations to Finance Minister; western provinces, lack of knowledge of; British Columbia, resources, 2940; Asiatic immigration; highways; electors of Revelstoke and Nelson; Mr. McQuarrie's charge of bribery, 2941; Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill; immigration; fruit-growing industry; returned soldiers, treatment of; discontent; Canadian Legion, Victoria, B.C. resolution; administration of Pension Act, 2942; Board of Pension Commissioners; Royal Canadian Mounted Police, withdrawal from Nelson; telegram of Nelson Board of Trade; professional agitators; copper bounty, 2943; Trail smelter; opening of copper rod mill; optimistic feeling in British Columbia; tariff; amendment, 2944
Canadian National Railways, legislation, qu. 4300
Canadian National Safety League, 3958
Chinese immigration bill, 2327-37
Copper bounty bill, 3241, 4373
Freight rates, equalization of railway rates, M. (Mr. Clark) 1970
Hindu franchise, 4658
Housing
Administration of act, 2171
Loans to provinces, 4704
Imperial Conference, 4658
Kootenay flats, reclamation, 3431
Labour, right to organize, 2895
Ore-testing, Ottawa plant, 2505, 2511
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3282, 4748
Pensions, 2942
Appeal boards, 697

Humphrey, Mr. L. W.—*Con.*
Pensions—*Con.*
Royal commission
Interim report, 2167
Recommendations, 2394
Powell River Paper Company, 2895
Returned Soldiers' Insurance bill, 4734

Hungary, immigration from, 1094

Hunter, Mr. J. B. *See* Public Works Department

Husband's Brother, Marriage with. *See* Deceased, Marriage

Huskisson, William, tariff reduction in Great Britain, 3050

Hydro Electric Power. *See also* Electrification; St. Lawrence River Waterway; Water Powers
Beck, Sir Adam, Morrisburg dam, 1270
Development in Ontario, 1270
Electric railways, 2475
Municipalities, 2475
Pointe Fortune, qu. 1974
Power exported to the United States, 1266
Quebec and New England Hydro Company, qu. 1974
Whitney, Sir James, 1266

Hydro Electric Power Commission of Ontario, 3782
Public ownership, 3056
Radial railways, 2476
St. Lawrence water power development, 2682
Toronto Suburban railway, qu. 280, 2181, 3324

Hydrographic Survey. *See* Marine and Fisheries

Ice and Icebreakers. *See also* Marine and Fisheries; Vessels
Bay of Fundy, 2615
Cabot strait, obstruction in, 2614
Mikula, qu. 1384
Murray Stewart, purchase of, 3354

Iceland, immigration from, 1096

Illicit Liquor Traffic. *See* Liquor

Illustration Farms. *See* Agriculture

Immigration, 2784, 3060, 3066. *See also* Address; Bank Act Amdt Bill; Budget; Labour, Unemployment; Naturalization
Advertising, 43, 81, 1084, 1085, 1103, 1180, 1218, 1318, 1873

Immigration—*Con.*
Agents
Appointment of, 1188
Biden, Miss, 1099
Bowder, Mr. W. R., representation of New Brunswick in Great Britain, 1086, 1198
European, 1876
Gardiner, Mr., 1099
Ingram, Mr., 2664
Lemont, Mr. Arthur, 1085, 1135, 1243
May, Mr., 2663
Murphy, Mr. representative in Scotland, 1095, 1879
Pattullo, Mr., 1096
Railways acting as, 1191
Agriculturists of, 37-38, 1881. *See also under this title,* Farmers
Alien enemies, restriction of, 1128, 2428, 2667
Alleged campaign against, 332
Appointments, 3252. *See also under this title,* Agents
Army officers, 1432
Artisans, shopkeepers, town dwellers, 1204
Asiatic. *See under this title,* Oriental
Assimilation, 1346
Assistance to settlers, 1242
Assisted passages, 1096, 1132
Great Britain, from, 1100
Immigrants family or friends, advance, 1100
Loans for passages, 1475-8
Banks and, 4042. *See also* Bank Act Amdt.
Barnado Boys' home, 1099, 1470
Beatty, Mr. E. W. and, 1337-8
Belgium from, 1096, 1173
Black, Mr. W. J., deputy minister, visit to England, 668, 1096, 1473, 1476, qu. 1633, 2084
Boundary inspection, 1875
Bracken, Premier, statement, 1123
British, 20, 43, 1084, 1105, 1218, 1339, 1346, 2929
Preference for Australia and New Zealand, 2932
British Columbia into, 1096, 1112, 2942
Co-operation with, 1097
Oriental, 1217. *See also under this title,* Oriental
Buildings
Halifax, 4612
St. John, 1457, 1464
"Canada an immigration sieve," 628, 647
Canada Colonization Association, 51, 71, 1089, 1118, 1133, 1175, 1178, 1180, 1191, 1208, 1215, 1237, 1240, 1315, 1352, 1357, 1396, 1391, 1399, 1425, 1428, 1437, 1439, 1479, 3637

Immigration—*Con.*
Canada Colonization Association—*Con.*
Advances, qu. 517, 1479
Advertising, 1318
Agreement, 1879, 3036
Signing of, 1976
Terms, 1102
Amery, Colonel, 1328
Brown, Mr. M. A., 1102-3, 1172, 1328
Letters from Messrs. Meighen and Forke, 1333
Budget expenses, 1877
Calder, Hon. Senator, voluntary colonizing agency, 1333
Canadian Manufacturers' Association, contribution, 1164
Canadian National Railways, 3324
Canadian Pacific Railway, and, 3324
Commission, 1877
Community clubs, 1183
Crawford and Kurdydyk, Messrs., letters, 1396
Creelman, Mr. George, manager, eastern Canada, 1172
Dennis, Col. J. S., statement of, 1324
Everett, Mr. Edward, manager, 1092, 1103, 1172
Forke, Mr. Robert, director, 1407
Letter to Mr. Brown, 1333
Statement by, 1105
Grant, 1877
Hebridean immigrants, 3585
History of organization, 1102
Imperial government, financial support, 1429
Land, sales of, 1316, 1431, 1877
Commission of ten per cent, 1102
Interest rate, 1877
Selection and purchase, 1091
Luse Land Company, 1103
McRae, General, 1324
Meighen, Right Hon. Mr., letter to Mr. Brown, 1333
Minister's statement, 1320
North Atlantic Trading Company, 1092
Officers and directors, 1327
Proposals, memo of, 1877
Published statement of objects, 1180
Railway contributions, 3400, 3633
Reorganization, 3324, 3400
Salvation army, 1093
Soldier Settlement supervisors, services of, 1090, 1877
Speculation in unimproved land, 1118
Subscriptions, 1877
Subsidy of $10,000 per month, 1092
Willison, Sir John, 1172, 1182, 1323, 1328, 1429

Immigration—*Con.*
Canada Colonization Association—*Con.*
Willison, Sir John—*Con.*
Letter to directors, 1431
Retirement from presidency, 1164, 1332, 1431
Telegram, 1325, 1331
Withdrawal of financial support, 1208
Canadian born, 3032
Canadian citizenship, value of, 2911
Canadian Council of Immigration, 1876
Central, southern and eastern European, 1346, 1883
Child, 1099, 1227, 1243, 1342, 1469, 1472, 1475
Agencies, grants to, 1469, 1470
Barnardo, Dr., 1099, 1470
Bilbrough-Wallace, Mrs., 1470
Cardinal Manning, 1470
Catholic Emigration Association, 1470
Cossar, Dr. George C., 1471
Inspection, 1874
Marchmont Homes, 1470
Middlemore, Sir J. T., 1470
National Children's home and orphanage, 1470
Oriental, 1445. *See also* Chinese Immigration bill
Quarrier, Mr. William, 1470
Rye, Miss 1470
Salvation army, 1470
Smart, Mr. Bogue, 1469
Statistics as to 1470
Chinese. *See under this title,* Oriental
Colonization, 1178, 1333
Eastern provinces, 1134
Societies, 1876
Commonwealth Club of California, 1195
Competition and, 1418, 1426
Conference with railway and shipping companies, 1193
Conservative administration under, 1335-6
Co-ordination of activities, 2800
Co-operation, 1255
Cost of, 1439
Crerar, Hon. T. A., statement, 1123
"Dangerous agitators from British Isles", 3033
Denmark, from, 1096
Department. *See* Immigration and Colonization
Deportation, 1875
British soldier, alleged inhuman treatment, 2254
Deserters from ships, 2435
Discrimination between native-born and immigrant, 2732
Distribution of, 1198

Immigration—*Con.*
Domestic servants, 1099, 1115, 1166, 1189, 1200, 1243, 1474, 1475-6, 1477, 1876
Doukhobors, 1176
Settlement and migration, 1340
Drift to cities, 1165-1171, 1342
Economic conditions and, 1231
Emigration, *See that title*
Empire settlement scheme, 288, 1096, 1111, 1120, 1127, 1132, 1175, 1205, 1237, 1328, 1480
Canada's non-co-operation, 1096
Canada's participation, 667
Grant
Agreement, 1461, 1464, 1469
Division of, 1475
European, 1085, 1094, 1170, 1340, 1346, 2748
Agencies, 1876
Assimilation of, 2749
Northern European, 1227, 1249
Southeastern European, 1195
Exhibitions, 1454
Expenditure, 1908, 2969
Contingencies and general expenses, **1873**
M. (Mr. Murdock) to reduce, 1908
Total, 1208
Farm labourers, 1100, 1115, 1166, 1174, 1187, 1188, 1190, 1200, 1358, 1416, 1475
Farmers, of, 1115, 1188, 1189, 1421
Farmers' Advocate, 1186
Financial assistance to settlers, 1098. *See also under this title,* Assisted Passages
Follow-up policy, 1181
Foster homes for children. *See under this title,* Child
Fowler, Senator, statement by, 3032
France, 1173
German and Hungarian immigrants, 1094
Growth of West due to, 1881-2
Hebridean, 2950, 3037, 3252, 3584, 4706
Canada Colonization Association, 3585
Macdonnell, Rev. Father, **3585**
Settlement in valley of Red Deer, 3252
Treatment of, M. (Mr. Speakman) to discuss etc., 3584, withdrawn, 3603
"Hidden Hand," the, 1167, 1193, 1201
Hindu, 498, 1120-8. *See also that title*
Franchise, 503, 4077, 4640, 4655
Iceland, from, 1096
Immigrant's struggle and success, 1216, 1399
Immigrants, rejected, qu. 706, qu. 1992
Imperial government, and, 1328
Increase of, 3055
Indian army officers, 1096
Intending immigrants to make application. *See* Immigration Act Amdt. bill
International Labour Conference, 1631
Isle of Man, address by Mr. F. W. Kerr, 2949
Jacobs, Mr., speech at Winnipeg, 1429

Immigration—*Con.*
Japanese. *See under this title,* Oriental
King, Mackenzie, Mr., speech at Stouffville, 1430
Labour. *See also that title*
Attitude of, 1167, 1176, 1186, 1193, 1196, 1241, 1337, 1892-3
Competition with, 2816
Employers and, 1193, 1194
Howat and Meyerscough, detention. *See* Howat; Labour
Restriction of, 1104
Land, 1091, 1102. *See also* Dominion Lands
Adjoining railways, 1893
For American immigrants, 1093, 1101
Sales, appraisal, 1316, 1431, 1877
Settlement, 2834
Larkin, Mr. James, detention at border, 1163, 1212, 1309, 3156. *See also* Howat
Literature, 1097-8, 1226, 1239, 1389, 1414, 1428, 1433. *See also under this title* Advertising; Propaganda; Publicity
Misreprensentations, 1203
Lloyd, Bishop, reported statement, 1117, 2844
Loans for passages. *See also under this title,* Assisted Passages
Overseas settlement board, 1469, 1481
Location of immigrants, 2834
London Times
Advertisement, South Africa, 1180
Statement of, 1124
Lougheed, Sir James, statement by, 3032
"Man with the sheepskin coat", 1204
Maritime provinces to, 1086, 1131, 1198, 1236
Ignoring of, 2950
Mechanics from the Clyde, 1204
Medical inspection, 702, 1875
Mennonites, 1176, 1229, 1341, 1884
Moore, Mr. Tom, 1170
National Trust Company, statement of president, 1122
Naturalization, 2196. *See also that title*
Netherlands, 1095, 3591
New Zealand Immigration Act, 497
Nomination system, 1360, 1475-8
Non-English speaking immigrants, 1216
Norway and Sweden from, 1191
Officers in Great Britain, 1879. *See also under this title* Agents
Ontario, into, 1096-98, 1428, 1475
Child immigration and foster homes, 1099
Domestic servants, 1099
London office, 1428
Northern, into, 1097, 1320
Oriental, 1117, 1247, 1307, 1346, 1443, 1900, 2941, 3037. *See also* Imperial Conference
Bill respecting, 4441

Immigration—*Con.*
Oriental—*Con.*
Bishop of New Westminster, on, 504
Chinese, 499, 1443, 1448, 4641. *See also* Chinese Immigration bill
Admission, statistics, 1921-22, 1445
Assimilation, 2321
Children, 1445, 1452, 2484
Education of, 1896
Consul General for China, propaganda, 1896
Estimates, 1443
Exclusion, 2313
Fingerprints, 502
Head tax, 1445
Evasion of, 2309
Indentured labour, 2330
Japanese and, 1117
Liberal platform of 1919, 1652
Merchants, 2309
Definition of, 2329
Students and, 1445, 2308, 2310
New Westminster Retail Merchants Association, 2319
Rainbow Shingle Mills, strike, 2319
Registration, 502, 1445, 1447, 1452
Regulations, 1445
Religious organizations, representations from, 2310
Roosevelt, the late Theodore, statement, 2320
Sailors, 2333
Schools, 2326
Silverton, B.C., public meeting, res. 2338
Tong wars, 2337
Tsur, Hon. Chilien, 1896
United States, 2313
Victoria retail merchants, 2316
Wives, 2484
Women, 2310, 2318
Competition of labouring classes, 1287
Disallowance of British Columbia legislation, 1161
Estimates, 1441, 1443
Exclusion of, 2869
United States, from, 1194
Hindu, 498, 1120, 1128. *See also* Hindus, Franchise
Franchise, 503, 4077
Sastri, Right Hon. V. Srinivasa
Letter from Prime Minister, 4665
Visit to Canada, 4641
Japanese, 1450, 1894, 4641. *See also* Immigration Act Amdt. bill
Birth rate, 1898
British Columbia, menace to, 1900
Canadian Japanese Association, pamphlet, 1894
Citizenship, 2442

Immigration—*Con.*
Oriental—*Con.*
Japanese—*Con.*
Consul General at Ottawa, pamphlet, 1894
Correspondence with Mr. McQuarrie, 1894
Direct, 1448
Escape from immigration sheds, Vancouver, 1447
"Gentlemen's agreement" 512. *See also under this title,* Lemieux agreement
Japanese freighter with stowaways, 859, 1448, 1451, 1454
Japanese organizations in United States, 2444
Lemieux agreement, 1894
Modification, 1447
Limitation of, 1449
Merchants, 1452
Nationality, 2443
Naturalization, 2442
Negotiations with Japanese government, 2328, 4441
North American Commission of American Legion, pamphlet, 1898
Petition of W. J. Bartlett and others, 2837, 4075
Irregular, Speaker's ruling, 2885
Propaganda in United States, 1896
Race equality, 1896
Restriction of emigration by Japanese government, 2328
Rights as British Subjects, 1899
Root-Takahjira "gentleman's agreement" 512
Supposed special privilege to land holders, 1450
Merchants, definition of, 1452. *See also under this title,* Chinese
Naturalization, 1453
Ormsby-Gore, Mr. W. G. on Canadian policy, 1111
Overcharging, Quebec, 3324
Overseas Settlement Board, 1099, 1469
Agreement, 1476. *See also under this title,* Empire Settlement Scheme
Passage. *See* Assisted Passages
Paternalism, 1133
Permission to intending immigrants. *See* Immigration Act Amdt.
Poland, 1204
Policy, 19, 29, 42, 1095, 1120-30, 1213, 1315, 1386, 1443, 1461, 2774, 2805, 2816, 2833, 2844, 2869, 2874, 2911, 2949, 3036
British dominions, 1882
Comment of London Times on, 1111
Laurier, Sir Wilfrid, 1177

Immigration—*Con.*
Population. *See also that title.*
Loss of, 3018
Not increased by, 1195
Prepaid passages, agreement with Imperial government, 2611. *See also under this title,* Assisted Passages
Prices of agricultural and manufactured products, 1407. *See also* Prices
Printing, 1873
Private enterprise, 1414
Progressive members, attitude of, 2774
Propaganda, 1192, 1389. *See also under this title,* Advertising; Literature; Publicity
Embracing all Canada, 1098
Oriental, 1894-6-8
Prosperity and depression, 1177
Provinces
Co-operation of, 1085
Other than western, discrimination against, 1097
Provincial governments and, 1327
Publicity, 1873. *See also under this title,* Advertising; Literature; Propaganda
Advertisements, cost of, qu. 518
Committee, 1871
Special writers, 1874
"Public charge" 3155
Qualifications of immigrant, 1882
Quebec, into, 1104, 1198
Railways acting as agents, 1191
Recruiting, 2834
Repatriation, 1085, 1188, 1198, 1876, 2834
French Canadians in United States, 1462
Restriction of, 1169, 1174, 1186, 1233. *See also under this title,* Oriental
Orders in council, 1128
Russia, 1340, 2845
St. John immigration building, 1464, 1908
Agreement with C.P.R., 1458
Salvation army, 1093, 1430, 1876
Saskatchewan
Domestic servants, 1099
Mennonites, 1229
Scandinavia, 1216
Scotland from, 1095, 1876
Scottish Aid Society, 1876
Selection, 1098, 1108, 1219, 1254
Settlement in colonies, 1100
Settlements far removed from railways, 3431
Shaw, Lord, statement in Winnipeg, 2833
Shipping Federation of Montreal, protest, 2435
Sifton, Sir Clifford
Importation fo British workmen, 1186
Policy, 1204, 1881-83

Immigration—*Con.*
Smart, Mr. Bogue, child immigration, 1469
Soldier Settlement board, 1126, 1255. *See also under this title,* Canada Colonization Association
Extension of system to immigrants, 1128
Supervisory agents, 1179
Speeches
Adverse effect of, 1423
"Blue ruin," 3037
Standards of living, 1127
Statistics, 3036, 3055
1881-1922, 1094
1914-1921, 1111
1920-22, 1105
Steamship companies, bonuses to, 1109, 1462
Stornoway immigrants, 3037. *See also under this title* Hebridean
Supplies, Quebec, 496
Alleged overcharging, 3324
Sweden and Holland, from, 1095, 3591
Switzerland, 3591
Tariff and, 1133. *See also* speeches on Budget
Taxation and, 1121, 1319, 2791. *See also* speeches on Budget
Thirty-two year payment plan, 1317
Thornton, Sir Henry, 1167 2795, 2844
Trade
Effect upon, 1122
Relations with oriental countries, 507
Ukrainians, 1341, 1396, 1883
Unemployment relief, 1679, 2730
Union Nationale Francais, 1877
United Farmers of Alberta, res. 81
United Farmers of Ontario, res. 1191
United States. *See also that title*
Agencies, 1875
From, 43, 1105, 1113, 1243
Unskilled labourers, 2822
Vancouver immigration sheds, 1896
Vessel crews, 2670, 3981. *See also* Japanese
Walker, Sir Edmund, 1343
War years, during, 20
Western Canada, 1086, 1347
Attitude of, 107, 1086-92, 1129
Western Canada Colonization Association. *See under this title,* Canada Colonization
Women's immigration division, 1876

Immigration Act Amendment Bills. *See also* Chinese Immigration bill
1. Permission to intending immigrants (Mr. Neill) 1r., 74; order for 2r. stands, 497, 857

Immigration Act Amendment Bills—*Con.*
2. Alien enemies; fines, shipmasters reporting desertions (Mr. Stewart, Argenteuil) 1r., 2204; 2r., com., 2428; com., 2668; 3r., 2671; Senate amdts., 3981
Sections and subjects discussed
British subject, 2429
Canadian citizen, definition, 2429
Canadian domicile, 2429
Deportation, 2429, 3981
Conspirators, 2428
Without trial, 2433
Deposit as security for return of deserters, 2435
Discharging crew without examination, 2435
Enemy aliens, 2428, 2667
Repeal of 1919 legislation, 2428
Undesirable classes, 2428, 2668
Aliens, 2428, 2667
Assassination, 2669
Vessel crews, 2670, 3981

Immigration and Colonization department
Chief Controller, 2308
Chinese immigration, salaries, 1443
Deputy Minister, Mr. W. J. Black
Appointment, 2664
Visit to Europe, 668, 1096, 1473, 1476, qu. 1633, 2084
Estimates, 1082-1135, 1163, 1213, 1315, 1386, 1443, 1464, 1873, 1909
Contingencies and general expenses, 1873
M. (Mr. Murdock) to reduce, 1908
Statement of expenditure, 1480
George, Little, deportation, qu. 3704
Lee, Miss Barbara, dismissal, qu. 385, qu. 2393
Little, Mr. W. R., employment, qu. 3144, qu. 4302
Minister
Reported statement, Sir Henry Thornton, as to, 2795, 2844
Statement of, 1082
Outside service, salaries, 1082, 1106, 1163, 1213, 1315, 1386
Quebec employees, qu. 4752
Burne, Mr. Joseph, qu. 3141
Transfers, qu. 3141
Salaries and contingencies, 1909
Amdt. (Mr. Spencer) to reduce, 1441, neg. 1441
Staff transfers, qu. 2517
Travelling expenses of inspectors, 1874

Imperial Conference
Agenda, 1686
Discussion of, 4638
Opportunity for, 3059, 3223, 3453, 4250

Imperial Conference—*Con.*
Agenda—*Con.*
Inquiry, 1976
Tabled, 1991
British North America Act, right to amend, 4660
Canada's status, 4664
Canadian autonomy, 4651
Canadian representative in United States, 3085, 4664
Commitments, 3059, 3223
Conferences of 1917 and 1921
Cattle embargo, 26
Smuts, General, 72
Confidential matters, 4660
Constitutional questions, 4660, 4661
Discussion, forecast of, 3453. *See also under this title,* Agenda
Egyptian policy, 4662
Embargo on breeding cattle, 3291
Expenses of delegation, 4638
Foreign relations, 4659
Hindu immigrants, franchise, 508, 4077, 4640
Imperial Federation, 4661
Imperialism, 4655, 4656
Militarism, 4652
Naval Service, 4654
Policy, 3453
Preferential tariff, 4661. *See also* British Preference
Publicity, 4665
Purchasing power of money, 4666
Reparations, 4653
Report inadequate, 4662
Representation of Canada, 1686
Resolution of Mr. Mackenzie King in 1921, 1535
Singapore naval base, qu. 3506, 3822
Treaty of Versailles, modification of, 4653
War, Canada's participation, 4655

Imperial Economic Conference, 4666
Agenda, 1686
Discussion of, 4638, 4666
Opportunity for, 3453, 4250
Inquiry, 1976
Tabled 1991
Expenses of delegation, 4638, 4666
Representation of Canada, 1686

Imperial Federation, British labour party and, 4651

Imperial Oil Company. *See also* Oil; Petroleum bounties
Gasoline, price of, 2547

Imperial Relations. *See* Canada's Participation in War; Imperial Conference; Near East Crisis; Treaties

Imperial Shipping Committee, qu. 3137

Imperial Veterans of Canada, petition, 4536

Imperialism. *See* Imperial Conference

Implements. *See* Agricultural Implements

Importation of Liquor. *See* Canada Temperance Act; Liquor

Imported Goods, marking of. *See* Customs and Excise

Imports and Exports, 2401. *See also* Agriculture; British Preference; Budget; Customs and Excise; Reciprocity; Trade; Treaties, French, Italian
- Agricultural products, 445, 1390
- Balance of trade, 2922
- Beans, 2981
- Binder twine, 2965
- Coal, 1226. *See also* Coal
- Comparison of 1897 and 1923, 3060
- Direct. *See this title under* British Preference; Treaties, French Treaty
- Exports
  - Agricultural machinery, qu. 814
  - Agricultural products, qu. 814
  - Butter. *See* Dairying Industry
  - Canada's best customer, 1838
  - Cattle to United States, 1410, 2910
  - Cheese. *See* Dairying Industry
  - Electric power, 658. *See also that title*
  - Export trade, 1838
  - France to, 1977, 2213. *See also under* Treaties, French Treaty
  - Gold, 4249
  - Grain. *See* Grain and Grain Trade
  - Newsprint. *See* Pulp and Paper
  - Potatoes, qu. 621. *See also that title*
  - Products of farm, sea and forest, 3061
  - Pulpwood. *See* Export Act Amdt.; Pulp and Paper
  - Settlers' effects, 20-21
  - Wheat 2774, 3062. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade
    - Great Britain, to, qu. 1867
- Fishery products, 445
- France, 2210, 2230. *See also* Treaties, French Treaty
- Grain, 2748. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade
- Great Britain, 2928. *See also* British Preference
- Home markets, 2869
- Imports
  - Agricultural products, qu. 617, 1246, 2917, 2958
    - United States, from, 2708

Imports and Exports—*Con.*
- Imports—*Con.*
  - Animals and animal products, 445
  - Butter, 2821
  - Canned vegetables, 445
  - Coal, qu. 490, qu. 516, 2828. *See also that title*
  - Direct, 2898
  - Duty collected, 2838. *See also* Customs and Excise
  - Eggs from United States, 2708, 2821
  - Farm produce, 1426
  - France, from, 1977
  - Fresh and dried fruits, 445
  - Marking, 931
  - Panama canal, via, 1921
  - Potatoes, 2820
  - Raisins, qu. 2699
  - Sales tax on, 4409
  - Silks, 445
    - France, from, 2397. *See also* Treaties, French
  - Tobacco, qu. 1258
  - United States from, 2820. *See also that title*
- Increased, 2936, 3055
- United States, 2929. *See also that title*

Income Tax. *See this title under* Taxation

Income War Tax Act 1917 Amdt. Bill (Chief occupation; interest on borrowed capital; deductions for expenses; incomes of consuls and consuls-general; penalty against employer; appeals; taxes; prior lien; indebtedness to taxpayer; distress in default of payment; pension exemptions). Res. 4440, 4491; 1r., 4502; 2r., com., 4504; 3r., 4508
- Sections and subjects discussed:
  - Act to come into force, 4508
  - Certificate of default to be registered as judgment, 4506
  - Collection of tax from third party, 4506
  - Decision of minister, notice of dissatisfaction with, 4505
  - Income from chief occupation, 4504
  - Taxes to be a lien, 4505

Indebtedness. *See* Bank Act Amdt.; Budget; Finance; Loan; Public Debt

Indemnity of Members. *See* House of Commons; Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill

Independent Commissions. *See* Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power)

India
Automobiles, export to, 508
Canadian trade commissioner in, 1840
Grain production, 1840
Hindu franchise, 4077. *See also* Imperial Conference; Hindus
Immigration of army officers from, 1096

Indian Affairs department. *See this title under* Indians

Indians
Agents
Burke, Mr. J. Garry, 2151
Local, 2146
Perth, New Brunswick, 2154
Wootten, Mr., 2154
British Columbia, 2152, 2163
Chieftainship, 2148
Condition of, 2125, 2145
Education, 2164
Brandon, 2147
Edmonton school, 2149, 2164, 2165
Elkhorn school, 2147
Kamloops, 2146, 2152
Morley reserve, 2150
Oblate Fathers, 2145
Red Deer school, 2164
Residential schools, 2164
St. Albert school, 2149
Sarcee reserve boarding school, 2145
White Bear reserve, 2162
Farming, 2156
Fishing, grazing and wood permits, qu. 706
General, 2163
Great Slave lake and Mackenzie districts, 2145
Hospitals, medical attendance, 2145, 2160
Hunting grounds, 2146
Indian Affairs, department
O'Connor, Mr. P. J., qu. 2085
Estimates, 2124, 2145, 2165, 4702
Salaries and contingencies, 2165
Live stock, 2162
Manitoba, 2145-7
Medical service, doctors, 2145, 2160
New Brunswick, 2124, 2153
North West territories, 2145-7
Nova Scotia, 2124, 4702
Ontario and Quebec, 2124 2146
Peguis, Saulteaux chief, monument, 4704
Potlatching, gaol sentence for, 2163
Preservation of, 2151-52
Prices charged to, qu. 3142
Rations, 2148
Relief, 2125
Reserves, 2124
Blackfeet, 2148
Prices charged, qu. 3142

Indians—*Con.*
Reserves—*Con.*
Blood, 2159
Carleton, 2162
Caughnawaga, expulsion of half-breeds, 2163
File Hills, 2145
Grain production on, 1139, 2156
Greater production, 2150, 2155, 2156, 2162
Highways passing through, 2153
Kitsilano, 383
Land, lease of, 2150
Moose Mountain, qu. 706
Muscowequan, 2156
Nipissing, 1307
Perth, N. B., 2154
St. Peter's, 2153
St. Pie, fencing, 2154
St. Regis, 2163
Sarcee, 2125, 2145
Six Nations, 1307, 2148
Tobique, timber cutting, 2154, 2155
Turtle Mountain, 3413
White Bear, 2162
Saskatchewan, 2145-7
Sioux, 2160
Round Plain band, 2162
Starving, 2125
Statement by minister, 2145
Titles, extinguishment of, 3398. *See* Dominion Lands Act bill
Tuberculosis, 2152
Western Canada, 2145

Indictable Offences. *See* Criminal Code

Indirect Taxation. *See* Taxation

Industrial and Scientific Research. *See* Research

Industrial Councils, Joint. *See* Labour

Industrial Designs. *See* Trade Mark and Designs Act

Industrial Disputes. *See* Labour

Industrial Disputes Investigation Act Amdt. Bill
(Application for boards; pending proceedings) 1r., 1361; 2r., com., 2061; 3r., 2063; Senate amdts., 4357, 4592
Sections and subjects discussed:
Industrial towns, 2889
Judges on conciliation boards, 4358

Industrial Problems, credit and. *See* Credits

Industrial towns, 2886, 2889, 2891

Industries. *See also* Address; Budget; Labour; Textiles; Trade
Agricultural prosperity and, 2962
Annual production, statement, 2720
Basic
Adequate protection 2822
Assistance to, 3238. *See also* Bounties
Wool-combing, qu. 1973. *See also* Wool
Bonused, 3072
Capital diverted from by income tax, 2914
Conservation of, 2820
Control of bank directors, 4022, 4023
Democracy in, 2727
Encouragement of, 2958
By artificial means, 3062
Farmers and, 2853
French treaty, effect on, *See* French Treaty
Indigenous, 2779, 2806
Industrial centralization, 2850
Industrial conditions, 636, 3002. *See also* speeches on Address, Budget
Industrial revolution, 2723
Industrial towns, 2886, 2889, 2891
Closed town system, 2888
Industry and finance, 4053
Investigation of by tariff commission, 2955
Joint control of, 1654
Key, 2752
Labour costs, 2876
Lack of in western provinces, 4047
Manufactured products
Exports, 3061
Value of, 2934
Manufacturing
Costs, 1409, 2720
Labour organizations and, 1857
Overhead, 2928
Production and distribution, 3029
Establishment in West, 1405
New, assistance to, 2780
Prices of agricultural and industrial products, 1403. *See also* Prices
Primary, relief, 2718
Protected, 2798, 2957
Raw materials, free trade in, 2858
St. Stephen, N.B., 2901
Salaries, average, 2720
Small industries, disappearance of, 2850
Tariff and, 3024
Wages, average, 2720
Watered stock, dividends on, 2956
Western Canada, 1889
Wood-working, 2806

Inflation and Deflation. *See* Finance; Money; Prices

Ingram, Mr., appointment. *See* Immigration

Inheritance Tax. *See* Taxation

Inland Revenue. *See also* Customs and Excise
Illicit stills, remission of fines, 2299
Postage stamps, used for, 3938. *See also* Post Office

Inland Revenue Act Amdt. Bills
1. Excise duties changed; cigarette duties
Res. 2655, 3229; 1r., 3242; 2r., com., 4392; 3r., 4393
2. Certificate of analyst; deodorizing or clarifying denatured alcohol; home-grown tobacco
Res. 3749; 1r., 4131; 2r., com., 4207; 3r., 4208; Senate amendments, 4528
3. Certificate of analyst, etc., order discharged, 3969

Insect Pests, 595. *See also* Agriculture; Forests and Forestry
Alfalfa weevil, 596
Apple sucker, 596
Browntail moth, 596
Cereal rust, 595
Codling moth, 597
Cornborer, 595
Cut worms, 4632
Grasshoppers, 595, 3447
Gypsy moth, 596
Nursery stock, 596
Potato diseases, 595
Satin moth, 596
Spruce bud worm, 596
White pine blister, 595

Inside Service. *See* Civil Service

Insolvent Cases. *See* Bankruptcy Act

Inspection of Seeds. *See* Seeds

Inspection of Fruit and Fruit Containers. *See* Sale and Inspection

Institutionalism, excess of, 1214, 1400, 1890. *See also* Hoey; Immigration; Speakman

Insulin Treatment, discovery. *See* Banting, Dr.

Insurance. *See also* Canadian National Railways; Returned Soldiers
Agents, bank officials acting as, 4093, 4094
Bank loans, security, 4094
Canadian National Railways. *See that title*
Combinations, 2591
Fire, soldier settlers, 496
Grain cargoes, 3764, 4219, 4223
Hail, 2769, 4095, 4509
Hail Insurance Commission of Saskatchewan 2770

Insurance—*Con.*
Hanna, Mr. D. B., director, 2050
Insurance branch
Annuities, old age, 1697
Salaries and contingencies, 3987
Live Stock condemnation, qu. 1972, 2699. *See also* Live Stock
Mitchell, Mr. A. J., director, 2050
Mutual companies, 4095-7
Roof coverings, 4703
Soldier Settlement Board, Edmonton, 3506
Soldiers. *See* Returned Soldiers Insurance bill

Insurance Act 1917 Amdt. Bill
(Duplication of returns; automobile insurance; correction of French version)
1r., 3045; 2r., com., 3147; com., 3977, 4357; 3r., 4357
Sections and subsections discussed:
Accidents to persons or property, 3978
Application, 3148
Automobile insurance:
Conditions of license for, 3147, 3977
No liability:
If driver under age limit or intoxicated, 3978
Unless stated in policy, 3978
Exceptions to insurability, 3148
French version amended, 3147
Misrepresentation, 3147
Returns of British or foreign unlicensed insurance, 3147

Intercolonial Railway. *See this title under* Canadian National Railways

Intercontinental Transports Limited, ocean freight rates, 2127

Interest. *See* Banks; Credits; Finance; speeches on Budget

Interim Supply. *See also* Estimates; Supply
Concurrence, 1482, 1538

Interim Supply Bills. *See* Appropriation Acts

Interior, Department of. *See also* Geological Survey
Astrophysics
Dominion Astrophysical observatory, Victoria, 3242
Expenditure, 3243
Campbell, Mr. R. H., retirement, 3410
Cory, Mr. W. W., deputy minister, salary, 4667
Dominion observatories, 3242

Interior—*Con.*
Dominion lands and parks, 3406
Canadian National Parks and historic sites, 3938
Contingencies, 3408
Engraving maps, printing reports, 3443
Estimates, 1908, 3242, 3406, 4702
Grazing inspectors, appointment, 3252
Grazing leases, Alberta, revenue, qu. 2515
Irrigation, surveys and inspection, 3428
Mines branch, 2970
Officials, 1108
Ordnance lands, salaries and expenses, 3443
Reclamation of Dominion lands. *See* Dominion Lands; Reclamation
Salaries and contingencies, 1098, 3949
Seed grain advances, 3444
Settlers' relief, 3447
Topographical surveys, 3244
Water powers, surveys, investigations, 3420

Interlocking Directorates. *See* Bank Act Amdt. bill

Internal Economy Commission. *See* House of Commons

International Boundaries
Survey and demarcation, 3246

International Court of Justice, 3994

International Fisheries Commission. *See* Fish and Fisheries

International Harvester Company, 4376

International Institute of Agriculture, 599
Wheat production, 2780

International Joint Commission. *See also* Lake of the Woods; St. Lawrence River Waterway
Lake of the Woods water powers, 3425
Pollution of boundary waters, 700, 3362
St. Lawrence river waterway, aerial survey, 1776, 3762, 3427
Welland canal, 3762

International Labour Conference. *See* Labour

International Law, violation of. *See* Germany, Reparations

International Operation of Railways. *See under* Canadian National Railways, United States lines

International Postal Conference, 4529

International Questions, opportunity for discussion, 3993, 3998

International Relations. *See* Imperial Conference; League of Nations; Treaties, Halibut Fishery
Commercial rivalry and industrial war, 2717

International Waters. *See* Lake of the Woods; St. Lawrence

Interprovincial Trade. *See* Trade

Interstate Commerce Commission. *See* United States

Intoxicating Liquor. *See* Liquor

Inventions. *See* Patents of Invention

Inverness pier, 4572

Investigations. *See* Combines Bill

Ireland
Proportional representation, 395
Senate, constitution of, 1371

Iron and Steel. *See also* Customs Tariff Items; Mines and Minerals
Bounties, 4371, 4381
British industrial development, 3847
Coast Range Steel Company, assistance, 2508
Duties and drawbacks, qu. 1994
Freight rates, 1964
French treaty, 1985, 1988
Iron and steel scrap duty, 2645, 2653, 3034, 3484
Iron ore and smelting industry, 3061
Ore-production and smelting, 3061
Rolled iron and steel
Hoops, bars, etc., duty, 3484
Milling cutters, for, 2653, 3484
Steel-workers strike, 287. *See also* Labour, Strikes
United States, production, 2751

Iron Ores. *See* Mines and Minerals

Irrigation. *See also* Dominion Lands, Reclamation
Alberta, 1436
Brooks demonstration farm, 3429
British Columbia, 457
Central Alberta irrigation scheme, 3428
Drought effect on grain production, 3429
Expenditure, 2969
Lethbridge irrigation district, 3429
Macleod irrigation district, 3429
Northern Saskatchewan, 3430
Surveys and inspections, 3428
United irrigation projects, Cardston, 3429
William Pearce irrigation project, 3430

Irrigation Act Amdt. Bill
(Mining rights of lease holders)
1r., 1992; 2r., com., 2138; 3r., 2204

Irvine, Mr. William (Calgary East)
Audibility of debate, 645
Bank Act Amdt bill, 4037, 4049, 4082, 4118
M. that chairman leave chair, 4125
Shareholders' audit, 4089
Bank mergers, 4137
Banking system, 634
Cadet services, 880
Calgary
Post office building, 1024
Unemployment relief, 1682
Canada-West Indies steamship service, 3378, 3387, 3397
Canadian National Railways, Paris offices, 3650, 3662
Canadian National Safety League grant, 3958
Capital punishment bill, 180, 487
Opportunity for consideration, 1810
Children, mortality of, 1179
Civil Service
Bonus, 1811
Commission, exemptions from jurisdiction, 914
Examinations, 366
Credit and industry, M. 626, 645, 650
Criminal Code Amdt., capital punishment bill, 180, 487, 1810
Customs and excise seizures, qu. 620
Dredging, 1012
Duff, Mr., amendment to Address, 117
Economic conditions, cycles of prosperity and depression, 1177
Emigration to the United States, 1178
Employers' liablity compensation, 692
Farm homes, building loans, 1178
Fielding, Right Hon. Mr., congratulations, 4743
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 333
Hayes, Mr. John J., dismissal, 1687, 1868
Immigration
Attitude of labour towards, 1176, 1177
Hebridean immigrants, treatment, 3600
Policy, 1176-80
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1706-7
Senate amendments, 4362
Interest rate, 4107, 4116
Joint Peat Committee, 387
Labour department
Capitalistic, 1674
Staff, reduction, 1672

Irvine, Mr. William—*Con.*
Labour
Representation in House, 3556
Right to organize, 2888
Lack of confidence vote, M., 208, 239-243
Land, taxation of, 1178
Lignite Utilization board, 387
Mail contractors, names, 3144
Marshall, Mr. Duncan
Appointment and qualifications, 3311, 3295
Redistribution, 3313
Two Ministers of Agriculture, 3313
Money, origin and function, 633
National gallery, 1020
National monument, Connaught place, 1021, 2688
Nova Scotia strike, troops employed, 495
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3555
Ottawa-Hull bridge, 1016
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3854, 4750
Postal appointments, 1801
Powell River Paper Company, 2888
Privilege—Hebridean immigrants, 3649
Proportional representation, 405
M. (Mr. Good) 414
Public buildings, Maritime provinces, 1022
Returned soldiers, unemployment relief, 1679
Scientific and industrial research, qu. 731
Secession—reported statement of Hon. W. F. Roberts, 3145
Single tax, 1178
Soldier Settlement board, 1179
Steamship services, 3378, 3387, 3397
Unemployment, 628
Federal and provincial responsibility, 1678
Relief, 690, 1679
Vetcraft shops, 695
Western conditions, cause of, 1890

Isenberg Leases. *See* Hoppe and Isenberg

Isle Perrot bridge, 3646

Italian Treaty. *See this title under* Treaties

Italy
Senate, constitution of, 1372
Tariff. *See also* Treaties, Italian Treaty
Trade, 2395
Treaty with. *See* Treaties
Wool-combing, 2866

Ivel, Mr. W. M. *See* Redistribution

Jackson, Professor, price chart, 1403

Jacobs, Mr. S. W. (George Etienne Cartier)
American fishing schooner Siloam, capture, 2207

Jacobs, Mr. S. W.—*Con.*
Arsenals, Quebec and Lindsay, 2165
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4050, 4052, 4056
Point of order, 4055
Bankruptcy Act M. (Mr. Casgrain) 1493, 1515
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3086-3108 3211-21
Belle River harbour, 4596
Binder twine, duty, removal of, 4387
Board of Audit bill, 4357
Business of the House
Private members' day, 1160
Saturday sittings, 3452
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2408 2413
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 3832
Canadian National Railways
Audit staff, transfer from Moncton, 575
Branch lines construction bill, 4335
Paris offices, 4514
Canadian representative in United States, 3085
Cattle embargo, reported statement of Mr. Duncan Marshall, 2614
Civil Service Act. M. (Mr. Power) 547
Combines bill, 2628
Criminal Code Amdt. bill (Registration of ownership) 615
Deputy minister of Immigration, 668
English and French-speaking people, 1341
Halibut fishery treaty, 1309
Hindu immigrants, franchise, 514, 4077, 4640
Immigration
Alleged campaign against, 332
Assimilation, 1117
Canada Colonization Association, 1164
President, 1092
Exodus to United States, 1165
Farm labour and domestic servants, 1165
Germany and Hungary, from, 1094
Labour, attitude towards, 1167
Medical inspection, 702
Policy, 1163-71
Restriction of, 1169
Shipping Federation of Montreal, protest, 2435
Immigration Act Amdt. bill, 514, 2428-35
Legislation of 1919, 243-32
Ships' crews, 2435, 2670
Undesirable classes, 2669
Imperial Conference, 4640-4661
Indians
Caughnawaga reserves, expulsion of half-breeds, 2163
Edmonton school, 2165

Jacobs, Mr. S. W.—*Con.*
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act Amdt. bill, 4359, 4361
King George and race-track betting, 728
Labour Gazette, printing, 1624
Meighen, Right Hon. Mr., alleged statement in North Essex, 670
Money, purchasing power of, 1167
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2189 2195, 2438, 2461
British system, 2438
Judical and executive authority, 2462
Limited naturalization, 2461
Nationality, dual, 2463
Secretary of State, administration, 2461
Opium and Narcotic Drugs, 700
Printing, outside Bureau, cost of, qu. 3131
Public Works Act, tender and contract, 957
Railway Act Amdt. bill (return tickets) 615
Receipt tax, 4425
Roumanian and Greek loans, qu. 623
Sales tax
Book or account, 4434
Licensed manufacturer, 4421
Speech at Winnipeg, 1429
Standard of living, 1168
Thetford Mines strike, 2207
Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner) 1295
Unemployment, 1168

James Bay Railway, 1036, 1049, 1402
Coal, transportation of, 1073

Japan
Bean-growing industry, 2982
British-Japanese relations, 2470
Canadian naturalization, 2442, 2461, 2467
Competition from, 2861
Expatriation from, 2443
French treaty, 3035
Immigration. *See also that title*
Restriction by Japanese government, 2328
Imports and exports, 1978, 2255
Japanese consul general
Immigration, 1447, 1894
Pamphlet, 2443
Japanese fishermen, 4484. *See also* British Columbia
Japanese organizations in United States, 2444
Military service, 2443
Mizusawa, Mr. Kosaku, alleged intervview, 1899
Nationality, 2442
Negotiations with, 4441
Rights of foreigners in, 1895
Silks, 2397
Trade concessions to. *See* Treaties, French Treaty

Japan—*Con.*
Trade with, 2214, 2234. *See also* Treaties, French Treaty
Trade treaty with, 1449, 2399
Wool-combing, 2866

Japanese. *See also* British Columbia; Fish and Fisheries; Immigration

Japanese Fisheries Association, 1453

Jelliff, Mr. L. H. (Lethbridge)
Accredited herds, 586
Agricultural credit system, 1438
Alberta
Grain production, 1435
Irrigation, 1436
Live stock, 1435
Southern, conditions in, 1435
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4113
Canadian National parks and historic sites, 3438
Cost of living, burdensome to farmers, 1437
Edmonton elevator, 4716
Freight rates, equalization of, 1437
Grain dockage and screenings, 786
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1437
Policy, 1435
Interest rate, 4113
Irrigation, surveys and inspection, 3429
Lethbridge elevator, 4716
Marketing of grain, M. (Mr. Millar) 300
Oil prospecting and development, 780
Petroleum bounties, 780
Public buildings, rents, 1025
St. Lawrence ship channel, 3339
Sales tax, M. (Mr. Stevens) 927
Timber wolves, 597
Tourist traffic, Southern Alberta, 3438

Jobbers
Sales tax and. *See* Special War Revenue Act Amdt. bill

Joggins, N. S., breakwater, 943

Johansen, Mr. F., assistant zoologist, 3360

Johnson, Mr. R. M. (Moose Jaw)
Certificate of registrar of Supreme Court, 515
Sales tax collections, qu. 285
Status of, inquiry, 202

Johnston, Mr. J. Fred (Last Mountain)
Agriculture, weed menace, 1887
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4097
British preference
Increase in, 2243
Percentage of duties to general rate, 2777

Johnston, Mr. J. Fred—*Con.*
Business of the House
Amdt. right of party not official opposition to move, 1300
Private members' day, 1159
Rules, amendment of, M. for special com. 856, 1299, 1300, 1306-7
Canadian National Railways
Branch lines construction bill, 4307
Grand Trunk, gratuities to directors and officials, 1666
Civil Service Act, special committee, names, 2417
Crowsnest pass agreement, statement that Progressives had forced concession, 2855
Dunblane-Aylesbury branch line, 4308
French treaty bill, 2242
Income tax, revenue, 3027
McMaster, Mr., statement of position, 3030
Nova Scotia secession resolution, 2243
Reciprocity with United States, 2243
Redistribution, 4740
Opportunity for discussion, 4593
Special committee report, 4740
Royal commission on lake rates, report, printing, 2927
Rules, M. for committee, 856, 1299, 1306-7
Seed grain advances, 3447
War claims, 2495
Waterous-Swift Current branch line, 4308
Wheat Board
Legislation, request to extend, 2927
Proceeding under Act of 1922, 1636
Yorkton-Willowbrook branch line, 4308

Joint Industrial Councils. *See* Labour

Joint Peat Committee. *See* Fuel

Jolly Roger, the, 2787

Jones, Mr. George B. (Royal)
Cooke, Mr. Leonard, qu. 2179
St. John river wharves, qu. 1488
St. Margaret's bay road, qu. 3135
Stuart, Mr. John Cameron, qu. 2179

Joynson-Hicks, Sir William, unemployment in Great Britain, 1205

Judges. *See also* Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill; Judges Act Amdt. bill; Naturalization Act Amdt. bill
Admiralty. *See* Admiralty Act Amdt.
Appointments, 3349
County court, naturalization certificates. *See* Naturalization
Industrial disputes conciliation boards, 4358
McKenzie, Hon. D. D., appointment to Bench, 1763, 1810
Naturalization. *See that title*

Judges—*Con.*
Ontario and Quebec courts. *See* Judges Act
Pensions, qu. 492, 1154
Doherty, Right Hon. C. J., qu. 1029, 1154
Political commissions, 3604
Retirement fund, qu. 1362
Salaries
Pensions and, 1154. *See also* Judges Act
Total payments, qu. 491
Trueman, Mr. W. H., K. C., Winnipeg, appointment, 1868
York county, 3607

Judges Act Amdt. Bill
(Salaries; Circuit Court judges)
Res. 3264, 3452, 3603; 1r., 3608; 2r., com., 3609; 3r., 3610
Sections and subjects discussed:
Additional $1,000 to judge of Circuit Court, 3610
Arbitrators or assessors under Railway or public act, 3609
Judges, Supreme Court of Ontario, 3609

Judique, N.S. wharf, 943

Jugo-Slavia, Italian treaty and, 2396

Jurisdiction. *See also* British North America Act; Labour, Unemployment; Lake of the Woods; Provincial Rights
Bankruptcy Act, 3095
Combines. *See that title*
Disallowance of provincial statutes
British Columbia, Chinese immigration, 1161, 1261, 1453
Nova Scotia, 208, 249, 3097, 4678
Drainage, 3256
Education, 882, 1884
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1646
Labour, 1442, 1646, 1650, 1618, 2894
Lake freight rates, 4227-31
St. Lawrence river waterway, 665
Unemployment, 1657, 1678
Water powers, 3421

Jurors, not British subjects. *See* Northwest Territories Act

Jury. *See* Grand Jury

Justice
Administration of, Yukon territory, 705
Appeals from convictions for indictable offences bill, 4250
Capital punishment, 768. *See also* Criminal Code
Department
Correspondence—Mr. F. T. Congdon, K.C., 2299
Employees, number and cost, 2970

Justice—*Con.*
Department—*Con.*
Deputy minister
Opinions
Liquor legislation, 2408
Naturalization, 2440
Wholesale Grocers' case, 2521
Salary, 4671
Estimates, 705, 768, 4667
International Labour Conference, 1442
Salaries and contingencies, 780, 4667
Solicitor General, retirement of, 1763, 1764, 1810, 2710
White, Mr. James, salary, 4667
Dominion statutes, revision, 779
Executive clemency, correspondence, 1975
Litigated matters, expenses, 779
Minister of, absence, 4514
Parole, release on, 1975
Pecuniary claims convention, 780
Penitentiaries, 706, 768
Capital punishment, execution of sentence, 768
Dorchester, qu. 494, 770
Earnings of inmates, 772
Nationality of inmates, 772
Prince Albert, Brenner, Meyer, release, 1975
Stony Mountain, 771
Trial of Eskimos charged with murder, Herschel Island, 4674

Kahn, Mr. Otto H., Elements of Success, 1399

Kamloops
Indian school, 2146
Public building, 1006

Kay, Mr. W. F. (Missisquoi)
Agriculture and Colonization Com.
Carroll, Mr., and, 3268
Oleomargarine, 3268
Reports
First, 858
Second, 911
Third, 986
Fourth, 1441
Fifth, 2204
Live Stock bill, 1441
Baker Memorial Com. report, 1256, 1991
Commissioner of Taxation, salary, 4669
Deputy ministers, salary increases, 4669
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4541
Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill, 1441
Oleomargarine
M. (Mr. Carroll) 3519
Amdt. 3520
Privilege—Mr. Carroll, 3268

Kay, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Soldier settlement, Missisquoi and Brome, 4012

Kellner, Mr. Donald F. (East Edmonton)
Address in reply, 106. Condition of country; inauguration of industrial epoch, 106; farmers in the West and immigration policy, 107; duty of government to see fair play, 108
Alberta Drainage Company, 3144
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4027, 4099-4103, 4133, 4139
Mortgages and hypothecs amdt. 4099 withdrawn, 4133
Percentage chargeable for collection, 4133
British preference and Canadian ports, 2678
Budget, 2809; commendation of Minister of Finance; tariff stability; interpretation of term; speech of Minister of Agriculture; allegation of bad farming; amendment; British preference; comparative statement of rates under government and Progressive proposals, 2809; speech of Minister of the Interior; Progressive party, assumption of power by; capitalistic interests and political parties; inheritance tax; reciprocity with the United States, 2810; agriculture, conditions of; budget; business and financial depression; "calamity howlers"; unsatisfactory conditions in West, 2811; disappointing record of Liberal party; no difference between Liberal and Conservative parties; invisible government; financial control; selfishness of those controlling destinies; prices and the tariff; interest rate; freight rates; charges of professional men; purchasing power, reduction of; conditions in the West; allegation of bad farming and extravagance, 2812; professional men, charges and standards of living, earnings of farmers; ridicule and intimidation of the West, 2813; government out of sympathy with people; Progressive party, predicament of; attention to demands of West, 2814
Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company, qu. 624
Canadian National railways, wage reductions, qu. 1363
Copper bounties, 3239
Crude petroleum duty, 3481
Dental instruments, raw materials, 3484
Deputy ministers, retirement, qu. 3135
Dominion Lands Act Amdt. bill, homesteads, 4364, 4368

Kellner, Mr. Donald F.—*Con.*
Dominion lands and parks, salaries, 3252
Dominion notes, circulation, qu. 1739
Dredging, Plamondon, Alberta, 1013
Farming at a profit, 81
Field supervisors, soldier settlement, 1090
Free trade and protection, 2923
Grand Trunk arbitration, commissioners, qu. 624
Hebridean immigrants, treatment of, 3595
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1352
Personnel, 1092
Policy, 1348
Wealth and, 1122
Inland revenue officers, salaries, qu. 3892
Irrigation, surveys and inspection, 3428
Live stock, tuberculin test, qu. 1972
Merchants bank inquiry, 3990
Solder settlement, 2024, 2027
Typewriters and parts, duty, 3485
Western provinces, conditions in, 1349

Kennedy, Mr. Donald M. (West Edmonton)
Agriculture, assistance to, 3237
Bacon imports and exports, 938
Business of the House, 1386
Canadian air force, forest patrol, 1778
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, steamship service, 2172
Canadian National Railways
Branch lines, construction of, 1185
Fidelity insurance, qu. 1029
Lifting of steel, 1664
Criminal Code Amdt. bill (scrip frauds) 730
Dominion lands, reclamation, 3430
Grain Act, litigation, 2045
Grain shipments, facilities for, 730
Grande Prairie railway, 4200
Harbours and rivers, 1001
Health department, salaries, 2170
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1180
Statement of objects, 1180
Supervision, 1092
Community clubs, 1183
Immigrants, standard of living, 1127
National land settlement plan, 1181
Policy, 1180, 1401
Indians, 2148
Labour Gazette, 1624
Land, clearing by fire, 1185
Mackenzie river district, half breed claims, 3444
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, speeches in Great Britain, 3595
Peace river district
Railway surveys, 4701

Kennedy, Mr. Donald M.—*Con.*
Settlement in, 1184
Prince Rupert Dry Dock Company, bonds, qu. 1138
Purchasing Commission, 1385
Railway Act Amdt. bill, (Equalization of rates) 730
Railway mail service, 1783, 1786
Rural mail carriers, compensation, 1833, 1834
Scrip frauds, 730
Soldier settlement, 2028
Steamship services, 2172
Northern Alberta, 2176
Unemployed pensioners, relief, 2168
Water powers, investigation, 3426

Kennedy, Mr. J. Wilfred (Glengarry and Stormont)
Agricultural conditions, 1843
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 376
Dairy Industry Act, 1914, Amdt. bill, renovated butter, 4510
Dairying industry, 1843
Exhibitions, 1454
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4272
Government workshops, Ottawa, 4620
Health department, salaries, 2170
Indian Affairs department, salaries, 2166
Labour department, employment officers, 1674
Military hospitals, 677
Pensioners, medical examination, 677
Ruddick and Wilson, Messrs. visit to Australia, 3288
St. Lawrence river islands, St. Regis reserve, 2163
Woollen industry, M. (Mr. Drummond) 935

Kennedy, Capt. William, Hudson Bay route, 1052

Kennedy, the late Hon. W. C.
Belle River harbour, 4597
References to, 4, 6, 8, 10, 54, 108
Letter of thanks for sympathy from Mrs. Kennedy, 281

Keynes, Mr. John M., on war, 46. *See also* Germany, Reparations
Economic Consequences of the Peace, 2724

Kincardine, Ont., pier, 982

King, His Majesty the, race-track betting, 728

King, Hon. J. H. (Minister of Public Works)
Armouries, fittings, etc., 1024, 2413
Bamfield public building, 1024
Brandon, damage by flood, 999
British Columbia fishing licenses, 1556

King, Hon. J. H.—*Con.*
Calgary post office, 1024
Calumet-Bryson bridge, 1014
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2410
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 536
Contrecoeur wharf, 950
Copper bounty bill, 3236
Dominion roads and bridges, 1014
Dredging
Alberta, Manitoba and Saskatchewan, 1012
Expenditure, 1012
Maritime provinces, 1009
Nanaimo harbour, 1014
Ontario and Quebec, 1011
Plamondon, Alberta, 1012
Shuswap lake, 1014
Victoria harbour, 1014
Dry Dock Subsidies Act Amdt. bill, 3583, 3979
Edmundston bridge, 1014
Esquimalt dry dock, 2671
Forest protection, M. (Mr. Michaud) 824
Fraser river improvements, 1006
Girrard Bridge Company, charter, 1008
Graving docks, 2682
Grondines wharf, 959
Harbours and rivers, 2671
British Columbia, 1002
Stanley park foreshore, 1008
Expenditures in different provinces, 947
Manitoba, 993
New Brunswick, 945
Grand Manan, 945
Wharves transferred to Dominion, 946
Nova Scotia, 941
Ontario, 981
Port Arthur and Fort William, 2675
Port Burwell harbour works, 983, 1012
Quebec, 950
Grondines wharf, 959
Matane, 970
Ste. Anne des Monts pier, 979
Saskatchewan and Alberta, 1001
Hydro Electric commission, St. Lawrence development, 2682
Lake Manitoba flooding, 1000
Land and cable telegraph lines, 2683
Laurier monument, 1017
Law, the late Bowan B., tablet to memory, 1020
L'Islet wharf, 970
Matapedia birdge, 1014
Montreal ordnance stores building, 1022
Moose Jaw public building, 1023
National Gallery, 1018, 2688
National monument, Connaught place, Ottawa, 1020, 2685
Okanagan lake wharves, repairs, 1008

King, Hon. J. H.—*Con.*
Ottawa-Hull bridge, 1015
Owen Sound wharf, 2690
Parliament buildings, 1716
Acoustics, 1721
Architects, settlement with, 1716
Cost, estimated and actual, 1723
Stone carving, 1720
Tower, 1720
Ventilation, 1722
Pointe aux Trembles wharf, 974
Port Burwell harbour dredging, 983, 1012
Port Elgin breakwater, 2690
Portage la Prairie
Member for, 2681
Sewerage outlet, 994, 998
Printing bureau
Improvements, 1022
New building, 1732, 1738
Public Works
Engineering branch, 1017
Estimates, 941, 993, 1009, 2571
Patronage, 945
Public buildings, 2690
Dominion archives building, 1730
Economy, renting or building, 1735
Local improvement taxes, 1023
Maritime provinces, 1022
New departmental, 1729
Ottawa, Daly building, 1023
Ottawa Parliament buildings, 1716. *See also under this title,* Parliament buildings
Power, 1025
Printing bureau new building, 1730
Rents, 1025
Salaries, 2684
Surveys and inspections, 1020
Public Works Act, contract and tender, 950, 955
Quebec, Champlain dock, 2675
Railway rates, equalization, M. (Mr. Clark) 1954
St. John harbour improvements, 2676
St. Laurent, the late Mr. A., appreciation of, 1006
Selkirk, repair slip, 1000
Sheguindah wharf, 2690
Swift Current public building, 1023
Telegraph and telephone lines, 1017, 2682
Toronto harbour improvements, 985, 1011, 2678
Toronto island protection breakwter, 984
Vancouver harbour bill, 267
Vancouver island telegraph lines, 1017
Victoria and Nanaimo harbours, dredging, 1014

King, Hon. J. H.—*Con.*
Victoria
Dry dock, 1002
Old post office building, taxes, 1024
Wanipigow dam, 1000
Wharves
Revenue, 975, 977
Transfer to Dominion government, 946

King, Mr. J. W. (North Huron)
Budget, 2908. Felicitations to Finance Minister; tariff; automobiles; Henry Ford greatest customs collector in Canada; tariff "purely and simply protective"; Liberal platform of 1896; Sir Wilfrid Laurier on tariff reduction and Senate reform; Liberal party repeating tactics following election of 1896; influences preventing government from carrying out pledges; Progressive party, withdrawals from; capital levy; reciprocity; new sources of revenue; luxuries; inheritance tax, 2909; reciprocity with United States; advantages of enlarged trade; diversity of products; treaty of 1854; abrogation of and its results; reciprocity in natural and manufactured products; manufacturing opportunities in Ontario and Quebec, 2910; President, Massey-Harris Company "ready for free trade"; duties under reciprocity agreement of 1911; members elected to support reciprocity; President Harding and world peace; Washington disarmament conference; trade rivalry cause of war; population greatest need of Canada; five million Canadians in United States; immigration; Canadian citizenship, value of, 2911

King, Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie (Prime Minister; Secretary of State for External Affairs; President of the Privy Council)
Address in reply, 27. Congratulations to mover and seconder; new leader of Progressive party, 27; criticisms of Speech from Throne by Mr. Meighen; co-ordination of National railways, 28; government's immigration policy, 29; national resources of western provinces, 29; Near East Crisis, explanation of circumstances, 29-33; communications from British government, 30; delay in receiving despatches, 31-32

King, Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie—*Con.*
Agricultural Conditions Com. report, 2181
Anglo-Japanese treaty, 1449
Annuities branch, transfer, 1641
Australia, trade treaty, 245
Banff national park, power privileges, 3750
Banting, Dr. F. G., annuity, 4437, 4676
Bell, Major Graham A., salary, 4557
Blackadder, the late Dr. Edward, M. P., 4
Board of Audit Act, 4249
Bolton speech, 2974
Breweries and export liquor houses, licensing, 1636
British Columbia building, London, 4630
British Empire exhibition, 3950
British mails, delay in, 2639
Budget, 3046. Speech of leader of Opposition; attack on Liberal party; fidelity to pledges and principles; Liberal platform of 1919; presentation of "chart"; statement to convention after adoption of platform; resolution presented by opposition in 1921; appeal to the country; campaign speeches, 3047; position on tariff put plainly before people; Liberal platform carried out; the budget, charge that it is protectionist; tariff reductions; British preference; preference of 50 per cent and over, 3048; reciprocity, sugar duties, reduction; no increase in taxation; substantial tariff revision downwards; commercial treaties with France and Italy; Combines Act, 3049; free trade; speech of Mr. McMaster; theoretical study and concrete application; capital, attraction of; tariff walls going higher and higher; world conditions; free trade in Great Britain; slow progress of movement after its inception; industrial revolution; gradual elimination of tariff duties; reciprocity treaty between Great Britain and France, 3050; attitude of Progressive party and Mr. McMaster; leaders in British free trade movement; problems and difficulties in connection with the tariff; amendment, 3051; stability does not mean finality; United States tariff; European situation; British preference, increase of, 3052; cattle embargo, removal of; development of Canadian railways and ports; trade to Pacific ports by Panama canal; trade relations with the United States; Canada seeking new markets; tariff and economic warfare; declara-

King, Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
tion of Genoa Conference; endorsement by Assembly of the League of Nations, 3054; economic conditions; statistics indicating revival; building operations; imports and exports; bank clearings; savings deposits; immigration; employment, 3055
Speech on, reference to, 3056, 3068
Statements omitted from, 2898
Business of the House, 179, 199, 250
Adjournments
Ascension day, 2518
Ash Wednesday, 254
Early, 74
Easter, 1162, 1483
Eleven p.m., 1360
Empire day, 2795, 2983
Hour of, 3261
King's birthday, 3323
Twelve midnight, 4672
Capital punishment bill, proceeding, 487, 1810
Economy of time, 382
Estimates, presentation, 4556, 4598, 4603
Facilitating of, 1836, 4736
Legislation pending, 2518, 3265
Announcement, 3452
M. that Com. rise to report progress, 1836
M. (Mr. Carroll) on oleomargarine, special order, 3270
Private members' day, 1158, 1160-62
Progress of, 2469
Prorogation, 4736
Facilitation of, 4732
Questions as orders for returns, 1385
Redistribution bill, motion to refer, 488
Rules, M. (Mr. Johnston) for special com., 1305
Select standing committee, personnel, 3, 202, 435, 486, 811, 1483, 2047
Sittings
Morning, 4132, 4249
Not later than midnight, 4579
Saturday, 2694, 3453, 4132
Wednesday, 99
Evening, 1163, 1995, 2518, 2694
Supply
Amendment to amendment, 1305
Concurrence, 4735
Business Profits War Tax Act Amdt. 4440
Campaign of 1921, speeches, 3047
Canada, constitutional development, 4474
Canada Temperance Act, correspondence, 1308
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, sale of vessels, 3705

King, Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie—*Con.*
Canadian National Railways
Amalgamation, 34
Order in council tabled, 53
Branch lines construction bill, 4400
Rejection by Senate, 4754
Directors, board of
Additional director from Quebec, 34
Labour representation, 1652
Grand Trunk
Gratuities, royal commission, Mr. F. T. Congdon, K.C., 2347
Shareholders' representations, 3960
Grand Trunk Pacific debenture holders, 3507
Management, responsibility and powers, 3673, 3677
Paris offices, 3673
Canadian National Safety League grant, 3954, 3959
Canadian offices in London, 4630
Canadian Press, Limited, subsidy, 4727
Canadian representative in United States, 3085, 4001
Cape Breton North and Victoria, vacancy, 2469
Capital punishment bill, 487, 1810
Carvell, Hon. F. B., alleged statements, 1869, 1910
Cattle embargo removal, correspondence, 4133
Cecil, Lord Robert, adjournment for lecture, 1685
China, trade relations with, 2313
Chinese immigration bill, 2312-33
Evasions, 2315
Exclusion, 2313
Head tax, 2312
International relations, 2312
Labour competition, 2312
Restriction of immigration, 2312
Students, 2313
Christie, Mr. Loring resignation, 3988
Civil Service
Bonus 1811
Commission, appointments, 371
Cost of living, increase, 1814
Political partisanship, 286
Superannuation, 4593
Work outside regular duties 1675
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 349, 358, 362, 374, 377, 522, 536, 545, 552, 559, 568
Special committee, 936
Appointment, 986
Change in membership, 2417
Coal, cost of, 1813
Combines bill, 254, 496, 938, 987, 2519, 2602, 2615-38, 2659-68, 2701

King, Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie—*Con.*
Combines bill—*Con.*
Amendments proposed, 2520
Civil Service Act, appointments, 2661
Commissioners, appointment and remuneration, 2627
Definition "combine" 2615, 2666
Distribution of report, 2632
Registrar
Appointment, 2628
Inquiry, 2618
Senate amendments, 3505
Statement of provisions, 987, 2520
Technicalities, 2665
Combines Investigation Act of 1910, 2605
Cost of living, reference to, 1812-13
Crowsnest pass agreement, extension, 2741. *See also under this title,* Freight Rates
Customs duties on goods shipped from one Canadian port to another, 2519
Dairy Industry Act 1914 Amdt. bill
M. (Mr. Motherwell) for discharge of order, 3449
Daylight saving, 2612
Debates, official report of
Pages said to be missing, 888, 889, 1082
Revised edition, enquiry, 122
Deceased members, tribute to, 4
Deputy ministers, salaries, 4557
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 2384, 2386
Disarmament, Great Lakes, correspondence, 244, 494, 1307
Dominion Elections Act, amdt. 1027
Duke and Duchess of York, congratulations, 2251
Election of 1921, speeches, 3047
Estimates, time of presentation, 4556, 4598,
Comparison with previous government, 4603
External Affairs, department, salaries, 3987
Fielding, Right Hon. Mr., congratulations on being called to Privy Council, 4743
Finance Act, 1914, Amdt. bill, 4249
Forest fires, relief, 4010
Freight rates. *See also under this title* Lake Freight Rates
Crowsnest pass agreement, 1962
Suspension of, 1949
Equalization of, M. (Mr. Clark), 1285, 1490, 1962
Legislation to be introduced, 3265
Fuel supply, M. (Mr. Church) 1284

King, Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie—*Con.*
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth), 336
Government publications, distribution, 3266
Grain and grain trade
Grain shipping rates, information, 2517. *See also under this title* Lake Freight Rates
Royal commission to inquire into, 1211
Grand Jury system, abolition of, 2695, 3272
Grant, Dr., civil service, 560
Halibut fishery treaty, 4437, 4474, 4736
Approval of, 4455
Correspondence tabled, 1256
Inquiry for papers, 1212
Ratification by His Majesty, 1309
Hansard. *See under this title,* Debates
Hayes, Mr. John J., dismissal of, 1694
Hector celebration, 4706
High Commissioner's office, London, 4629
Hindu franchise, 4077, 4665
Hoppe and Isenberg leases, 4442
House of Commons staff, organization, 4592
Housing, legislation, 2518
Hudson Bay railway, Motherwell, Hon. Mr., reported statement, 1686
Immigration. *See also under this title,* Chinese Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1330
Attitude of Conservative and Progressive parties, 1333
Forke, Mr., letter to Mr. Brown, 1333
Meighen, Right Hon. Mr., letter to Mr. Brown, 1333
Reorganization, inquiry, 3324
Willison, Sir John, telegram, 1331
Oriental. *See also under this title,* Chinese
Bill respecting (Mr. Neill) 4441
Exclusion, possible results, 1453
Japanese
Japanese stowaways on freighter, 1448
Lemieux agreement, 1447
Negotiations with Japanese govt. 2328, 4441
M. for return, 1261
Policy, 1330
Immigration Act Amdt. bills
Undesirable classes, 2669, 4441
Imperial Conference
Agenda, 1976, 4639-65
Opportunity for discussion, 3453, 4250
Tabled, 1991
Confidential matters, 4660
Constitutional questions, 4661
Forecast of discussion, 3453
Hindu immigrants, franchise, 4665
Preferential tariff, 4661

King, Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie—*Con.*
Imperial Conference—*Con.*
Representation of Canada, 1686
Imperial Economic Conference
Agenda, 1976, 4639-65
Opportunity for discussion, 4250
Tabled, 1991
Representation of Canada, 1686
Income War Tax Act 1917 Amdt. bill, 4440
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 2063, 4361
Illicit liquor traffic, 2208
Insurance Act 1917 Amdt. bill, 3978
Internal Economy commission, 3
International Labour Conference
Carruthers, Mrs. James, 1647
Italian Treaty bill, 2437, 2701
Japan
Immigration from. *See under this title,* Immigration
Secret agreement, 1448
Trade with, 1449, 2313
Kennedy, the late Hon. W. C., 5
King's birthday, observance of, 3323
King's Printer, Mr. F. A. Acland, 1669
Kitchener local improvements, 1022
Labour
Estimates, 1643
Right to organize, 2895
Strikes correspondence, 816
Lack of confidence vote, M. (Mr. Irvine) 213 216, 226
Lafortune the late Mr. D. A. M.P., 4
Lake freight rates, commission, 247
Legislation arising out of report, 3507
Lake of the Woods
Control, 247
Control board expenses, 4001
Levels 247
Lausanne conference, 54
League of Nations, Canada's contribution, 3992
Legislation, Senate salaries, 3949
Liberal convention of 1919, 2994, 3047
Labour resolution, 1652
Liberal platform, speech of June 1, 1920, 2994
Library of Parliament, 202
Joint committee, 516
Lowe, Dr. A. M., capture by Chinese bandits, 2695
Macdonald, Hon. E. M.
Acting Minister of National Defence, 2295
Sworn as member of Privy Council, 1764
McDougall, Mrs. William, pension, 3949
McKenzie, Hon. D. D.,
Appointment to Bench, 1810
Retirement, 2392

King, Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie—*Con.*
Militia and Defence disbursements, 344
Minister of Justice, absence, 4514
Minister of Railways and Canals
Appointment, 519, 1081
Hon. Mr. Graham, 2295
Mines and minerals com. report, 4743
Montreal harbour commission bill, 3463
Moose Jaw by-election, 2295
National monument, Connaught place, 2685
Near East crisis, 29-33
Correspondence, 45
Newspaper combines, 2524
Oleomargarine
Further legislation, inquiry, 1309, 2519
Members circularized, 3402
M. (Mr. Carroll) 3326, 3524
Precedence, 3451
Special order, 3270
Orders in council, government by, 1652, 1655
Orient, trade relations with, 2313
Pan-American union, 496
Paris agency, 4001
Parliamentary government, 1652
Passports, issuing of, 3988, 4708
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 4744
Pension board, resolution for removal, 3400
Pensions, old age
Legislation, 2518
Liberal convention of 1919, res. 1651
Mothers, and, conference with provinces, 3046
Petition of right, fiats, 3146
Postmaster General, absence through illness, 1315, 1538
Powell River Paper Company, 2895
Preston, Mr. W. T. R., 247
Prices, monopolies and, 2521
Printing Committee, 202
Private betting, M. (Mr. Good) 494
Private bills, consideration, 1836
Privilege, Mr. Carroll, 3270
Proportional representation
M. (Mr. Good) 417, 421
Single transferable vote, 1661, 2181
Public expenditure, 4556
Public Works
Estimates, 4557
Tenders, 4568
Publicity representative in London, 2984
Pulpwood, prohibition of export
Farmers and settlers, 4513
Royal commission, 4709
Purchasing commission, 3950, 4001
Salaries and contingencies, 4704
Quebec, statutes of, 1660
Race track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 494

King, Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie—*Con.*
Redistribution bill, 250, 436
Special committee
Reference to, 488, 572
Report, 4742
Returned Soldiers Insurance bill, 4735
Returned soldiers unemployment relief, 1680
Returns, inquiry for, 3962
Roberts, J. H., imprisonment, 1660
Roberts, Hon. W. F., reported statement on secession, 3145
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, hours, 4514
Rush-Bagot treaty negotiations, 2700
Russia, relations with, 3402
St. Lawrence river waterway, 204
United States, negotiations with, 3208, 4513
Saar valley commission, Mr. R. D. Waugh, 3145
Sales tax
Exemptions, 2998
Speech in 1921, 2997
Senate and House of Commons report, 2794
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4734
Senate, estimates, 2694
Sastri, Right Hon. Mr., letter from Prime Minister, 4665
Shipping combine, 4077
Shire horses from Great Britain, 2207
Singapore naval base, 2470, 3822
Stewart, the late Hon. J. A., 5
Stouffville, speech at, 1430
Supplementary estimates, presentation, 4558
Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner) 1288, 1298
Toronto viaduct, 4441
Trade Mark and Designs Act Amdt. bill, 2063
Treaties
Newspaper reports, 245-6
Signing of, 4474
Triplets, bonus for, 3145
Trueman, Mr. W. H., K. C., appointment to Bench, 1868
Unemployment relief
Conferences with provinces, 436
Expenditure, 1656
Federal and provincial responsibility, 1680
Union bank, position of, 4250, 4272
United States liquor laws, 4295
Vimy ridge memorial, 180
War
Commitments, 859
Glorification of, 2687
Wheat board
Extension of legislation, 2696, 2740
Proceedings under act of 1922, 1636
White, Mr. James, salary, 4667

King's Birthday Adjournment. *See* House of Commons

King's Printer. *See* Printing Bureau

Kingston dry dock, 4563

Kitchener
Local improvement taxes, 1022
Manufacturers and United States markets, 2856

Kitsilano Reserve. *See* Indians

Klondike. *See* Yukon

Knitting Industry. *See* Textiles

Knox, Mr. Andrew (Prince Albert)
Agricultural conditions, special committee, 667
Canadian Air Force, 1750
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 3813
Canadian National Railways
Branch lines construction bill, 4319
Rejection by Senate, 4753
Fixed charges, qu. 814
Cheque tax, 3934
Dairy Industry Act Amdt. bill, 4254
Drainage areas, 3259
Harbours and rivers, Saskatchewan and Alberta, 1001
Hudson Bay railway
Construction vote, 4680, 4685
M. for consideration of Senate report, 1032, 1079
Port Nelson terminals, 3647
Route, investigation by air service, 1750
Statement as to cost, correction, 2296
Trips through Hudson strait to Port Nelson, qu. 4011
Welland canal and, 3779
Indians, 2162
Duck lake school, 2159
Lake Grain rates bill, 4226
Melfort branch line railway, 4319
Moose Range drainage, qu. 3144, 3259
National Defence, ammunition, 1741
National monument, Connaught place, 2686
Order paper, absence of, 4744
Paddockwood branch line railway, 4319
Paris agency, 4001
Penitentiaries, 770, 773
Port Nelson dredging, 1012
Public buildings, rents, 1025
Relief of distressed Canadians, 1456
Renovated butter, 4254
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, pensions, 776
Soldier settlement, 2023, 2028

Knox, Mr. Andrew—*Con.*
Steamship services, 4003, 4004
Trent canal improvements, 3647
Waterhen lakes drainage, qu. 4303
Welland canal construction, 3779

Kyte, Mr. George W. (Cape Breton South and Richmond)
Arrangement between Whips as to adjournment, 53
Canadian National Railways branch lines bill, 4317, 4319
Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia, 4574
Hudson Bay railway, 1062
Morrison, Mr. T. D., Little Anse claim, 4574, 4725
St. Peter's-Louisburg branch line, 4319
Troops, use of in labour troubles, 869
Wrecks, removal of, 3332

Labarre, Que., postmaster, dismissal, qu. 3138

Labour. *See also* Civil Service; Housing; Immigration; Industrial Disputes; Returned Soldiers
Advertisements, 287
Asiatic competition, 2485. *See also* Immigration
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4016, 4041
British Columbia, conditions in, 1125
British National Labour party
Capital levy, 2722
Policy, 2721
Building trades. *See also* Building
Drift to United States, 1129, 1812
Canadian National Railways. *See also that title*
Directors, representation of, 1652-6, 3636
Labour costs, 1561
Capital and, 2744, 4026. *See also* Capital and Labour
Canadian Pacific railway shopmen, 3338
Cheap, 1118
Chinese, 2310, 2316, 2330. *See also* Immigration
Civil Service. *See* Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power)
Special committee, representation on, 937
Coal miners from Belgium, 1177
Combines bill, trades unions not affected, 2666
Competition, 1287, 1418, 2485
Conciliation and Labour Act, 1621
Conferences, 1443, 1678
Conventions, 1645, 1652
Copper bounty and, 3031
Cost of living. *See that title*
Costs, 1561, 2748, 2876

Labour—*Con.*
Delegates from United States, detention, *See* Howat
Demand for, 1248
Department
Actuaries, 1677
Annuities branch, 1672, 1682
Old age, administration, 1639
Basis of computation, 1683, 1694
Superintendent, 1677
Assistant deputy minister, 1671
Canada Gazette, printing, 1707
Capitalistic, 1674
Co-operation with provincial departments of labour, 1678
Deputy minister, 1675
Employees and cost, 2970
Estimates, 1621, 1668
Reduction in, 1638-43
Immigration and, 1170
Salaries and contingencies, 1657, 1668, 1694
Staff, dismissals and transfers, 1671, 2032
Statistics, 1677, 1682
Discontent, 1194
Dominion and provincial
Conference, 1442
Jurisdiction, 1442
Eight-hour day, 131, 207, qu. 279, 287, 1643 4,000. *See also under this title,* Hours
Jurisdiction, 1650
Moore, Mr. Tom., 1427
Emigration of. *See* Emigration to the United States
Employers and immigration, 1193, 1194
Employers' liability compensation, 691
Employment, 1124. *See also* Immigration and *under this title,* Unemployment
Index number, increase, 3055
Employment offices,
Co-ordination, 1643
Director of, 1672, 1676
Employment Offices Co-ordination Act, 1630
Provincial, 2169
St. John, 3453
Espionage, 1142-3
Factory and Shop Act, 1443
Farm, 37, 38, 1100, 1174,1416, 1424, 1427, 1475, 2876. *See also* Agriculture; Immigration
Competition of protected industries, 2731
Wages, 1240, 1355
Winnipeg, in, 1976
Federal and provincial jurisdiction, 1646
Opinion of Justice department, 1650
Financial Post, labour shortage in lumber camps, 1125
Grand Trunk, employees' compensation, 1564

Labour—*Con.*
Hours, 1416, 1643, 1841. *See also under this title,* Eight-hour day
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 4514
Station agents, 132
Howat, Alexander, detention. *See* Howat
Immigration. *See also that title.*
Attitude on, 332, 1167, 1177, 1186, 1193, 1197, 1224, 1241, 1337, 1413, 1426, 1892-3, 2816
Restriction of, 1104
Trades and Labour Council, and, 1419
"Unseen Hand," the, 1201
Imperial federation, 4651
Industrial disputes. *See also under this title,* Strikes
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, and, 1141
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1627, 1655, 1702, 1716. *See also that title*
Federal jurisdiction, 1646
Joint industrial councils, 1654
Granting of boards under, 287
Limited application, 1702
Industrial and "closed" towns, 2886-91
International Association of Machinists, res. 1338
International Federation of Trade Unions, 3158
International labour bureau, 3994, 4000
International Labour Conference, 1386, 1642
Carnegie, Colonel, 1648
Carruthers, Mrs. James, 1442, 1647
Incomplete return, 1539
Pacaud, Mr. L. T., 1539, 1647
Recommendations and conventions, 1643, 1645
Tabled, 1441, 1631
Report of 1922 meeting, 1442
Representation, papers tabled, 1483
Smith, Mr. Obed, 1648
Statistics, 1631
Joint industrial councils, 1654
Labour bureaus, 1424
Labour Gazette, 1621
Correspondents, 1626
Cost of living, 1684, 1812
Michell, Professor, figures, 1700
Cost prices and freight rates, 1958
Editor, 1625, 1671
Federal Printing Company, 1621
Hooper, Mr. Roland, 1625
International Labour Conference, 1386, 1442
Printing, cost of, 1621, 1708, qu. 3131
Union label on, 1621
Labour members, reference to by Sir James Lougheed, 3033

Labour—*Con.*
Labour party platform, 2728, 2815
Larkin, Mr. James, detention at border, 1163, 1212, 1309, 3156
Lewis, John L., correspondence, 250, 815
Liberal platform "plank" 1652
Lord's Day Act, federal jurisdiction, 1646
Macdonald, Mr. Ramsay, labour vote in Great Britain, 2722
May Day, 3158
Mechanics, qu. 203
Skilled, emigration to United States, 2790
Meyerscough, Mr. Thomas, detention at border. *See* Meyerscough; Howat
Miners' wages and price of coal, 1345
Moore, Mr. Tom
Delegate to International Labour Conference, 1642
Immigration, 1167
Labour representative on Canadian National Railway Board, 1654, 3636
National Industrial Conference, 2890
Organization of, 50, 123, 2815
Organized, dictation of, 1426
Organizing power of, 1857
Oriental. *See* Immigration, Oriental; Chinese Immigration bill
Penitentiaries, 772
Pensions, old age, 1646
Popular attitude towards work, 1189
Powell River Paper Company, 2886
Printing bureau. *See also that title*
Estimates, 1710
Professional agitators, 2943
Public works, 950, 956
Railway companies acting as agents, 1191
Railways, 126, 132, 1426, 3621
Renovated butter, 4251
Representation in House, 3033, 3555
Requirements in northern Ontario and Quebec, 1086
Right to organize, 2886, 2890, 2896
Bank employees, 4084, 4161
British constitution, 2894
Common law of Great Britain, 2894
Contract between workingman and employer, 2894, 2896
Federal and provincial jurisdiction, 2894
Legislation, necessity for, 2896
Treaty of Versailles, 2889
Royal Canadian Mounted Police
Duty, seven-day week, 4514
Espionage, 1142
Industrial disputes, 1141
Royal commission on industrial relations, 2889
Short hours and high wages, 1416

Labour—*Con.*
Shortage
Lumber camps, Financial Post, statement of, 1125
Saturday Night, statement as to, 1125
Skilled labour, 1224
Strikes, 84, 123-125, 1628, 1702. *See also under this title,* Industrial Disputes
Advocates of, deportation, 2434
Agricultural labourers, Great Britain, 2822
Cape Breton. *See under this sub-title,* Nova Scotia
Conciliation, 2786
District 18, coal miners, 1629
Joint industrial councils, 1654
Lewis, Mr. John L., correspondence, 250, 815
Nova Scotia coal miners, 495, 815, 866, 1627, 1716, 3155
Board of Conciliation award, 1628
Correspondence, 914
Troops, use of, 861, 893
Nova Scotia steel workers, 287, 397, 1643, 1703, 1705
Rainbow shingle mills, Chinese workmen, 2319
Shipping and railway, M. (Sir Henry Drayton) for papers, 245, 495, 815
Thetford Mines, 2207
Troops, employment of, 495, qu. 624, 861, 866, 893, 1627, 2893, 3072
United States coal miners, 1262, 2786
Technical Education
Administration of act, 1637
Director of, 1674
Trade unions, 2786
Combines bill, not affected by, 2666
Congress at the Hague, 46
Troubles, 123, 2893. *See also under this title,* Strikes
Unemployment, 50, 628, 1125, 1168, 1187, 1194, 1242, 1348, 1657, 2819, 3032. *See also* Immigration; Soldiers
Calgary post office, 629
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 3828, 3843
Decrease of, 15
United States in, 2650
Employment offices. *See under this title,* Employment Offices
Great Britain in, 1205
Hoboes, origin of, 1194
Insurance, 1638
International Labour Conference, 1646
Montreal Unemployed Workers' Association, letter, 2719
Municipalities, statements as to, 41-43
Order in council No. 220, 435

Labour—*Con.*
Unemployment—*Con.*
Pensioners, 2168
Provision for qu. 732, 1657
Purchasing power, limitation, 2716, 2725
Relief, 1644, 2730, 3032
Calgary, 1679
Expenditure, 1655, 2969
Federal and provincial responsibility, 1678
Federal assistance withdrawn, 1655-58, 1678
Soldiers' civil re-establishment, 689
Resolution passed in 1922, 436
Responsibility for, 1657
Seamen, 3379
Value of time lost, 1685
Vancouver, 1340
Waterton lakes highway, qu. 2085
Winnipeg, 435, 1124, 1215, 1416, 1883
United Mine-Workers of America, 3155
Delegates, detention at border, 2297. *See also* Howat; Meyerscough
Unorganized workers, 3534
Unskilled, employment for, 80
Wages, 1240. *See also* Cost of Living
Average, 2720
Bricklayers, $12 per day, 3017
Building trades, 2165, 3004
Canadian National Railways, qu. 1363
Inflation, 1167
Inquiry by fair wage officers, 2982
Loss through strikes, 1628
Manufacturing, 2876
Miners, 3206
Railway, 2800, 2876, 3190, 3205
Reduction, 2800
Textile industry, 3467
United States, 1165, 1248, 2650
Urban and rural, 35-36, 1240, 1355
Wage slavery, 2727
Wage system, 2723
War labour policy, 2887
Welland canal, 3762
Whitley councils, 1654
Workingman, position of, 2982

Labour Party, 2728, 2815

Labrador

Boundary, Mr. James White, salary, 4667
Discovery of placer gold, 1995
Report, 2611
Labrador Goldfields, Limited, qu. 2696

La Chambre de Commerce, Montreal, Bankruptcy Act, 1492

Lac Seul. *See* Lake of the Woods

Lack of Confidence Vote, M. (Mr. Irvine) 208; neg. on div. 243-4

Lacroix, Mr. Eugene, postmaster, Sayabec. *See* Post Office

Ladner, Mr. L. J. (Vancouver South)
Alaskan, wreck of, qu. 1763
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4105-24
Bank loans and deposits, 1133
Bankruptcy Act, M. (Mr. Casgrain) 1493, 1506
British Columbia fishing licenses, M. (Mr. Clark) 1541
Canada's participation in war, 1534
Canadian customs officer at New York, 1213, qu. 2611, 2419
Chinese immigration bill, exclusion, 2482
Civil Service patronage, 368
Dairy Industry Act 1914 Amdt. bill, 4270
Emigration to United States, 1085
Exhibitions, 1467
Forest destruction by fungi and insects, qu. 2178, qu. 2697
Fraser river improvements, 1007
Freight rates, equalization of, M. (Mr. Clark) 1967
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 316
Illicit still cases, remissions, 2299
Immigration
Assisted class, 1100
British Columbia, co-operation with, 1096 1097
Empire settlement scheme, 1096
Financial assistance to settlers, 1098
Oriental, 506
Competition of labouring classes, 1287
Immigration Act Amdt. bill, (Mr. Neill) 506
Indians, potlatching, 2163
Interest rate, 4105, 4108
Labour department, co-operation with provinces, 1678
Lack of confidence, M. (Mr. Irvine) 221
Lapointe, Hon. Mr., visit to Washington, 734
Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill, 2201
Lowe, Dr. A. M., capture and maltreatment in China, 2795
Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. bill, 2117, 2122
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3550
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3849-69
Disability attributable to war service Amdt. (Mr. Ladner) 3850, neg. 3870
Pensions
European war and active militia, 3717, 3736
Royal commission, recommendations, 2983
Prince Rupert dry dock, qu. 1664

Ladner, Mr. L. J.—*Con.*
Proportional representation, M. (Mr. Good) 390, 393, 398, 432
Renovated butter, 4270
Returned soldiers, death from tuberculosis, qu. 3134
Sales tax, M. (Mr. Stevens) for com. of inquiry, 921
Scientific knowledge, contributions to, 1286-7
Stanley park, foreshore protection, 1008
Titles, honours and decorations, M., 1285, 1297
Trader, wreck of, qu. 1763
Unemployment, provision for, 1657
Vancouver harbour bill, 199, 261, 332

Laflamme, Mr. J. N. K. (Drummond-Arthabaska)
Imperial Conference, 4653

La Flèche, Colonel. *See* Purchasing Commission

Lafortune, the late Mr. D. A., M.P., 4, 6, 8, 16
Letter from Madame Lafortune acknowledging sympathy, 281

Lake, Mr. R. S., Hudson Bay railway, 1053

Lake Freight Rates. *See* Freight Rates, Shipping

Lake Grain Rates Bill
Res. 3960, 4218; 1r., 4235; 2r., 4276; com., 4290; 3r., 4295
Sections and subjects discussed:
Canadian and American ports, 4218-4234
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 4223
Cargo space, 4219
Coasting laws, suspension of, 4219, 4222
Discussion, opportunity for, 4225
Insurance, brokers prohibited from writing, 4219, 4223
Interpretation, "board", 4291
Jurisdiction of parliament, 4227-31
Penalties, 4219
Rates, discrimination in, 4218, 4222
Power to fix minimum, 4218
Receiving and tabulating charges, 4294
Shipping combines, prosecution of, 4227
Tariff to be filed with Grain Commissioners 4219

Lake Grain Rates Commission. *See* Freight Rates, Shipping

Lake of the Woods. *See also* Water Powers
Control board
Expenses, 4001
M. for papers, 247

Lake of the Woods—*Con.*
Levels, 247, qu 2700
Water powers, 3421, 3425

Lake of the Woods Regulation Act 1921 Repeal Bill
1r., 2885-6; 2r., on div. 4163-80; com., 4181; 3r., 4185
Agreement with Ontario government, 2885

Lambton, steamer, wreck of, 3354

Lamont Park, Buffalo reserve, 3941

Lanark, election, 157

Lanctôt, Mr. Roch (Laprairie-Napierville)
Annual training, 865
Imperial Conference, 4656
Imperialism, 4657
Indemnity of members, 4242
Labour Gazette, 1622
Military expenditure, 865
M. for reduction, 866
Naval service, 4657
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4242
War, Canada's participation in, 4656

Lands. *See also* Dominion Lands; Immigration; Natural Resources
Clearing by fire, 1185
Colonization of, 1178
Decrease in value, 2019
Dominion reversion of. *See* Dominion Lands Act
Homesteads, second. *See* Dominion Lands
Hudson Bay railway, sold for, qu. 283. *See also that title*
Patents, issue of. *See* Dominion Lands Act Amdt Bill
Policy, 1344
Purchase price of, 1178
Railway, purchases or sales, 1739
Reclamation, 2969. *See also* Dominion Lands
Sales of. *See also* Immigration, Canada Colonization
Immigrants, to, 1431
Scrip frauds, 730
School lands. *See* Dominion Lands; Schools
Settlement, 43, 1893, 3060. *See also* Dominion Lands; Immigration; Soldier Settlement
National land settlement plan, 1182
Soldier settlement and, 2019. *See also that title*
Speculation in, 1119, 1395, 1887, 2955

Lands—*Con.*
Taxation, 1178, 1395. *See also that title*
Land values, 2745, 2778, 2803, 3016
Tax sales, 4062
Unimproved, 1118
Vacant, 1105, 1344

Landlord. *See* Bankruptcy Act

Language Questions. *See* French Language

Lanoraie wharf, 969

Lapierre, Mr. E. A. (Nipissing)
Eastern Lands Company, 626
Electric power, exportation, M. (Mr. Deslauriers) 661
Forest protection, M. (Mr. Michaud) 823
French river improvement works, qu. 620
Georgian bay elevators, qu. 620
Immigration policy, 1401
Kipawa Pulp and Paper Company, 1402
Lumbering in Timiskaming district, 1402
New Ontario, agricultural conditions, 1401
Nipissing Indian reserve, 1307
St. Lawrence river waterway, 661

Lapointe, Hon. Ernest (Minister of Marine and Fisheries)
Alaskan, wreck of, 1660, 3330
Atlantic fisheries commission, 3084, 3365
Belleville harbour commissioners, dismissal, qu. 491
Biological Board Act Amdt. bill, 3820, 3974
Boots and shoes, free admission, 3500
British Columbia
Fishing licenses, M. (Mr. Clark) 1540, 1544, 1546
Salmon canning industry, licenses, 1544
Business of the House, adjournments to discuss, etc. 1540
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bills
Coastal regulations, suspension, 4276
Distressed seamen, 574, 3969, 4207
Masters and mates certificates, 2418, 2668, 3146, 3972
Pilotage, 3146
Registration of foreign ships, 3749, 3961, 3973
Canadian Arctic expedition, reports, 3360
Canadian National Railways, Mr. Talbot, 2004
Canadian ports, use by United States fishermen, 3361
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 538
Detroit river, regulation of traffic, 3358
Dredging, unification of work, 3341
False creek bridge, 3376

Lapointe, Hon. Ernest—*Con.*
Fisheries
Canned and pickled fish, inspection, 3367, 3375
Deep sea fisheries, 3364
Publicity, 3364
Salmon river fishways, 3362
Sawdust pollution of streams, 3362
White Mud river, fishway, 3363
Fisheries Act Amdt. bill, 4009, 4207
French Treaty bill, 2216, 2256, 2815
Bottles, 2218
Bronze powder, 2217
Butter, 2217
Cotton, 2218, 2263
Dairy products, 2217
Favoured nation, 2219
France
Balance of trade, 2221
Exports to, 2216
Friendly relations with, 2216
Line of attack, 2216
Luxuries, 2221
Sales tax, 2279
Silks, 2221, 2256
Treaty of 1907, 2222
Grain shortages, complaint by British importers, 1764
Halibut fishery treaty, 4132, 4440, 4459
Rider inserted by United States Senate, 1308
Signing of, 858, 1308, 4461
Visit to Washington, 858
Inspection of live stock shipments, 3334
Johnston, Mr. R. M., status, 202
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4231
McConica, Mr., congratulations upon return, 1660
Margaree Salmon Fisheries Association, 3371
Marine and fisheries
Annual report, 1080
Committee, report, 3084
Distressed seamen, relief, 574, 3332, 3375, 3969, 4207
Dominion steamers and icebreakers, 3160
Bay of Fundy, 2615
Thunder bay, etc. 3359
Estimates, 2610, 3160, 3330
Hopper barge, construction, 3350
Hydrographic survey, 3336
Ice obstruction, Cabot strait, 2614
Life-saving service, 3335
Appliances, British Columbia, 1660
Stations, Long Point, Lake Erie, 3335
Lighthouse service
Lights, new, 3357
Maintenance and repairs, 3353

Lapointe, Hon. Ernest—*Con.*
Marine and Fisheries—*Con.*
Lighthouse service—*Con.*
Richibucto cape lighthouse, 3353
Salaries of lightkeepers, 3351
Marine agencies, 3351
Marine biological board of Canada, 3372
Marine signal service, 3358
Marvale, wreck of, 3333
Masters and mates, examination, 2610. *See also under this title,* Canada Shipping Act Amdt. Bill
Meterological service, 3360
Murray Stewart, steamer, 3354
Navigation
Aids to, 3357
Obstructions to, 3334
O'Hara, Captain Marshall, salary, 3331
Patrol of northern waters, 3360
Pilotage, 3146
Administration of, 3358
Pensions, 3359
Steamer Eureka, 1364
Salaries and contingencies, 3373
Steamboat inspection, 3360
Tidal and current survey, 3338
Unforeseen expenses, 3335
Wireless stations, 3337
Wrecking plant subsidies, 3334
Wrecks
Investigation into, 3160, 3330
Removal of, 3332
Montreal harbour commissioners bill, 4508
Montreal-Longeuil bridge, 2640, 3508
Northern Pacific Halibut Fishery bill, 4480. *See also under this title,* Halibut
Political patronage, 3344
Quebec arsenal, 888
Radiotelegraphy
Broadcasting stations, 3374
Radiotelegraph service, 3337, 3374
Regulations tabled, 3045
Radiotelegraph Act Amdt. bill 2086, 2284, 2467
St. Lawrence ship channel, 3339
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4240
Sorel shipyard, 3343
Alleged dismissals, 3344
Tariff
Liberal policy, 2221
Opposition resolution of 1922, 2220
Three Rivers Harbour bill, 3399, 3963, 4207
Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner) 1290
United States steamer Siloam, capture, 2207
Vancouver harbour bill, 199, 255-70, 332
Vimy ridge monument, 182
Visit to Washington, 734, 857

Lapointe, Hon. Ernest—*Con.*
West Ukrainian republic, M. (Mr. Campbell) 657
Wrangel island, ownership, 3360

Lard. *See* Meat Products

Larkin, Mr. James, detention at border. *See* Immigration; Labour

Larkin, Mr. P. C. *See* High Commissioner

Larouche, Que., postmaster, qu. 3137

Laurentians, The, 4312

Laurier, Sir Wilfrid. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget
Administration, 2815
Canadian railways and ports, traffic for, 1756
Conscription issue, 3015
Election of 1896, 2936
Hudson Bay railway, 1053, 1061, Announcement ,1047
Immigration policy, 1177, 1425
Imperial Conference, 4663
Last public address, 2995
On hour of meeting in 1918, 1
McMaster, M., and, 3030
Monument, 1017
Protective system, 2719
Reciprocity, defeat of, 3015
Tariff reduction and Senate reform, 2908

Lausanne Conference, 54

Lavaltrie, Que. wharf, 969

Lavigueur, Mr. Henri E. (Quebec County)
Bank draft tax, 3929
Canadian National Railways, directors, 4525
Immigration dept. employees, Quebec, qu. 4752
Burne, Mr. Joseph, qu. 3141
Little, Mr. W. R., qu. 3144, qu. 4302
Transfers, qu. 2517, qu. 3141
Indemnity of members, 4240
Little, George, deportation of, qu. 3704
Orleans island bridge, 3646
Quebec, Champlain station, 4446
St. Charles river improvements, 4447
St. Malo repair shops, 4447
Ste. Petronille wharf, 4588
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4240
Talbot, Mr. O., 4525
Toronto viaduct, 4446

Law, the late Mr. Bowman B., tablet, 1020

Lawyers, charges and standard of living, 1154, 2813. *See also* Canadian National Railways, Grand Trunk

Lead Pencils, marking of goods, 2988

Leader, Mr. Harry (Portage la Prairie)
Accredited herds, 584, 2131, 2132
Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt. bill, 2131, 2137
Assiniboine river
Damage by flood, 993, 3041
Expenditure on dyking, etc. qu. 3264
Budget, 3039. Reception of budget in West; district board, Portage la Prairie, resolution; betrayal of the people; British preference; direct importation; obligation to Great Britain for removal of cattle embargo; free admission of British goods; cheque tax charged by grain buyers to farmers, 3039; cattle trade; freight rates, ocean rates; Canadian Government Merchant Marine vessels; statements of Mr. Motherwell and Mr. Grisdale, 3040; Assiniboine river floods; resolution of Elie branch of United Farmers; Canadian National Railways, traffic and management; annoyances and inconveniences to passengers; railway equipment; people patronizing their own road; cattle shipment over Canadian Pacific; Riley's army, transportation Ottawa to Toronto, 3042; government interference with railway management; government plea for economy not sincere; new officers with high salaries; Mr. Duncan Marshall; Hon. Mr. Pugsley; members' indemnities, reduction of; extravagance in administration; cabinet ministers absent from duty; cabinet ministers, number in Canada and United States; speech of Mr. McMaster on budget; Manitoba Free Press, stand in defence of common people, 3043
Cattle, ocean space, 2123, 3040
Copper bounty bill, 3241
Experimental farms, 461-486
M. to reduce neg. 486
Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia, 943
Health of animals, 583
Hudson Bay railway, 461
International fishing boat race, 114
Live stock
Ocean shipping rates, 2133, 3040
Removal of cattle embargo, 3039

Leader, Mr. Harry—*Con.*
Ministers' salaries and members' indemnities, 3043, 4243
M. for reduction of, 1153
Reference to, 2915
Officials attending fairs, qu. 285
Portage la Prairie
Representation of, 2680
Sewerage outlet, 993, 997, 2680
Railway mail service, cost of, qu. 3143
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4243
Deductions for non-attendance, 4243
Tuberculosis in cattle, 583

League of Nations. *See also* Imperial Conference
Activities and policies, 3993
Assembly
Tariff
Economic warfare, 3054
Stability, 3053
Canada's contribution to Permanent Secretariat, 3990
Canada's participation in foreign wars, 4000
Canada's withdrawal from, 3999
Cecil, Lord Robert, lecture in Ottawa, 1685
Criticism of, 3993
Expenses of Canadian delegation to, 3989
Franco-German relations, 4652
International Labour Conference, 1441, 1652
Invitation to meet in Canada, 3997
M. (Mr. Power) for withdrawal, 1529
Saar Valley Commission, Mr. R. D. Waugh, 3145
Silesia, partition of, 3995
West Ukrainian republic, settlement, 651

Leases
Cancellation of. *See* Dominion Lands Act Amdt. bill
Coal lands. *See* Hoppe and Isenberg

Leather, free admission to United States, 3016

Leblanc, Mr. Joseph, seizure of fishing boat, 1489

Leblanc, Mr. Louis, qu. 285

Le Droit d'auteur. *See* Copyright Act Amdt.

Lee, Miss Barbara. *See* Immigration department

Léger, Mr. A. T. (Kent, N.B.)
English and French, harmony between, 1341
Export Act Amdt. bill (pulpwood) 4347, 4354
Kent Northern railway, 4190
Leblanc, Mr. Joseph, seizure of fishing boat, 1489

Léger, Mr. A. T.—*Con.*
Lighthouses and lightkeepers
Maintenance and repairs, 3353
Richibucto cape lighthouse, 3353
Salaries and allowances, 3351
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4347, 4354

Legislation. *See also* Government; House of Commons; Senate
Class, 2851
Distribution between Senate and House of Commons, 4007
House of Commons, 2691
Committees, expenses of, 4674
Indemnity of members, 4674
In advance of public sentiment, 2925
Joint Committee on, 4008
Paternal, 727, 1133. *See also* Race Track Betting
Preparation and form of, 4007
Provincial, disallowance of. *See* Disallowance; Jurisdiction
Record of, 407, 408
Retroactive, 3128
Senate, salaries and contingencies, 3949
Too much, 2543, 2547, 3434. *See also* Combines bill
Uplift, 2054

Legislative Council. *See* Senate, M. (Mr. Denis, Joliette)

Leitch, Professor
Agricultural conditions, 1845
Dairying industry, 1843

Leitche's Creek, N.S. wharf, 943

Lemaire, Mr. E. J., 1822

Lemieux, Hon. Rodolphe. *See* Speaker

Lemieux Agreement. *See* Immigration; Japan

Lemont, Mr. Arthur. *See* Immigration, Agents

Leprosy, treatment of. *See* Health

Lesueur, Mr. R. V. (West Lambton)
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3869
Mother whose husband is helpless, amdt. 3870, agreed to, 3871
Petroleum, crude, bounty, 3914, 3922

Letter Carriers. *See* Post Office

Level Crossings. *See* Canadian National Railways; Canadian Pacific Raiways; Toronto

Levels, National. *See* Lake of the Woods

Lévis
Dry dock, 1261
Postmasters, qu. 519
Quarantine station, purchase of beef, qu. 3141

Lewis, Mr. Arthur J. (Swift Current)
Address in reply, 117. Expenditure on agriculture; criticisms from Maritime province members, 118; condition of western farmers; immigration policy, 119; competition in wheat markets, 120; economy in length of session, 120; Near East crisis, 120-121; sales and stamp taxes, 121; necessity for economy in public expenditures. 121
Agricultural conditions in western provinces, 119, 1841
Agriculture
Department, salaries, 611
Immigration and, 1228
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4096-4116
Bounty system, 3922
Cadet services, 881
Canadian National parks and historic sites, 3942
Canadian National Railways
Branch lines construction bill, 3626, 4201, 4333
Dunblane-Mawer, 4201, 4333
Moose Jaw-Riverhurst, 4333
Paris offices, 3626
Cheque tax, 3933
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 543
Civil Service examinations, 366
Combines bill, 2599
Registrar, powers of investigation, 2626
Cost of living, combines and, 2599
Customs drawback, hatters' sweats, 3502
Domestic servants, provision on trains, 1477
Dredging, 1012, 3340
Eggs, price of, 1841
Expenditure in excess of revenue, 1230
Free trade, necessities of life, 1230
French treaty, agricultural implements, 2247
Fruit and Fruit Containers bill, 2105
Hydrographic survey, 3336
Immigration
Alleged discrimination in favour of West, 1098
Canada Colonization Association, 3633
Child, 1227, 1470
Experience as an immigrant, 1226
Great Britain from, 1105
Literature, 1226
Mennonites, 1229, 1884
Policy, 1225
Immigration Act Amdt. bill, 2436

Lewis, Mr. Arthur J.—*Con.*
Indians, 2149
Interest rate, 4116
Life-saving service, 3335
Lighthouses
Maintenance and repairs, 3353
Salaries of lightkeepers, 3351
Magazines and periodicals, M. (Mr. Hocken) 839
Matapedia bridge, 1014
Members' indemnity, 4009
Mennonites, 1229, 1884
National gallery, 1018
Naval service, 910
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3536
Ottawa-Hull bridge, 1016
Penitentiaries, 771
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3849
Pension commissioners, board of, 3743
Petroleum bounty, 3922
Prices, spread in, 1230
Provincial educational rights, 1884
Public works, surveys and inspections, 1020
Quebec arsenal, 884
Raisins and dried currants, duty, 3478
Royal Canadian navy, 910
St. Lawrence river waterway, 3778
St. Lawrence ship channel, 3340
Sales tax, abolition of, 1230
Saskatchewan, national parks, 3942
Soldier settlement, 2021, 2027
Sorel shipyard, 3349
Spectacle and eyeglass frames, duty, 3483
Standard Oil Company, 2601
Sugar duty, 3479
Swift current public building, 1023
Tidal and current survey, 3338
Trade commissioners, 1841
Typewriters and parts, duty, 3485
Welland canal construction, 3761, 3777
Western provinces, conditions in, 1225
Wines, tax on, 3938
Wireless stations, 3337
Wrecking plants, subsidies, 3334

Lewis, John L., correspondence, 250, 815

Liberal Party. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget
British Columbia liquor law administration, 2414
Charge of abandonment of policy, unfair, 3010
Conventions of 1893 and 1919, 2777. *See also under this title* Liberal Platform
Senate, elective or nominative, 1369
Crowsnest pass agreement, 2971
Disappointment with, 2812

Liberal Party—*Con.*
Election promises in 1896 and 1921, 2951
High protectionists in, 2931
Influences preventing carrying out of pledges, 2909
Liberal platform of 1919, 2603, 2777, 2885, 2932, 2952, 2974, 2991, 3007, 4393
British preference, increase in, 454
"Chart" 3047
Circumstances of adoption, 3019
Economy, 2003
Endorsed by opposition in 1920, 2994
Euler, Mr., statement of, 3019
Failure to implement, 2981, 3066
French treaty, 2211
Government should not be asked to carry out, 2852
Immigration, Chinese, 1652
Interpretation of, 3047
Labour legislation, 1651, 1652
Maclean, Hon. Mr. (Halifax), statement of, 3019
Planks from, included in amendment, 2861
Progressive party, opposition to, 2925
Proportional representation, 407
Quotation from, 3019
Repudiation of, alleged, 2994, 3019, 3047,
Resolutions moved in opposition, 2736, 3047
Tariff, 1222, 2714, 2718, 2736, 2737, 2872, 2904, 2957, 3008
Planks not carried out, 2220, 3062, 3033. *See also under this title,* Tariff
Taxation, 2003
Luxuries, 2011
Liberals and Conservatives, Bank Act, 4019, 4048, 4125, 4126, 4142
Liberals, responsibility for expenditure, 2921
Pledges and promises, 2908, 2981, 2992. *See also under this title,* Conventions; Liberal Platform
Elections of 1896 and 1921, 2908, 2981, 2992
Repudiation of, alleged, 2793, 3035
Senate elective or nominative, 1369
Tariff
Difference between Liberal and Conservative, 3008
Platform of 1896, 2908
Policy, 3007
Protective, 2818
Record since 1896 3009
Stability, new doctrine, 3064

Liberal and Conservative Parties
Alleged union on Bank Act, 4019, 4048, 4125, 4126, 4142

Liberalism, "watchwords of the past", 3014

Libraries. *See* Public Libraries

Library of Parliament
Committee, 53, 202, 516
Change in membership, 615
Estimates, 2691
Salaries, contingencies, etc. 2692

Life Imprisonment. *See* Criminal Code Amdt. bill

Life Saving. *See* Canadian National Safety League; Marine

Lighthouses and Lightkeepers. *See* Marine

Lignite. *See* Coal; Fuel Supply

Lincoln, Abraham, on immigration, 1236

Lindsay
Arsenal 883, 1744, 1752
Market scales, 208

Linen
Linen thread. *See also* Textiles; Treaties, French Treaty
Bounty, 2647
Linen yarns, 3897
French treaty, 1981
Industry, 3897

Liquor. *See also* Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill; Customs and Excise
Beer, excise taxes, qu. 518
Bonded liquor warehouses. *See under this title.* British Columbia; New Brunswick
Bootlegging, 2410, 2419, 3358. *See also* Belle River Harbour
Brandy. *See also* Treaties, French
Duty on, 2742, 2999
French, 444, 2643, 3478
Breweries and export liquor houses
Licensing, 1636
Violation of liquor laws, qu. 1866
British Columbia, 2405-11
Purchases by British Columbia government, 2410
Warehouse licenses, qu. 1260, qu. 1866, qu. 1971, qu. 1974, 2404-7, 3144
Canadian and Scotch whisky, competition of French brandy, 3478
Canadian National Railways, transportation, 1868, 3324
Drunkenness, convictions for, 2411
Exportation, 2404, 3144, 3704, 4295
British Columbia, qu. 1260
Government control. *See* Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill
Illicit stills
Prosecutions, Vita, Manitoba, 3280
Remissions of fines, 2299

Liquor—*Con.*
Illicit traffic, Canada to United States, 2208
Importation
For sale under regulations, 2404, 3704
Provinces, into. *See* Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill
Intoxicating, consumption of, qu. 285
Laws, evasion of, 2543
Manufacture, 2410, 3704
New Brunswick export warehouses, 815
Ontario Temperance Act, 2410
United States laws, 4295
Wines, 3035. *See also* Treaties, French
Beer and, excise taxes, qu. 518
Duty, 2710, 2999
Abolition of, 2742
Reduction of, 2643
Excise tax, qu. 518, 2656, 3937, 4425
French treaty, 438, 442, 452, 1977, 1997, 2010, 2209, 2225
Native, prohibition of, 2411
Port, manufactured at False Creek, Vancouver, 2411
Yukon, 86

L'Islet wharf, 969

Literature. *See also* Advertising; Immigration
National. *See* Copyright Act Amdt. bill; Magazines and Periodicals, M. (Mr. Hocken)
Recognition of work in. *See* Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner)

Lithographic Works, marking of goods, 2988

Little Current, Ont., harbour, 982

Live Stock. *See also* Address; Agriculture; Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt Bill; Budget; Live Stock Acts Amdt.
Accredited herds. *See* Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt. Bill, *and under this title,* Health of Animals
Alberta, 1435
Animal contagious diseases. *See also that title*
Eradication board, 2699
Research, 2867
Canada's position as a live stock country, 2934
Cattle
Dairying industry. *See that title*
Diseases *See under this title,* Health of Animals
Embargo. *See also* Agriculture, Experimental Farms
Removal of, 15, 25, 26, 38, 48, 148, 170, 575, 1869, 2871, 3053

Live Stock—*Con.*
Cattle—*Con.*
Embargo—*Con.*
Removal of—*Con.*
Conference, 3989
Correspondence, 4132, 4184, 4295
Credit for, 3293
Doherty, Mr. Manning, 3293
Drury, Hon. E. C., 3293
Effect of, 1101
Health of Canadian herds, 2132
Inquiry, 575, 576
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, 3293
Pledge of British government, 3531
Shipment to Great Britain. *See under this sub-title,* Shipment to Great Britain
Stock, classification of, 3291
Export to United States, 1410, 2910, 3293. *See also* United States
Feeding
Shipment in car lots, 595
Winter feeding, 469
Markets, 2871
Ocean freight rates on, 2127, 2136, 2757, 2807, 3040
Prices, 300, 2877
Chicago, Winnipeg and Dundee, 2871
Weight and, 2871
Quarantined at Levis, qu. 3141
Reciprocity, 3082. *See also that title*
Scrub, 2810
Shipment to Great Britain, 208, 1036, 2807, 3017, 3324, 3641. *See also under this sub-title.* Embargo
Alleged unsanitary condition of boats, 2127, 2613
Finished cattle shipped as stockers, 2872
First, 3309, 3310
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, reported statement, 3041
Dundee at, 2614
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 3811
Grisdale, Dr., statement, 3040
Rates, 2133, 2963
Stockers and fat cattle, 2135
Trial shipment, expenses, 4675
Tuberculosis, report as to, 2469
Vessel space, 1868, 1869, 2757, 2963 3040
Testing, 1307, 2133
Trade, development of, 3040
Chicago Fat Stock show, 1398
Community breeding, 476
Condemnation insurance, qu. 1972, qu. 2699
Contagious diseases. *See under this title,* Health of Animals

Live Stock—*Con.*
Dairy cattle, testing, 1307
Destruction by timber wolves, 597
Dryden, Mr. W. A., trip to South America, qu. 1031, 1213, 3294, qu. 3704
Estimates, 575, 587, 4675
Experimental farms, 457, 460-85
Export. *See under this title,* Cattle, Embargo, Shipment; *and also,* Treaties, French Treaty
Feeding. *See* Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill
Health of Animals, 483, 575, 4676. *See also* Animal Contagious Diseases Bill
Accredited herds, qu. 206, 484, qu. 492, 577, 626, 3064, 3302
Richmond county, qu. 813
Wolfe county, qu. 813
Alderson, Mr. George B., claim, 582
Compensation for slaughter, 462-486, 576, 582
Hall, O., and McDougall, W. F., veterinary inspectors, 3989
Hog cholera, 582
Contracted from whey, 3299
Pathological laboratories, 578
Watson, Dr., chief pathologist, 579, 2866, 2868
Tuberculosis, 576, 2469
Buffalo, 3439
Condemnation insurance, qu. 2699
Eradication, 3989
Restricted area, Manitoba, 576
Tuberculin test, qu. 1972, 3065
No encouragement to farmer, 2933, 3300
Hogs
Bacon type, 2864
Breeding, feeding and marketing, 2865
Corn-fed, 2865
Garbage feeding, 582
Grading, 466, 590, 1905
Prices, Chicago and Toronto, 2865
Horses
Glanders, serum for, 579, 584
Horse-breeding, 588
Market for, 590
Racing of. *See* Race Track Betting
Shire horses from Great Britain, 2207, 2253
Thoroughbred, breeding of. *See* Race Track Betting
Tariff on. *See* Treaties, French Treaty
Imports and exports, supervision of. *See* Live Stocks Act Amdt
Improvement, 2773
Indian reserves, 2159, 2162
Infected, sale of. *See* Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill

Live Stock—*Con.*
Loans, 4103
Loss from inferior, 2862, 2866, 2867
Markets, 588, 594, 1410
Prices and quality, 2862. *See also under this title,* Cattle
Marshall, Mr. Duncan. *See also that title*
Cattle embargo, 3293
Reported statements, 2614, 3041
Trip to South America, qu. 1031
Poultry. *See that title*
Prices, 2862, 2877. *See also* Prices *and under this title,* Cattle
Decrease in, 1410
West, in, 1101
Propaganda, 594
Purchase of thoroughbred stock, by Mr. E. S. Archibald, 3290
Ranching, 588
Sheep, 2866
Pure-bred, importation, qu. 3141
Screenings, feeding on, 2040, 2867
Sheep-raising. *See* Textiles; Woollen Industry, M. (Mr. Drummond)
Shipments, inspection of, 3334. *See also under this title,* Cattle, Shipment
Stockyards
Agents at Prince Albert and Moose Jaw, qu. 1156
Fraudulent practices, 276, 485, 576
Moose Jaw, qu. 1156, 2779
Prince Albert, qu. 1156, 2779
Union, 2762
Stock Growers' Protective Association, grant, 587
Trade. *See also that title*
South America, 594, qu. 1031
Visit of Canadian commissioners to, qu. 1031, 1213, 3294, qu. 3704
Transportation. *See also* Freight Rates
Hudson Bay railway, 1071
Tuberculin test. *See under this title,* Health of Animals
Western Canada Live Stock Union, 2699
World competition, 2781

Live Stock Acts Amdt. Bill. *See also* Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt. bill (Marketing, consolidation and amendment)
1r., 193; 2r., 276-277; ref, to Agriculture Com., 277; report of com. 1441; com., 2200; 2992; 3r., 2293; Senate amdts. 3150

Live Stock Exchanges. *See* Live Stock Acts Amdt. Bill

Llandovery Castle, sinking of, 1745

Lloyd George, Right Hon. David
Agricultural conditions in Great Britain, 2755
Career of, 1399
Free trade and protection, 3012
German reparations. *See* Germany
Great Britain, unemployment, 1205
Liberalism, "fair play for the under dog," 3014
Near East question, 4655
Proportional representation, 392
Socialist strength in Great Britain, 2722
Turkey, threatened war with, 2815

Loans, 93, 630, 2642. *See also* Banks and Banking; Credits; Finance; Harbours, advances to
Agricultural 1400. *See also* Credits
Borrowings of former government, 2831
Comparative commissions on, 158-9
Conversion, recent, qu, 386
Farm. *See* Banks and Banking; Credits
Interest, 2831
Live stock, 4103
New York, 1922, 154-155, 630, 640, 2963
Provincial, 2987
Roumanian and Greek, qu. 623, 2010
Vocational. *See* Soldiers Civil Re-establishment
War, delivery of dividend cheques, 1804

Lobster Canning. *See* Fish and Fisheries

Local Improvements. *See* Public Works

Lockeport, N.S. wharf, 943

Logan, Mr. Hance J. (Cumberland)
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4079
Bienfait briquetting plant, 2512
British preference, direct importation, 3455
Coal, duty, 3498
Deputy ministers, salaries, 4671
Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia, 4561
Johnston, Mr. Alex., Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries, 4671
Members' indemnity, 4009
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3878
Amdt. time for appeal, 3881, agreed to, 3881

London, publicity agent, reported appointment of Mr. W. T. Cranfield, 2927, 2983, 4707

London Times, comment on Canadian immigration, 1111

Lord Selkirk Association, monument to Indian Chief, Peguis, 4704

Lord's Day Act, discrimination against poor, 3585

Lougheed, Sir James
Hudson Bay railway, 1033
Labour members of parliament, 3033

Lovett, Mr. L. J. (Digby-Annapolis)
Annual training, 95th regiment, 863
Arthur Young and Company, qu. 1137
Black, Mr. W. J., Deputy Minister of Immigration, qu. 1633
Budget, 2944. Congratulations to Finance Minister, 2944; budget generally acceptable; return of prosperity; tariff, downward revision; revenue requirements; postage rates, reduction; fishing industry handicaps and difficulties, 2945; reduced freight rates; United States markets; machinery for manufacture of fish waste into fertilizer; optimism of Maritime provinces; immigration; pessimistic utterances of Progressives; Mr. Forke on the budget; statement of Mr. H. W. Wood, 2946; amendment; agriculture, assistance of; forest conservation, 2947; pulpwood, restriction of export; work of Mr. F. J. D. Barnjum in interest of forest conservation; cheque tax; bounties, free admission of machinery; sugar duty; sales tax; British preference; reciprocity, 2948
Civil Service Commission
Appointments, 535
Cost of 1917-22, qu. 1137
Clementsport postmaster, 1796
Export Act Amdt. bill, pulpwood, 4351
Forest conservation, 2947, 4351
Foster, Mr. A. deWitt, qu. 1633
Griffenhagen and Associates, qu. 1137
Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia, 4571
Military hospitals, medical staff, 677
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3855
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 2948, 4351

Lovie, Mr. W. J. (Macdonald)
Animal Contagious Diseases bill, 2138
Budget, 2871. Congratulations to Finance Minister; Canadian cattle embargo, removal of; value of British and United States markets; prices, Chicago, Winnipeg and Dundee, Scotland; weight and price; finished cattle shipped as stockers; unlimited quantity of cattle available for shipment; agricultural conditions; protection unfair to West; double standard of selling

Lovie, Mr. W. J.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
and buying; Premier Dunning on the tariff; Liberal tariff planks; Sir Wilfrid Laurier on protection; revenue tariff and protection; excise duty, 2872; taxes paid to protected manufacturers; agricultural conditions in Western Canada; statement of Mr. Samuel Larcombe at Winnipeg; wheat, market for; prices of agricultural and manufactured products; unprofitable crop of 1922, 2873; hard wheat; mixed farming; letter from Mr. J. Scott; farmers who own automobiles; automobiles in Ottawa, 2874; mill feeds, adulteration of; freight rates; lumber, price of, 2875; freight, classification of; transfer charges; express rates; labour costs in industrial and agricultural occupations; cost of living, 2876; protective tariff; disparity between producer's and consumer's prices; cheque tax, limitation; discrimination in favour of rich; protection, 2877; Hudson Bay railway; British preference; world conditions; cancellation of war debt, 2878; Sir George Lawson Johnston on payment by Great Britain of debt to United States; dollar reserve fund in Canada, 2879
Experimental farms, 477
Farms of 160 acres, 1087
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4271, 4546
Health of animals, 580
Horse-breeding, 588
Mill feeds, adulteration of, 600, 2875
Seed inspection, 196

Lowe, Dr. A. M., capture and maltreatment in China, 2695, 2795

Lower, Mr. A. R. M., fisheries of Hudson bay, 1065

Lucas, Mr. W. T. (Victoria, Alta.)
Address in reply, 74, 75. Unfair criticism of Progressive party, 75; Great Britain our best market; condition of western farmers, 76; immigration policy of government, 77; revision of Bank Act; transportation of grain; comparative grain rates; economy in administration, 78; the government and its platform; old party divisions, 79
Agricultural loans, 1400
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4041
Bruederheim branch railway, 4199, 4316
Canadian air force, 1749, 2418
Central repair shops, 1750

Lucas, Mr. W. T.—*Con.*
Canadian national parks and historic sites, 3942
Canadian National Railways branch lines bill, 4198, 4316
Canadian Pacific Railway, qu. 625
Land, 3704
Canadian representation in United States, 4001
Civil Service Commission, 3986
Copper bounty bill, 3240
Disallowance, Nova Scotia statute, 2378
Dredging, Maritime provinces, 1011
Elevators, dockage, 2044
Finance Act 1914 Amdt bill, 4408
Freight rates, reduction of, 1400
Grain pooling, 1400
Immigration
Banks and, 4042
Canada Colonization Association, 1399
Chinese, 1445
Policy, 1397
Institutions, surplus of, 1400
Lloyd George, Right Hon. David, 1399
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2109
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3866
Pharmaceutical preparations, qu. 3261
Public Works engineering branch, 1017
Railway mail service, 1790
Raisins and dried currants, 3478
Spectacle and eyeglass frames, duty, 3483
Tariff reduction, 1400
Western provinces, conditions in, 1398

Lumber. *See also* Forests and Forestry; Pulp and Paper; Timber
Alleged labour shortage in lumber camps, 1125
British Columbia in, 1245
Combine, 2593
Competition and prices, 2593
Creosoting industry, qu. 813, qu. 1137, 1245, 3234
Vancouver Creosoting Company. 3231
Depression, 3002
Freight rates, 139, 1961, 2855, 2875, 3036
Georgia pine, importation of, 3411
Importation for Welland canal, qu. 1867
Manufactures of, 1989. *See also* Treaties, French Treaty
Prices, 2875, 3036
Provincial revenue from, 2802
Railway ties, freight rates and prices, 3036
Sales tax, 4181, 4418
Sawdust pollution of streams, 701, 3362
Temiskaming district, 1402
Timber exportation, 3416
Wood-working industry, 2806

Lumbermen, emigration to United States, 1125

Lunenburg, N.S. harbour, dredging, 4576
Amdt. (Mr. Guthrie) to reduce item, 4577, neg. 4580

Luse Land Company. *See* Immigration

Lusitania. *See* Germany, Reparations

Luxuries. *See also* Taxation; Treaties, French Treaty
Demand for, 1856

Macallum, Dr., discoveries in helium, 4439

Macarow, Mr. D. C., application to subpœna, 4145. *See also* Bank Act Amdt. Bill, Merchants Bank

Macbrien, General. *See* National Defence

Maccan Coal District. *See* Coal

Macdonald, Hon. E. M. (Acting Minister of National Defence)
Acting Minister of National Defence, appointment, 2295
After war conditions, 1231
Annual drill, 4635
Bank Act Amdt. Bill, 4064
Business of the House
Audibility, 4593
Chair ruling of, 4720
Motions, anticipatory, 3329
Supply, M. to postpone, 3669
Camp Borden, approach to, 4565
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill, 3749
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 4732
Canadian National Railways
Branch lines construction bill, 3961
Rejection by Senate. 4698
Coal
Freight rates on, 1277
Purchase of in United States, 3493
Management, responsibility and powers, 3690
Paris offices, 3616-17, 3689
Thornton, Sir Henry, 3617
Canadian Northern railway, acquisition, 1937
Class consciousness 1233
Coal
Canadian National Railways, 1277, 3493
Duty 3493
Nova Scotia 1277
Combines bill enforcement of 4229
Criminal Code amdt. (Betting information) 4733
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute 2372

Macdonald, Hon. E. M.—*Con.*
Dredging Maritime provinces 4591. *See also under this title* Harbours and Rivers
Emigration to the United States 1234
Eskimos, trial of, 4674
Experimental farms, buildings, 4630
Fielding, Right Hon. Mr., congratulations, 4743
Freight rates
Coal, 1277
Crowsnest pass agreement, 1937
Manitoba-Canadian Northern agreement, 1939
Railway rates, equalization, M. (Mr. Clark) 1937
Fuel supply, M. (Mr. Church) 1277
Halifax grain elevator 4714
Harbours and rivers
New Brunswick, 4586
Nova Scotia, 4561, 4563
Dartmouth, 4568
Digby, 4568
Dredging, 4569, 4591
East Sandy Cove, 4570
Little Anse, 4722
Morrison, Mr. T. D., claim, 4572, 4722
Lunenburg, dredging, 4576, 4577
Ship Harbour, 4586
Windsor, 4586
Ontario, 4589, 4594
Belle River, 4596
Port Maitland, 4589
Prince Edward Island, 4586
Georgetown, 4587
Quebec, 4588
Rimouski, Raymond and Talbot, Messrs. claim, 4588
Ste. Petronille, 4588
Hawkesbury bridge, 4590
Hebridean immigrants, treatment, 3597
Hector celebration, grant, 4636, 4705
Hindu immigrants, franchise, 510
Homestead lands in the West, 1087, 1090
Hudson Bay railway, discontinuance, 1062
Immigration
Empire settlement board, 1237
Hebridean, treatment of, 3597
Maritime provinces, and, 1236
Oriental, 509
Policy, 1230-38
Immigration Act Amdt. bill (Mr. Neill) 509
Inland Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 3749
Judges Act Amdt. bill, 3452
Justice, administration of, 4674
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4229
Militia Pension Act Amdt. bill, 2052, 3582, 3975

Macdonald, Hon. E. M.—*Con.*
Mines and Minerals Com. report, 1738
Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. bill, 2121
National Defence
Canadian Air Force, desertions, 2418
Desbarats, Mr. G. J., acting deputy minister, 4673
Estimates, 4635
Militia camps at harvest time, 3976. *See also under this title,* Petawawa
National spirit, 1232
Naval service, recruiting, 2897
Northover, Major H. R., claims, 4635
Oleomargarine
M. (Mr. Carroll) 3552
Discussion of, 3329
Sub-amdt. (Mr. Good) 3571
Policy, 3451
Parliament buildings, common meeting room, 1727
Party system, 1235
Petawawa camp and Ontario elections, 3976, 4005, 4162
Petroleum and Naphtha Inspection bill, 3749
Public buildings
New, 4615
New Brunswick, 4613
Sackville, 4613
Nova Scotia, 4613, 4628
Ontario, 4615
Haileybury armoury and post office, 4615
Ottawa, new departmental, architects, 4633
Saskatchewan, 4629
Public Works
Estimates, 4561, 4594
Roads and bridges, 4590
Reciprocity, defeat of, 1233
Redistribution
Intention of government, 4250
Opportunity for discussion, 4593
Special committee, 857, 937
Reports
First, 857
Second, 3399
Third, 4510, 4736
Returned Soldiers Insurance bill, 4735
Sworn as member of Privy Council without portfolio, 1764
Toronto
Customs building, 4624
Harbour improvements, 4610
Postal station "A" building, 4624
Seed branch building, 4622
United States civil war, conditions following, 1232

Macdonald, Right Hon. Sir John A.
Confederation and, 1366

Macdonald, Right Hon. Sir John A.—*Con.*
National policy, 2838
Reciprocity, 2922
Senate and House of Lords, 1374
Title, 1295

Macdonell, Rev. Father
Immigration
Hebridean, 3585
Scotland, from, 1876

MacKelvie, Mr. John A. (Yale)
British Columbia telegraph lines, 1017
Canadian National Railways branch lines bill, 4314
Chinese immigration bill, 2322
Conditions in British Columbia, 2322
Merchants, Vernon, telegram, 2322
Officer in China, 2322
Codling moth, 597
Dredging, Shuswap lake, 1014
Experimental farms, 464
Fruits and vegetables, registration, 2307
Halifax grain elevator, qu. 4751
Hope-Princeton highway, 2342
Immigration
British Columbia, into, 1095
Canada Colonization Association, 1346
European, 1346
Labour, restriction of, 1104
Oriental, 509, 1346, 2322
Policy, 1345
Immigration Act Amdt. bill, 509
Indians, British Columbia, Major McGraw, 2163
Kamloops-Okanagan line, 4314
Magazines and periodicals, M. (Mr. Hocken) 837
Mara, B. C., postmaster, qu. 1489, qu. 1739
Military hospitals, 671
Okanagan lake wharves, 1008
Pensions, European war and active militia, 3723
Seed testing bill, 2307
Sugar lake telegraph line, 1017
Summerland experimental farm, 464
Western provinces, conditions, 1347

Mackenzie River District
Half-breed claims, 3409, 3444
Steamship services, 2176

Mackenzie, William Lyon, 47

MacLaren, Mr. Murray (St. John City and Counties of St. John and Albert)
Annual drill, 4637
Artificial limbs for disabled soldiers, 675
Boy Scouts, 879

MacLaren, Mr. Murray—*Con.*
British preference, direct importation, 1772, 2948
Budget, 2948. British preference, increase of direct importation, 2948; French and Italian treaties, limitation to Canadian ports; Canadian National Railways, comparison of mileage and traffic; Canadian grain passing through United States seaports; petroleum bounties and tariff on oil; proposal to curtail and discontinue; immigration policy; Maritime provinces ignored; lecture of Mr. F. W. Kerr in Isle of Man, 2949; Hebridean immigrants; naval recruiting in the interior; forest conservation; government economy, 2950; civil government; Hudson Bay raiway, 2951
Cadet services, 879
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill, 3970
Canadian air force, 1748
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Negotiation for sale of 27 ships, 1975
Steamship sailings, qu. 4511
For 1924, qu. 4751
Canadian National Railways, 2944
Atlantic division, 1770
Branch lines construction bill, 4310
Chicago traffic originating at, 1769
Comparison, mileage and traffic, 2949
Directors, New Brunswick representative, qu. 282
Grand Trunk, Portland terminal. 1768, 1769
Halifax terminals, qu. 4510. qu. 4751
Policy, discussion of, 1762, 1764
Regulations, 496
St. John station, 4310
Civil Service Commission, 3986
Dredging, Maritime provinces, 1009
Emigration to United States, 1198
Employers' liability compensation, 695
Esquimalt dry dock, 2674
Export Act Amdt. bill, pulpwood, 4347
Flour shipments, Canadian and United States ports, 1767
Forest protection, 2950
M. (Mr. Michaud) 822
French treaty, direct importation, 2303, 2949
Grain shipments, 1767
Harbours and rivers, New Brunswick, 948
Hector celebration, 4637
Hudson Bay railway, 2951, 4681, 4684
Immigration
Bowder, Mr., agent in Great Britain, 1198
Distribution of, 1198
Farm labourers and domestic servants, 1200

MacLaren, Mr. Murray—*Con.*
Immigration—*Con.*
Hebridean, 2950
Maritime provinces ignored, 2949
Officers in Great Britain, 1879
Policy, 1197, 2949
St. John immigration building, 1457
Italian treaty, direct importation, 2401, 2948
Labour Gazette, printing, 1624
Macdonald, Hon. E. M., appointment as minister, 1764
Militia Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3975
Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. bill, 2116, 2119
National monument, Connaught place, Ottawa, 1021, 2685, 2688
Olympic games, Canadian team, 4706
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3854-67, 4747
Pensions, European war and active militia, 3711
Petroleum bounty, 3919
Post Office department, printing, 1818, 1820
Public ownership, railways, 1770
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4347
Questions unanswered, 4455
St. John
Employment office, 3453
Harbour improvements, 2677
Immigration building, 1457
Quarantine station, 1021
Terminals, 4445
St. John and Quebec railway extension, 4310
Sales tax, 4427
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, Vancouver office, qu. 2297, 3085, 3822
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 4427
Taxation, payment in postage stamps, 1821
Telegraph and telephone lines, 2683
Tracadie lazaretto, 702
Vancouver harbour bill, 261
Venereal diseases, 705
Vocational loans, 687

MacLean, Mr. A. E. (Prince, P.E.I.)
Aeroplane mail service, 1775
Animal Contagious Diseases bill, 2134
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4083
Budget, 2967. Congratulations to Finance Minister; debt and interest charges; Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 2967; budget the best possible under circumstances; tariff revision; tendency downwards; reciprocity, offer to negotiate; attitude of United States; British preference, increase in; sugar duty; expenditure and economy, 2968; irrigation, water power survey and land reclamation; immigration; unemployment relief, 2969; migration of Can-

MacLean, Mr. A. E.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
adians; air force; Civil Service, number of employees; Civil Service Commission; government departments, increase in cost of, 2970; Canadian National Railways; improved situation on eastern division; courtesy of officials; Crowsnest pass agreement, claim that concession forced by Progressives, 2971; natural resources of western provinces and Maritime provinces; agricultural conditions in Prince Edward Island; fishing industry; reciprocity; distribution, cost of; middleman; producer and consumer; confidence and co-operation; evidence before Agricultural Conditions Committee; cost of living, 2972; tariff stability; deficit; reduction of; reasons for supporting budget; amendment, 2973
Canadian National parks and historic sites, 3436
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 557
Combines bill, 2601
English and French, harmony, 1341
Forest protection, 3419
Fox-breeding industry, 590
Horses, market for, 590
Maritime provinces, summer resorts, 3436
Militia camps at harvest time, 3976
Natural resources, 2972, 3436
Pensions, European war and active militia, 3730
Proportional representation, 432
Public expenditure, east and west, 3436
School lands, unpaid balance, 4204
Seed potatoes, inspection, 2306
Seed testing bill, 2306

Maclean, Hon. A. K. (Halifax)
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4035, 4080-4124, 4133-60, 4509
Merchants' bank, 4037, 4050, 4156
Proceedings before Banking and Commerce Com. 3887
Shareholders' audit, 4090
Bank mergers, 4138
Merchants' bank 4037, 4050, 4156
Banking and Commerce Committee
Leave to sit while House in session, 986
Printing of proceedings, 3887
Reports
First and second, 986
Third, 1080
Fourth, 1538
Fifth, 2926

Maclean, Hon. A. K.—*Con.*
Banking and Commerce Committee—*Con.*
Reports—*Con.*
Sixth, 3505
Seventh, 3887
Eighth, 4131
Budget, 3000. Congratulations to Finance Minister, 3000; speech of Mr. Meighen; budget, form of presentation; budget statements in Great Britain; budget well received in country; expenditure and taxation, burden upon taxpayers, 3001; the future bright; agriculture; fishing industry; business and industrial depression; problems should be faced in national spirit; Canada difficult country to govern, 3002; secession, talk of; accentuation of provincial and local problems; group political organizations; Alberta farmers resolution; European reconstruction; European origin of Canadian commercial conditions, 3003; wheat prices; emigration to United States; government not responsible; economic causes of movement; inflation in the United States; building trade, 3004; balanced budget; public expenditure; attitude of public and parliament; Hudson Bay railway; commission to inquire and investigate, 3005; commercial feasibility of route; Welland canal; railway extension in the West; Canadian Government Merchant Marine, deficit; deficit in financial operations of government; railway deficit and taxation, 3006; tariff policy of government; Liberal platform of 1919; too much importance attached to; statesmen who have reversed opinions on public policy; Sir Robert Peel and repeal of Corn Laws, 3007; tariff declarations of Liberal Convention; unwise to re-write tariff schedule; Progressive platform; inconsistency of Conservative party; consistently protectionist; Conservative arguments in favour of protection; position of Liberal party, 3008; tariff board; tariff reduction; free trade; Progressive party, inconsistency of; Alberta coal, transportation to Ontario; record of Liberal party since 1896; preferential tariff, 3009; reciprocity agreement with United States; opposition to reciprocity by Progressive members; recent tariff reductions; free trade and revenue; amendment;

Maclean, Hon. A. K.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
taxation; income tax; reliance upon customs tariff; tariff, unwise to abandon; United States, attitude towards Canada; Fordney tariff, 3010; reciprocity offer; tariff stability, 3011; problems to be solved, 3012
Speech on, reference to, 3070
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill, 3973
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Committee on, 2474
Competition with subsidized service, 3381, 3385
Deficit, 3006
Canadian National Railways, 3006
Committee, 2474
Management, responsibility and power, 3695
Paris offices, 3694
Cheque tax, 3934
Cold Storage Act Amdt. bill, 272, 273
Commercial union, 3907
Companies Act Amdt. bill, 4214-17
Credit and industry, M. (Mr. Irvine) 631
Distressed seamen, 3973
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4274
Freight rates, control of, 4226
French treaty, 444
Halifax grain elevator, 4713
Hudson Bay railway commission to inquire, 3005
Insulin, supply of, 704
Interest rate, 4105
Lack of confidence, M. (Mr. Irvine) 232
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4224-28, 4292
League of Nations
Activities and policies, 3997
Invitation to meet in Canada, 3997
Liberal platform of 1919, 3003, 3019
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, appointment, 3318
Merchants' bank merger. *See under this title,* Bank mergers
New York, Canadian customs officer, 3274
Nova Scotia miners' strike, troops, 398
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3572
Reciprocity with United States, 3010. 3907
Steamship services, West Indies, 3379
Union bank, 4225
Vancouver harbour bill, 258, 259, 262

Maclean, Mr. W. F. (South York)
Bank Act Amdt bill, 4135-45, 4147
Banks
Charters, limitation of time, 4147
Combinations of, 2578
Mergers, 4135
Notes, substitution for national notes, 4408

Maclean, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Banting, Dr. F. G., 4440
Budget, 3055. Mr. McMaster in "Greenland"; doubtful virtue of consistency; speech of Prime Minister; professed protectionist; grievances of East and West; railway question; Canadian National Railways; Canadian Pacific; public vs. private ownership; effort to acquire or destroy national system, 3056; strategic advantages; present deficits but success assured; waterways complementary to railway system; company-owned railways; railway situation in United States, 3057; traffic pools and running rights; personnel of management; capitalization; stock exchange gambling; necessities of life; grain and sugar speculation, 3058; race-track betting; new Franchise Act needed; equality of citizenship as between men and women; previous discussion in parliament; right to revise constitution, 3059; tariff; immigration and land settlement; grievances of Maritime and western provinces; banking legislation; rural credits; war clouds 3060
Canada, constitutional development, 4473
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 3842
Canadian National Railways, 1050, 3056
Annual statement of minister, 1617
Branch lines construction bill, 4193, 4335
Courtesy, 2971
Electrification, 3203
Estimates, 1566
Grand Trunk gratuities, 1667
Public ownership, 1618, 3056
Report, 3223
Securities, approval of, bill, 4403
Toronto approaches and terminals, 4193, 4335, 4447
Unification of system, 3195, 3223
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 539
Combines bill, 2575
Parliament, right to investigate, 2666
Combines, steamship, 2667
Companies Act Amdt. bill, 4209-15
Constitution
Right of Canada to make her own, 1378
Right to revise, 3059
Copper bounty bill, 4371
Dairy Act Amdt. bill, 3327
Farm loans, 1088, 3060, 4366
Finance Act Amdt. bill, 4407
Forest protection, M. Mr. (Michaud) 824

Maclean, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Franchise Act Amdt. 3223
Freight rates
Crowsnest pass agreement, 1965
Grain, 1965
Railway rates, equalization, M. (Mr. Clark) 1965
Reclassification, 1618
Waterways, 1619
Fuel supply, 3198
M. (Mr. Church) 1272
Government printing, 1733
Halibut fishery treaty, 4473
Hebridean immigrants, 2950
Highways, effect on railways, 1619
Hoppe and Isenberg leases, cancellation, 3146, 3222
House of Commons acoustics, member should occupy central position, 1721
House of Lords, constitution of, 1374, 1378
Hudson Bay railway, M. (Mr. Knox) 1049
Hydro Electric Commission, 2682
Imperial Conference, 3223
King's birthday, observance, 3323
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4219
Merchants bank, 2576
Mining companies shares, 4209
National Defence estimates, 859
National land bank, 4366
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2185
Nickle, shipments to Germany during war, 4371
Parliament buildings, 1725
Peat experiments, 3199
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3851, 3860
Petition of right, fiats, 3146, 3222
Proportional representation, 420
Public departments, consolidation, 3341
Public ownership, 3842
Railways, 3056, 4194
Railways, co-operation between, 4337
Redistribution bill
Opportunity for discussion, 488
Representation by population, 572
Rural credits, 1088, 3060, 4366
St. Lawrence ship channel, 3340
St. Lawrence water power development, 2682
Sales tax, imports, 4409
Senate, elective or nominative, 1373, 1378
Singapore naval base, qu. 3506, qu. 3820
Sugar trust, 2576, 3058
Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner) 1295
Toronto
Approaches and terminals, 4193, 4335, 4447
Viaduct, 4447
United States Federal reserve bank, 4407
United States, preferential treatment, 440

Maclean, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
War commitments, 859
Water powers
Export of electrical energy, 1272
Survey of, 3203
Woollen industry, M. (Mr. Drummand) 933

Macneil Case. *See* Disallowance of Nova Scotia Statute

Macphail, Miss Agnes C. (Southeast Grey)
Agricultural conditions, 1190, 1844
Agriculture, expenditure, 3241
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4048
Copper bounty bill, 3241
Dominion Council of Health, lady members, 3649
Experimental farms, 3241
Farm women, 1844
Immigration
Domestic servants, 1189
Farmers and farm labourers, 1190
Policy, 1189
Labour, attitude towards mental and physical work, 1189
Life on the farm, 1189
Members of parliament, party funds and, 4237
References to, 1243, 1249
Rural depopulation, 1189, 1844
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4236-47
M. to refer back, neg. 4247
Sessional allowance, M. to reduce, 4240, neg. 4242
Soldier settlement, 2022, 2026
Questionnaire, 1845
Trade
Encouragement, qu. 284
Representatives, qu. 284

Macphail, Sir Andrew, immigration, 1393

McAdoo Award, 126

McArthur, J. D. & Co., Hudson Bay railway claim, 4686, 4689

McArthur, Mr. J. J., international boundaries, 3246

McBride, Mr. T. G. (Caribou)
Animal Contagious Diseases bill, 2134
Annual training, 872
Army officers, settlement in Canada, 1432
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4065, 4096
Mutual insurance companies, 4097
British Columbia
Agricultural production, 1432
Liquor law, administration, 2427

McBride, Mr. T. G.—*Con.*
Brule lake-Grande Prairie projected railway, 4699
Budget, 3031; pessimism; playing politics; sales tax; pyramiding; equalization of the tax; copper bounty; hemp bounty, 3031; proposed extension; employment of Canadians; British preference, clothing; old age pensions; unemployment relief; highway construction; immigration bill, statement by Sir James Lougheed and Senator Fowler, 3032; labour members, reflection on; people from British Isles, 3033
Building materials, prices, 2165
Canada's participation in war, 1534
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2412-15, 2427
Canadian Forestry Association grant, 3409
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Advance, 3825
Disposal of, 3385
Grain trade, 4234
Canadian National Railways branch lines bill, 4315
Canadian National Safety League grant, 3958
Canadian ports, use by United States fishermen, 3361
Canoe wharf, 1005
Cariboo wharves, 1005
Chinese immigration bill, 2309-27
Coal
Freight rates, Mines and Minerals Com. 4514
Hudson's Hope, possibilities, 3198, 3202
Conscription of fire fighters, 3409
Distressed seamen, relief, 3332
Easter adjournment, 1162
Exhibitions, 1467
Experimental farms, 475
Export Act Amdt. bill, pulpwood, 4352
False Creek bridge, 3376
Fishways, 3363
Forest protection, 3409
Fruit industry
Alleged combine, 2616
British Columbia, in, 147
Fuel supply, 3202
Grazing inspectors, appointments, 3254
Harbours and rivers, British Columbia, 1005
Hemp bounty bill, 3913, 4388
Hindu immigrants, franchise, 4641, 4648
Hudson's Hope, coal possibilities, 3198, 3202
Immigration
Chinese, 2309-27
Estimates, 1446

McBride, Mr. T. C.—*Con.*
Immigration—*Con.*
Chinese—*Con.*
Exclusion of, 2327
Schools, 2326
South Africa, 2327
Hindu 1128
Franchise, 4641, 4648
Literature, 1433
Oriental, 511
Policy, 1432
Imperial Conference, 4641, 4648-60
Indians, 2152
Kamloops-Okanagan railway, 4315
Kamloops public building, 1006
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4234
Magazines and periodicals, M. (Mr. Hocken) 848
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2199
Navigation schools, 3331
Oleomargarine, Agriculture Com. discussion, 3267
Ore-testing plants, 2507
Peace river district
Immigration, 1433
Railway construction, 1433, 4698
Peat, comparative value of, 3202
Penitentiaries, 771
Point Grey sand head leases, 3671
Powell River Paper Company, 2895
Prince George-Peace River railway, 1434, 4701
Public Works Act, tender and contract, 952
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4352
Railway rates
Equalization of, M. (Mr. Clark) 1926
Grades, etc. qu. 625
Renovated butter, 4263
Rural depopulation, 1432
Rural mail carriers, remuneration, 1789
Salmon Arm wharf, 1006
Settlers' relief, 3447
Steamship services, 2171
Taxation, building materials, prices and, 2165
Telegraph lines, revenue, 3946
Trent valley canal, qu. 4301
Western provinces, conditions, 1252
Winter trips to California, 1252

McConica, Mr. T. H. (Battleford)
Address in reply, 166. The late Mr. Stewart; condition of the West, 166; wheat prices; amendments of Messrs. Hoey and Shaw 167; economy everywhere necessary, 168
Canadian National Railways
Branch lines construction bill, 4201
Paris offices, 3700

McConica, Mr. T. H.—*Con.*
Congratulations upon return to House, 1660
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3531
Wheat Board, correspondence, 626

McCraney, Mr. George E., Hudson Bay railway, 1064

McDonald, Mr. Angus (Timiskaming)
Haileybury public building, 4615
Unemployment, 1125

McGiverin, Mr. Harold B. (Ottawa)
Buffalo and Fort Erie Bridge Company, 1835
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 378
Government workkshops Ottawa, 4620
Private Bills Committee
Reports
First, 936
Fourth, 2204
Fifth, 2417
Sixth, 2837
Seventh, 3323
Eighth, 3887
Tenth, 4391
Suspension of rules, 4248, 4308

McInnes, Mr., resources of Hudson bay region, 1072

McIsaac, Mr. C. F. (Antigonish and Guysborough)
Canadian National Railways branch lines bill, 4317
Half Island cove, 4572
Sonora wharf, 4585
Sunny Brae-Guysborough railway, 4317

McKenna, Mr. J. A. J., Hudson bay route, 1063

McKenzie, Hon. D. D. (Cape Breton North and Victoria; Solicitor General)
Appointment to Bench, 1763, 1810
Canada Temperence Act, 574, 767
Correspondence with British Columbia, 1032
Chimney Corner wharf, 942
Fuel supply, 800
M. (Mr. Church) 1273, 1283
Naturalization Act, M. (Mr. Carroll) 1382
Nova Scotia coal, 800, 1273
Reported statement in Halifax, 147
Resignation, 1763, 2392

McKillop, Mr. Hugh C. (West Elgin)
Budget, 2981. Congratulations to Finance Minister; tariff on sugar and clothing; Liberal pre-election promises; tariff changes not very encouraging; by-election results; handwriting on the wall; duty on exports and imports of beans, 2981; production of beans in Canada; competition with Austria and Japan; Japanese wages for labourers; prices of beans to consumer; conditions of workingmen; fair wage officer; satisfied labour a bulwark against Bolshevism; country needs strong national policy 2982
Civil Service
Appointments, 1922, 3324
Returned soldiers, 386
Grain dockage, qu. 4300

McKillop, Mr. Hugh C.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*

McLachlan, Mr. J. B. *See* British Empire Steel Corporation

McLean, Kennedy and Company, ocean rates, 2127

McLennan, Professor
Helium 703
Scientific discoveries, 1287

McMaster, Mr. Andrew R. (Brome)
Acoustics, "bedside" manner of speaking, 2446
Address in reply, 172. The amendments; view of Minister of Finance, 172; amendments sanctioned by best modern constitutional practice, 173; necessity for a downward revision of tariff, 174
Agricultural conditions, 1858
Special committee on
Leave to report, 911
Reports
First, 911
Second, 986
Third, 1136, 1209
Fourth, 2127
Fifth, sixth and seventh, 4007, 4075
M. to concur in, 4295, 4363
Tariff Commission evidence, 2296
Agriculture, economic organization, 1858
Alpine Club grant, 3954
Attitude towards tariff policy, 3055
Audibility of debate, 3327
British Empire exhibition, 3949
Budget, 3012. Speech of leader of Opposition; reference to Mr. Sinclair; Great Britain and debt reduction; free trade; Mr. Lloyd George, statement by; 3002; United States tariff; reciprocity; permanency of arrangement;

McMaster, Mr. Andrew R.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
treaty of 1854; trade relations and national spirit; defeat of reciprocity agreement of 1911; proposed remedy for unsatisfactory economic conditions —protection and high taxes; Liberal party, attitude towards tariff; a mere "attitude of mind" not sufficient, 3013; to vote for amendment of Mr. Forke and against budget; to sit on cross benches; justification of action; Liberal principles; "need of retrenchment and reform"; "free trade, peace, good will amongst the nations"; "trust in the people"; Mr. Lloyd George's definition, "fair play for the under dog;" absurdities of protectionist principles; language of Liberal statesmen; election of 1896; Liberal budget of 1897; British preference and reciprocity; advances to Washington; reciprocity campaign of 1911, 3014; flag-flapping; racial cries and appeals to sentiment; "No truck or trade with the Yankees"; Sir Wilfrid Laurier; conscription issue; protectionist budget with strong Maritime flavour; amendment, 3015; claims for protection; reciprocity clause; revenue, methods of raising; tax on unearned increment of land; reciprocity negotiations; standing offers on Canadian and United States statute books; questions of permanence, 3016; United States offer of reciprocity in boots, leather and agricultural implements; ups and downs of the budget; raisins and dried currants, duty; artificial silk duty; hemp and copper bounties, 3017; protection governing principle of budget; not much difference between Liberals and Conservatives on tariff; prices of agricultural and manufactured products; protection a dismal failure; National Policy, anti-national and anti-social; Edmund Burke on function of parliament, 3018; repudiation of Liberal platform of 1919; attitude of Mr. Maclean (Halifax) and Mr. Euler; framing of tariff plank; the platform quoted, 3019; claim of Minister of Finance that he is not bound by platform; acceptance of nomination for leadership; amendments moved by Mr. Fielding in 1920 and 1921, 3020; budget repudiation of utterances of Finance Minister integrity of public life and maintenance of parliamentary institutions; reasons for undertaking an "unpleasant task"; relationship between member and constituent; Edmund Burke, 3201; not leaving party but refusing to support budget, 3022
Speech, comment on, 3026, 3029, 3043, 3050, 4393
Canada Highways bill, 2340
Canadian National Railways branch lines bill, 4306
Canadian National Safety League, 3953
Combines bill, 2581, 2660-69
Application for investigation restricted, 2617
Civil Service appointments, 2662
Commissioner of Taxation, salary, 3949
Copper bounties, 3017
Bill, amdt., advances to be repayable, 4369
Cross benches, 3014
Deep sea fisheries, development, 3366
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 2349
Experimental farms, 471
Export Act Amdt. bill, pulpwood, 4333
Free trade, 3002
Agriculture and, 1858
French treaty bill, 454
Favoured nation, 2210
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 340
Grain inquiry, royal commission, 1209, 1212
Hemp bounties, 3017
Bill, amdt., advances repayable, 4376
Immigration, undesirable classes, 2669
Liberal platform of 1919, 3019, 4393
Magazines and periodicals, M. (Mr. Hocken) 853
Manitoba Court of Appeal decision, 1212
Maple products industry, 1810
Marriage with deceased husband's brother, bill, 1256, 1836
Moose Jaw election, point of order, 1714
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2453
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3533
Parliament buildings, 1718
Commons galleries, members, 1729
Patents of Invention bill, 2069-78, 2083, 2097
Appeal to Exchequer Court, 2080
New or amended patents, 2082
Points of order
Members coaching each other, 405
Moose Jaw election, 1714
Relevancy, 2663

McMaster, Mr. Andrew R.—*Con.*
Proportional representation, M. (Mr. Good) 403, 430
Protection, combines and, 2581
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4393
Purchasing commission, 3951
Purchasing power, depreciation in Europe, 1859
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 728
Res. in 1919, free food and implements, vote on, 2996
Rural depopulation, 1860
Shipping combine, 2583
Sinclair, Hon. J. E., reference to, 3012
Tariff. *See also under this title,* Budget
Commission, evidence, 2296
Duties, pyramiding, 2998
High, revolt against, 1859
Policy, attitude on, 3067, 3013
Proposals, vote against, 3022, 3081
Trent canal, Young's Point dam, qu. 1363
Victorian Order of Nurses, grant, 3954

McMurray, Mr. E. J. (North Winnipeg)
Binder twine, 4376
Educational opportunities, foreigners and, 1885
Government printing, Winnipeg, 3144, qu. 3323
Hemp bounty bill, 4376
Immigration
Hebridean immigrants, treatment, 3587
Policy, 1880
Immigration Act Amdt bill, 2429
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4231, 4277
Lake of the Woods Regulation bill, 4168
Municipal and provincial extravagance, 1890
Natural resources, 1880-1
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2463
Judges, 2463
Secretary of State, administration, 2463
Proportional representation, M. (Mr. Good) 404
Railway problems, 1880
Shipping combines, 4277
Soldier settlers, fire insurance, 496
Taxation, burden of, 1880
Unemployment in Winnipeg, 435
Unrest, alleged, in western provinces, 4514
Winnipeg coal purchases, 496

McNeill, Paul. *See* British Empire Steel Corporation

McQuarrie, Mr. William G. (New Westminster)
Anglo-Japanese treaty, 1453
Appeals from convictions bill, 4250
Bamfield public building, 1024
Bankruptcy Act, M. (Mr. Casgrain) 1505, 1525

McQuarrie, Mr. William G.—*Con.*
Bribery charge, Revelstoke and Nelson electors, 2941
British Columbia
Fishing licenses, 1553
Liquor legislation. *See under this title,* Liquor
Orientals and fishing industry, 1899
Canada Highways bill, 2341
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill, 3971
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2284, 2404-17, 2428. *See also under this title,* Liquor
Amdt., 2415, neg. 2428
Canadian Press Limited, bill, 1464
Chinese immigration bill, 2308-22
Merchants, amdt., 2320
Trade, 2320
Civil Service
Appointments, 372-3
Number in, 3264
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 370
Coast Range Steel Company, 2508
Downie, Mr. Donald, 777
Forest protection, M. (Mr. Michaud) 823
Fraser river improvements, 1003
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth), 316
Health department, returned soldiers, 2171
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1324
Oriental, 1307, 1893
Child, 1453
Chinese, 1446, 2308-22
Assimilation of, 2321
Consul General for China, propaganda, 1896
Labourers, 2310
Merchants, admission of, 1445, 2320
Regulations, evasion, 1445
Statistics, 1445
Students, 2319
Treaty with, 1448
Disallowance of British Columbia legislation, 1261
Exclusion, demand for, 503
Hindu, franchise, 508
Japanese
Alleged rights as British subjects, 1899
Correspondence with Consul-General, 1894
Escape from immigration sheds, Vancouver, 1447
Fishermen, 1899
Lemieux agreement, 1447, 1894
Petition against further immigration and naturalization, 2837, 2885, 4075

McQuarrie, Mr. William G.—*Con.*
Immigration—*Con.*
Oriental—*Con*
Stowaways on freighter, 859, 1448
Naturalization, 1453, 1899
Immigration Act Amdt. bill (Mr. Neill) 503
Japanese trade, 1453
Lack of confidence, M. (Mr. Irvine) 211
Liquor. *See also under this title,* Canada Temperance
British Columbia law
Administration, 2412, 2428
Bootlegging, 2414
New Westminster, sale of liquor, 2415
Ottawa Citizen editorial, 2412
Warehouse licenses, qu. 1974
Marine biological board of Canada, 3372
Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. bill, 2118
Naturalization. *See also under this title,* Immigration
Correspondence with Vancouver county court judges, 2199
Japanese, 1899
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2183, 2199, 2465
Oil companies, stock selling, 781
Orientals. *See also under this title,* Immigration, Oriental
Business competition, 1902
Propaganda in United States, 1896
Pacific highway, 2341
Parliament buildings, members' rooms
Allocation, 1729
Lighting, 1728
Pensioners, unemployed, relief, 2169
Petroleum bounties, 781
Proportional representation, M. (Mr. Good) 400
Provincial employment offices, 2169
Redistribution, Mr. W. M. Ivel, employment, 733
Returned soldiers
Health department, 2171
Unemployment, 2169
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, legal adviser, 777
Sales tax, M. (Mr. Stevens) 925
Salmon fisheries, British Columbia, 1553
Secret agreement, 1448
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, qu. 3137

McRae, General. *See* Canada Colonization Association

McTaggart, Mr. Neil H. (Maple Creek)
Agricultural conditions in West, 1352
Dominion lands, alienation of, 1353
Homestead pre-emption and purchase, qu. 1030, 1032, 4202

McTaggart, Mr. Neil H.—*Con.*
Immigration policy, 1352
Livestock agents, qu. 1156
School lands, 1032
Unpaid balance of purchase price, 4204

Machinery. *See also* Agricultural Implements; Customs Tariff Items; Prices
For manufacture of fertilizers. *See* Customs Tariff Items
French treaty, 1981, 1988

Magazines and Periodicals. *See also* Press
Canadian
Competition, 1418
Encouragement of, M. (Mr. Hocken) 826
Postage, 4436, 4528
Sales tax, 4415, 4421

Magdalen Islands
Hydrographic survey, 3336
Pointe à Elie wharf, 974
Pointe Shea (Amherst) wharf, 977
Steamship service, 2174

Magna Charta. *See* Immigration Act Amdt.

Magrath, Mr. C. A., Fuel supply, 799

Mail Carriers. *See* Post Office

Mail Catalogue Prices. *See* Bancroft; Prices

Mail Subsidies. *See* Steamship Services

Main Estimates. *See* Estimates

Maine, state of, railway construction, 2902

Majority Government. *See* Lack of Confidence, M. (Mr. Irvine)

Majority Rule. *See* Proportional Representation

Malbaie, Que. wharf, 968

Malcolm, Mr. James (North Bruce)
British preference, cotton goods, 3466
Civil Service Act, special committee
Order of reference, 1256
Reports
First, 1136, 1256
Second, 4592-3
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 762
Redistribution bill, 572
Textile industry, 3466

Malcolm Island, Finnish settlement, 1247

Malone, late Lieut. Col. W. P., qu. 206

Management, Charges of. *See* Finance

Manila Fibre. *See also* Bounties; Hemp
Bounties, 4369
Rope, oil used for, drawback, 3502

Manion, Hon. Robert J. (Fort William and Rainy River)
Adjournment, time of, 2694
Agriculture, votes for, 3237
Automobile insurance, 3148
Banting, Dr. F. G., 4439
Budget, 2746. Congratulations to Finance Minister; speech of Mr. Raymond; conditions serious; emigration to the United States; causes; high taxation; railway deficits; small and scattered population; sectional interests and problems; depression, causes of, 2747; prices of manufactured articles and agricultural products; Europe, chaotic condition of; production costs; France, occupation of the Ruhr; world conditions; United States tariff against Canadian products; grain, exports of; home market; lower production; grain, exports of; home market; lower production costs; interprovincial trade; immigration, 2748; European immigrants, assimilation of; taxation, reduction of; Great Britain, retrenchment and tax reduction; sugar duties; national debt; stumping machines, lowering of duties on, 2749; boots for cripples; sales tax; contracts affected; too much pessimism; wheat export; gold output; coal deposits; silver production; cobalt; nickel; asbestos; water powers; pulp, paper and forest products; fertile lands; fisheries; iron ore; vigorous and virile people; causes for optimism; agricultural conditions; farm mortgages; farm credits; United States and protection; claim that United States is a free trade country; high duties imposed by United States; industrial development of United States, 2751; free trade, advocacy of in western Canada; protection and war; trade competition between Great Britain and Germany; Great Britain and protection, 2752; tariff as it affects East and West; world opinion favourable to protection; free raw materials, 2753; agricultural implements; tariff, periodical revision; advisory tariff commission; tariff revenue in Great Britain; taxation on necessaries of life; free trade and unemployment; poverty and pauperism in Great Britain, 2754; British agriculture under

Manion, Hon. Robert J.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
free trade; Lloyd George, statement of; Liberal tariff policy; National Policy tariff; stability; amdt. of Mr. Forke, 2755
Building materials, prices, 2164
Canadian Air Force
Camp Borden, 1775
Hospital, 1775
Forestry protection, 1776
Canadian National Railways
Branch lines construction bill, 4310
Long Lake branch, 4310
Paris offices, 3631
Cattle embargo, removal of, 3293
Civil Service
Appointments and promotions, 330
Commission, exemptions from jurisdiction qu. 278
"Lady who rides to work in automobile", 1772
Returned soldiers, 1792
Cloud Bay wharf, 982
Combines bill, 2542
Copper bounty bill, 3237
Copyright Act Amdt bill, 2287, 3154
Song writers, 2287
Divorce proceedings, publicity, 2054
Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 2034
Elevators. *See under this title,* Grain
Emigration to United States, 1113
Empire Settlement scheme, 288
Export Act Amdt. bill, pulpwood, 3413, 4347
France, occupation of the Ruhr, 2748
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 320, 329
Grain and grain trade
Elevators
Leases qu. 4132
Screenings, 2039
Inquiry by Grain Commission, 2254
Sale of, qu. 1633
Unscalped or uncleaned, qu. 1739
Grain commission, 2036, 2254
Grain shipments, 3769, 3789
Injustices to western farmers, 1114
Marketing, M. (Mr. Millar), 295
Port Colborne, qu. 1209
Shipments, 3769, 3789
Great Britain, to qu. 1867
Health department, salaries, 2170
Hebridean immigrants, treatment of, 3597
Icebreaking, Thunder Bay, 3359
Immigration
Great Britain, from, 1105
Northern Ontario, 1097, 1112
Policy, 1110-1115

Manion, Hon. Robert J.—*Con.*
Immigration—*Con.*
Western Canada, conditions in, 1112
Indians
Agent, Mr. J. Garry Burke, 2151
Education, 2164
Northern Ontario, 2151
Preservation of, 2151-2
Tuberculosis, 2152
Insurance Act Amdt. bill, 3148
Labour
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1702
Strikes, 1702
Land and cable telegraph lines, 2683
Legislation
Estimates, 2691
Too much, 2543
"Uplift," 2054
Lighthouses, date of closing, 3356
Magazines and periodicals, M. (Mr. Hocken) 840
Militia Pension Act Amdt. bill, 2053
Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. bill, 2114, 2116
Home-brew, conviction, 2121
National Defence
Dominion arsenal, Quebec, bonus, 1772
Expenditure, 3238
Nova Scotia strike, use of troops, 896
Orders in council passed, 1921-1922, qu. 1488
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3853-86
Amdt, 3886, agreed to, 3886
Pensions
European War and active militia, 2166, 3707, 3713
Pension Act, suggested amendment, 2166
Pension Commissioners, salaries, 3742
Royal commission
Findings, action, 2639, 3400
Interim report, 2166
Unemployed pensioners, relief, 2168
Pilotage, administration of, 3358
Port Arthur and Fort William harbours, 2675
Progressive members and protection, 3237
Proportional representation, 431
Public Works, salaries, 2684
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 3413, 4347
Reciprocity, offer to negotiate, 3474
Returned Soldiers Insurance bill, 3744, 3892
Returned soldiers in civil service, 1772
St. Lawrence river waterway, 3769
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment bill, 3747
Soldier settlement, 2020, 2027, 2028
Tariff
Advisory tariff commission 2754
Agricultural implements, 2750, 2754
Telegraph and telephone lines, 2683
Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner) 1293

Manion, Hon. Robert J.—*Con.*
Trade
Commissioners, 1837
Manufactured goods, exports, 1839
Trade and Commerce, estimates, 2031
United States tariff, 1113, 1119, 2751
Vimy Ridge memorial, 183
Wages, building trades, 2165
War medals, 1744
Welland canal construction, 3769

Manitoba. *See also* Western Provinces
Agricultural and economic conditions, 1213, 1220, 1404, 1462, 1906, 2766
Bank Act revision, 4016, 4041, 4045
Bracken, Premier, statement on immigration, 1123
Canada Colonization Association, 1877
Change of government, 2799, 2810
Coal supply, 1265
Court of Appeal
Grain Inquiry Commission, decision, 1210
Trueman, Mr. W. N., K.C., appointment, 1868
Dairying industry, production in 1921, 2744
Dominion forest reserves and parks, 2060
Dredging, 1012
Experimental farms, 459
Freight rates, 1931, 1932
Manitoba-Canadian Northern agreement, 1939
Grand Jury system abolition of, 2695, 3272
Harbours and rivers, 993, 4589
Hemp production, 2780
Highways, 3184. *See* Canada Highways bill; Highways
Illicit stills, prosecution for operating, 3280
Income tax, 2859
Indians, 2145, 2153
Institutions and services in excess of present needs, 1214, 1400, 1890
Lake of the Woods bill, 2885
McLeod, Hon. G. L., help for needy farmers, 1404
Manitoba Pulp and Paper Company lease, 3254
Mixed farming, 2772, 2773
Natural resources. *See also* Lake of the woods Regulation bill
Cost of administration, 2782
Political patronage, 3348
Prohibition referendum, 2414
Public buildings, 4628
Radio-telegraph service, 2285, 2468, 3338
Reclamation of land, 1065
Sessional indemnity, reduction, 1156

Manitoba—*Con.*
Taxation
Agricultural products, 1404
Production and, 1391
Tax sales 2961
Unpaid taxes, 1251
Telephone system, 2285
Unemployment relief, discontinuance, 1658
United Farmers of Manitoba, 1404, 1462
Water powers. *See* Lake of the Woods Regulation bill
Wheat board, 2836

Manitoba Free Press, Sir Clifford Sifton and, 3043

Manna. *See* Dairying Industry

Manson, Hon. A. M., Attorney-General, British Columbia
Asiatic immigration 1901
Liquor legislation. *See* Canada Temperance Act

Manton, Judge, immigration, 1234, 1237

Manufactured Goods. *See also* Agricultural Implements; Industries; Textiles
Binder twine discrimination against, 2964
Export, 1838. *See also* Imports and Exports
Prices 1167, 2748. *See also* Prices
Spread between producer and consumer, 2713

Manufacturers. *See also* Canadian Manufacturers Association
Difficulties, 2854
Employers' liability compensation, 691
Farmers and, 2716
Free trade in raw materials, 2858
Japan, competition from, 2861
Licensed, 4410. *See also* Special War Revenue bill
Markets, lack of, 2856
Not able to compete, 3062
Ontario and Quebec, 2910
Orient competition from, 2861
Profit, 2854
Sales tax and. *See* Special War Revenue
Securities of manufacturing companies, 2720
Understanding between and people of East, 3023
United States
Competition from, 2861
Markets, 2856

Maple Products industry, 1810

Maps. *See* Interior, Surveys

Mara, B.C., post office, qu. 1489, qu. 1739

Marchand, Mr. J. O. *See* Parliament Buildings, Architects

Marcil Hon. Charles (Bonaventure)
Business of the House
Debates, official report, returns, 940
Private members' day 1160
Questions right to put on orders of day, 734
Canadian National Railways branch lines bill, 4186, 4307
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 542, 553
Export Act Amdt. bill, 4345
Gaspe and Bonaventure forest fires, 4010
Gaspe peninsula, railway facilities, 4186, 4307
Grondines wharf, 967
Hudson Bay railway, 1041
Japanese immigration, Lemieux agreement, 1448
La Societie des Artisans Canadians Francais, 1028
Magazines and periodicals, M. (Mr. Hocken) 843
National gallery 1018
Oleomargarine M. (Mr. Carroll) 3535
Petition of right, fiats, 3223
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4345
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 742
Rulings as Chairman
Amdt. not relevant, 3667
Debates, official report, statements not read, 1830
General argument on particular clause, 4069
Governor General acknowledgment of address, 1256
Member may not reflect on vote of committee 4119
M. that committee rise not debatable, 1836
M. to postpone resolution in supply, 3667
Newspaper article reflecting on proceedings, 4126
Reference to com. in advance of report, 2970
Reflection on sincerity and integrity of members, 4067
Rule 17B, closure, 3667
Supply, relevancy, 808, 871, 1847, 1858, 1861, 4336
Ste. Anne des Monts pier, 979
St. John and Quebec railway bill, 3404
Special delivery letter postage, 1872
Toronto viaduct, 4307

Marcouiller, Mr. C., St. Barnabé Nord postmaster, 1830

Margaree River Fisheries. *See* Fish and Fisheries
Margaretville, N.S. harbour, 4581
Marine and Fisheries. *See also* Canada Shipping Acts Amdt; Canadian Government Merchant Marine; Fish and Fisheries; Naval Service; Shipping and Shipbuilding; Vessels
Agencies, rents and contingencies, 3351
Alaskan, wreck of, 1212, 1659, qu. 1763 3160, 3330
Annual report presented, 1080
Belleville harbour commissioners, dismissal, qu. 490
Biological board, 3371
Building fishways and clearing rivers, 3362
Committee reports
First, 1307, 1384
Second, 1686, 1763
Third, 2983, 3084
Department
Estimates, 2610, 3160, 3330
Expenditure by provinces, statement, 3888
Johnston, Mr. Alex, deputy minister, 3373, 3671, 4667
Publicity, 3364
Salaries and contingencies, 3373, 3375
Distressed seamen, relief of, 3332
Dredging
Dredge No. 12, qu. 1487
St. Lawrence ship channel, 3339
Unification of work, 3341
Examination of masters and mates, 2610
False Creek bridge, 3375
Halibut Fishery treaty. See Treaties
Hopper barge, self-propelling, 3350
Hydrographic survey, 3336
Icebreakers, 3160
Ice obstruction in Cabot strait, 2614
Mikula, qu. 1384, 2614, 3160
Murray Stewart, 3354, 3359
Thunder bay, etc., 3359
Inspection
Boats over 100 tons register, 1660
Live stock shipments, 3334
Steamboats, 3360
Institutions assisting sailors, 701
Life-saving service, 3335
Appliances, 3171
British Columbia, 1659
Long Point, lake Erie, 3335
Rewards, 3335
Lights and lightkeepers
Boudrot, Mr. E., Green island, qu. 2613
Classification, 3352
Conley, Mr. James, dismissal, qu. 4183
Descheneaux, Mr. Patrick, dismissal, qu. 4512
Marine and Fisheries—*Con.*
Lights and lightkeepers—*Con.*
Lambton, loss of, qu. 812, 3354
Leblanc, Louis, qu. 285
Lighthouses, maintenance and repairs, 3353
Reliance, wreck of, qu. 812
Richibucto cape, 3353
Salaries and allowances, 3351
Marine hospitals, 701, 2167
Marine signal service, 3358
Meterological service, 3360
Murray Stewart, steamer, purchase, qu. 203, qu. 386, 3354, 3359
Navigation
Bay of Fundy, 2615
Closing of, date, 3356
Construction of lights and aids to, 3357
Detroit river, traffic regulation, 3357
Obstructions, Seymour Narrows, 3333
Safeguards, lake Superior, qu. 812
Schools, 3331
Wireless telegraphy, 1046
Ocean and river service, 2610, 3375
Distressed seamen, relief of, 3375
Investigation into wrecks, 3160
Alaskan, wreck of, qu. 1763, 3160, 3330
Maintenance and repairs to steamers, 3160
Patrol of northern waters, 3360
Pilotage. *See also* Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bills
Administration, 3358
Pensions to pilots, 3359
Pilot boats, 3358
Eureka, qu. 1364
Father Point, 3358
Radiotelegraph service, 3337, 3374
St. Lawrence river ship channel, 3339
Dredging and maintenance, 3375
Sawdust pollution of streams, 3362
Sorel shipyard, 3343
Tidal and current survey, 3338
Trout-fishing season, 1686
Unforeseen expenses, 3334
Wireless equipment for vessels, 3356
Wrecking plants 3334
Wrecks, Alaskan. *See under this title,* Alaskan

Marine Hospitals. *See* Health; Marine and Fisheries

Maritime Provinces. *See also* New Brunswick; Nova Scotia; Prince Edward Island
Bank centralization, 4079
Boards of trade, conference with Sir Henry Thornton, 1755, 1771

Maritime Provinces—*Con.*
Canadian National Railways, 1764, 1770. *See also that title*
Coal. *See that title*
Conditions in, 1207, 2763, 2936
Dredging 1009, 4590
Freight rates, 1963, 3192. *See also that title*
Coal from, 1272, 1813
Grievances, 3056
Immigration, 1086, 1131, 1198, 1236. *See also that title*
Natural markets, loss at confederation, 2852
Natural resources, 2972
Needs of, 3000
Public buildings, 1022, 4614
Secession talk 1757, 2940. *See also* Secession
Roberts, Hon. W. F. reported statement, 3145
Senate elective or nominative, 1376
Shale deposits, 2513

Markets. *See also* Address; Agriculture; Budget; Grain and Grain Trade; Industries; Live Stock; Manufacturers; Prices; Reciprocity Trade; Treaties
Access to, 2937
Agricultural products, 2731, 2861, 2910
Great Britain, 2869. *See also that title*
United States 2869. *See also that title*
Bacon, 2864
Beans, 2982
Cattle, 2871
Competition for, 2725
Dairy products, 2863
Development of, 2869
Disorganized, 2861
Export, 2869
Fish, 2906, 2946, 3002
Foreign, 4054
Fruit, 463
Hogs, 2864
Home, 2869
Industries and, 2975
Horses, 590
Live stock 588. *See also that title*
South America, 594
Manufactured products, 2910
Maritime provinces, 2852
Marketing and quality, 2862, 3066, 4027
Production exceeding demand, 2957
Purchasing power, 637
United States. *See also that title*
Fish, 2946
Wheat, 3068. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade

Marketing of Grain. *See* Grain

Markham, Violet. *See* Carruthers, Mrs. James

Marking Act. *See* Customs and Excise; Imports

Marking of Woollen Goods. *See* Wool

Marler, Mr. Herbert (St. Lawrence-St. George)
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4121
Budget, 3022. Congratulations to Finance Minister; speech of leader of Opposition, able but lacking in generosity; Sir Henry Drayton, amendment; position of Progressive party; difficult country to govern; understanding between manufacturers and people of West; agricultural and business conditions, 3023; difficulties universal; lower freight rates; loss of purchasing power, inflation; rural credits; demand for lower tariffs; free trade "a splendid theory"; revenue; not a protectionist but a development tariff; without moderate tariff industries would close, 3024; prices, Canada and United States; revenue and tariff, 3025; income tax; tax on unearned incomes; inheritance tax; excise duties, 3026; natural resources, development of; capital and people necessary; taxation direct and indirect; expenditure and economy; civil government costing too much; ratio of employees to population, 3027; deficit; spend only what we have to spend; tariff stability; tariff committee; permanent advisory tariff commission, 3028; production costs; distribution; spread between manufacturer and consumer; speech of Mr. McMaster, "chasing a rainbow"; free trade impossible, 3029; rejection of Sir Wilfrid Laurier's tariff policy; result of government defeat; Wheat board a protective measure, 3030
Cabot strait, ice obstruction, 2614
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 3836
Canadian National Railways, debenture holders, 3507
Canadian National Safety League, 3954
Canadian Pacific Railway dividends, 1203
Civil Service Commission, 1800
Combines bill, 2536, 2615-21
Definition "combine" 2615
Registrar, inquiry, 2619
Dominion Textile Company, profits, 3464
Emigration to the United States, 1128, 1392

Marler, Mr. Herbert—*Con.*
English and French speaking people, 1341
Firebrick, duty, 3482
Freight rates
Crowsnest pass agreement, 1948
Railway rates equalization, M. (Mr. Clark), 1947
Girl Guides, grant, 3954
Government publications, waste, 1713
Hospital supplies, coverings, duties, 3501
Immigration, 1391
Attitude of the West, 1129
Restrictions upon, 1128
Income tax, 3026
Proposed amendment, 4503
Unearned income, 2882, 3026
Income War Tax Act Amdt. bill, 4492, 4500
Labour, employment for all willing to work, 1124
McMaster, Mr., speech on budget, 3026, 3029
Montreal, postal appointments, 1800
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3848-82
Amdt. 3881, neg. 3882
Pension Commissioners, duties, 685
Soldier Settlement board, 1126, 1128
Taxation, increase of, 1121
Victorian Order of Nurses, grant, 3954
X-Ray plates, coverings, duties, 3501

Marriage
Publication of evidence, 1971
Settlements. *See* Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill

Marriage with deceased husband's brother, Bill respecting, 1r., 1256; 2r., 1836; com., 3r., 1837

Married Woman, rights of. *See* Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill

Marriott, Professor, England since Waterloo, 1231

Marshall, Mr. Duncan, 70, 286, qu. 384
Agricultural instruction grant, 608, 3293
Appointment as Commissioner of Agriculture, 2615, 2710, 3043, 3150, 3303, 3320
Order in council, 3294, 3320, 3303
British Empire exhibition, 4704
Cattle embargo, removal of, 2614, 2871, 3041, 3293
Fordney tariff, 3293
Inspection of live stock shipments, 3334
Qualifications, 3306
Redistribution, 3313
Reports, 3705
Salary, 608, 3043, 3287, 3309, 3352

Marshall—*Con.*
Speeches, 2615
Great Britain, 3595
South Oxford Liberals, 594, 3292, 3309, 3316
Stornoway, 2181
Trips
Great Britain, 3290, 3308, 4675
Florida, 3307, 3311
South America, qu. 1031

Martell, Mr. L. H. (Hants)
Address in reply, 101. Congratulations to mover and seconder, 101-102; deceased members; the Maritime provinces and representation, 102; government ownership of railways; Sir Henry Thornton and Canadian National Railways; development of Canadian ports, 103; Minister of Justice, 104; Hants county; Mr. Shaw and Progressives; Near East crisis, 105
Agricultural produce marketing agent, 4676
Alaskan, wreck of, 3164
Alpine Club of Canada, 3444
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3099, 3126, 3220
Bay of Fundy, icebreaker, 2615
Boyer, Dr., appointment, qu. 2418
British Columbia
Fisheries Commission, 3372
Fishing licenses, 1548, 1554
British common law, 2894
Budget, 2904. Liberal tariff platform, 2904; tariff for revenue; railway deficit and direct taxation; public ownership and low tariff; relations with United States; reciprocity; printing industry and United States market, 2905; Fordney tariff; markets; fish, 2906; reciprocity agreement of 1911; negotiations with President of the United States; the weapon in our hands; Treaty of 1818; use of Canadian ports by United States fishing vessels; license system, 2906; trans-shipment of catch; shipment in bond; suggested denial of privilege; bounties preferable to tariff increase; reasons for supporting budget; revenue requirements; revision downward; British preferance; elected to support Liberal party, 2907
Business of the House, Saturday sittings, 2694, 3452
Business profits tax, 4490
Calder Act, 2926
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 3818

Martell, Mr. L. H.—*Con.*
Canadian National parks and historic sites, 3406
Canadian National Railways, branch lines bill, 4333
Canadian Press Limited bill, 1464
Cattle shipments to Great Britain, 3291
Carvell, Hon. F. B., alleged statement of Mr. Motherwell, 3189
Civil service
Commission, ministers and, 371
Technical and professional officials, 815
Civil Service Act, M (Mr. Power) 525, 545, 546
Clementsport postmaster, 1798
Coal, duty, 3499
Cold Storage Act Amdt. bill, 273, 2056, 2086
Incorporated companies, 2058
Private enterprises, 2059
Constituents, interests of, 3550
Dairy industry, protection, 3552
Deputy ministers, salary increases, 4667
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 2350
Distressed seamen, relief, 3332
Dredging, Maritime provinces, 1010
English and French, harmony, 1341
Exchequer Court judgeship, 2500
Experimental farms, 461
Fertilizers, nitrate of soda, 2307
Fishways, 3363
Fort Edward, N.S., historic site, 3406, 3432, 3435
Fruit trees, new varieties, 2307
Fruits
Pre-cooling, 2056
Vegetables and, freight rates, 626
Howat and Meyerscough, Messrs, detention, 3157
Hudson Bay railway, 461
Hydrographic survey, 3337
Immigration
Assisted, 1178
Canada Colonization Association, 1175
Chinese, 1445
Hebridean immigrants, treatment of, 3587, 3589
Hindu immigrants, franchise, 4646
Japanese, Lemieux agreement, 1447
Imperial Conference, 4645
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act Amdt. bill, 4360, 4362
Interprovincial trade, 2177
Johnston, Mr. Alex., salary, 4667
Labour, representation in House, 3555
Lack of confidence, M. (Mr. Irvine) 226
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4282, 4290
Liberal party pledges, 3035
Litle Anse, Morrison claim, 4723

Martell, Mr. L. H.—*Con.*
Migratory Birds Convention Act, 3443
Narcotic Drugs Amdt. bill, 2118, 2122
Naturalization Act Amdt. bill, 2185
New departmental building, Ottawa, 4619
Nova Scotia
Historical society, 3406
Secession talk, 2057, 2177
O'Hara, Captain Marshall, salary, 3331
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3516, 3554
Olympic games, Canadian team, 4707
Patents of Invention bill, 2072
Pensions
Appeal board, 683
Old age and mothers, conference, 3046
Pension board, removal, res. 3399
Petition of Right Act Amdt. bill, 3128, 3223, 3224
Playgrounds, children, 3407, 3432
Prince Edward Island car ferry terminals claim, 4679
Privilege—Civil Service Com. report, 4363
Public expenditure, apportionment, 4560
Public Works Act, tender and contract, 954
Pugsley, Hon. William, appointment, 2499
Railway rates, reductions, 118
Representation, irreducible minimum of, qu. 285
Riordan Pulp and Paper Company, 4490
St. John—Windsor steamship service, 2176
Sawdust pollution of rivers, 3364
Schofield, Rev. Dr., 3399
Seed distribution, 2306
Seed testing bill, 2306
Steamship services, Maritime provinces, 2177
Tariff items carried without discussion, 3492
Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner) 1298, 4645
Toronto seed branch building, 4623
Windsor-Chester branch line railway, 4333
Windsor, dredging, 1010

Martello Tower, St. John, 3444

Marvale, wreck of, 3333

Massey Harris Company. *See also* Agricultural implements
President of and free trade, 2911
Settlement of war claims, 2497

Masters and Mates. *See* Canada Shipping Act; Marine and Fisheries

Matane, Que. wharf, 970

Matapedia Bridge, qu. 4184

Maxwell, Mr. C. F., Winnipeg-St. Croix route, 2901

May, Mr. *See* Immigration, Agents

Maybee, Mr. M. E. (Northumberland, Ont.)
Dryden, Mr. W. A., payments to, qu. 3704
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, and, 3705
Government offices, directory of, qu. 2085
Grasshopper pest, 596
Regimental funds, qu. 4010
Seed-cleaning stations, 600
Wool-combing industry, qu. 1973

Mayberry, Col. Thomas R., 286

Meaford, Ont., wharf, 983

Meagher, Mr. N. H. *See* Disallowance

Meats. *See also* Bacon; Cold Storage; Live Stock; Treaties
Canned, inspection, 2202
Chilled and preserved, shipment to Great Britain, 463, 3091, 3291, 4675
Fresh and cured
Exports, 1984
Imports, qu. 617, 2959
Inspection. *See* Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill
Meat products, lard, 1978
Pork products, French treaty, 1984
Preserved in tins, 1978

Mechanics. *See* Labour

Medals. *See* War, Medals

Medical Advisory Board. *See* Pensions

Medical Care. *See* Health; Indians

Medical Course, length of, 2934

Medical Examinations. *See* Returned Soldiers Insurance

Medical Inspections. *See* Health; Immigration; Pensions

Medical Research. *See also* Scientific Research
Banting, Dr. *See that title*
Helium, discoveries by Doctors McLennan and Macallum, 703, 4439
Insulin treatment, discovery of, 703. *See also* Banting
Standardizing and testing laboratories, 703

Medical Students. *See* Universities

Medicine Hat
Customs employees, qu. 3505
Dominion lands office, 3250

Medicines and Drugs. *See also* Health; Narcotic Drugs
"Metagen", analysis of, qu. 1867
Patenting, 703, 2077, 2078
Pharmaceutical preparations, qu. 3261

Medicines and Drugs—*Con.*
Proprietary or patent, 700
Supplies for hospitals. *See* Customs Tariff Items; Hospitals

Mediterranean
Fish from Maritime provinces, 3002
Steamship service, qu. 1488, 1636

Meductic-New Brunswick boundary line, 4309

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur (Leader of the Opposition)
Address in reply, 17. Congratulations to mover and seconder; new leader of Progressive party, 18; delay in co-ordination and amalgamation of Canadian National Railways, 18-19; Grand Trunk not yet amalgamated with Canadian Nationals; railway expenditure without authority of parliament; immigration policy of government, 19; export of grain crop; export of settlers' effect, 20-21; no government policy to check emigration, provide employment or reduce taxation, 21; natural resources of western provinces; the tariff question; customs collections, 22; national debt increased under present administration, 22-23; decrease in respect to soldiers' pensions, increase in sales tax; added burden of taxes; post office revenue and the stamp tax, 23; late government and reorganization of departments, 24; Great Britain paying off a portion of her national debt, 24; conduct of Dominion finances during war years, 24; western Canada and the harvest of 1922; sounder agricultural conditions; Canada anxious for peace and prosperity; Near East crisis, 25; removal of cattle embargo, 25-26; condition of the western farmer; Bank Act revision, 26; redistribution, 27
Alleged understanding, Mr. Shaw's amendment, 987
Admiralty Act Amdt. bill, 2051
Agricultural conditions, 1853
Committee reports, 1209, 4363
Great Britain in, 1861
Leitch, Prof., dairy industry, 1858
Luxuries, demand for, 1856
Agricultural implements duty, 2246, 2990
Reduction by Conservative government, 2756
Speech of 1910, 2848
Agricultural products, distribution, 1857
Agriculture, estimates, 575

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Alien enemy property, claim against United States, 3823
Alpine Club grant, 3415
Ammunition, 887, 1742
Anglo-Japanese treaty, 1449
Annual drill, 863, 4635
Appointments by government, 2502
Artificial silk, duty, 2990, 3489
Arts, literature and science, recognition, 1289
Atlantic fisheries commission, 3084
Attorney General, Ontario vs. Wholesale Grocers, decision, 2051, 2560
Auditor General, vacancy, 3307, 4512
Australia, trade treaty with, 245, 1849, 1850
Banff park, water powers, 3939
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4133-4160
Liberals-Conservatives, alleged union on, 4143
Newspaper articles, Montreal Standard, 4143
Bank Act revision, inquiry, 496
Bank charters, renewal of, 4143
Bank mergers, 4138
Banking and Commerce Com. proceedings, 4143
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3213-14
Banting, Dr. F. G., 4437
Belgium, treaty with, 246
Belle River wharf, 4594
M. to reduce 4600, neg. 4610
Personal explanation, 4638
Binder twine, duty free, 4379
Biological Board Act Amdt. bill, 3974
Blackadder, the late Dr. Edward, 6
Board of Commerce, 2558, 2571
Boots and shoes, free entry to United States, 3499
Breweries and export liquor houses, 1636
British and foreign news service, 4712
British Columbia
Fishing licenses, M. (Mr. Clark) 1546, 1547
Liquor law administration, 2425
British preference, 453
Fifty per cent, 3049
Increase, 3487
Woollen goods, 3460
Brussels postmaster, 1800
Budget, 2984; expressions of good will towards Finance Minister; courtesy and frankness; budget disappointing; omissions from presentation; what a budget should contain; analysis of financial position and trade conditions; budget speeches in Great Britain and Australia; public debt, 2984; additions to; demobilization and war

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
responsibilities; revenues collected during the war; comparison with Great Britain and Australia; taxation of incomes and war profits, 2985; returns for war expenditure; per capita debt; demand for a balanced budget; debt reduction by sale of war material; expenditure, reduction of, 2986; railway obligations; soldiers' civil re-establishment; pensions; soldier settlement; housing; unemployment; expenditure and revenue; tax reductions and debt increases; sugar duty; reduction; refiners' protection not interfered with, 2987; rigid adherence to protective principle; depreciated currency clause; marking clause; orders in council; two favoured industries; lead pencils; lithographic works; dumping clause; tobacco duty, cigarettes, 2988; bootlegging in tobacco; injury to tobacco-manufacturing industry; beet sugar duty; proposals of budget of 1923; British preferential tariff; reasons for changes not apparent; combines and mergers; woollen industry; duty on raisins and currants, 2989; French treaty debate recalled; tariff increase to facilitate negotiations with Australia; artificial silk duty; inconsistency of government; protection principles intact; woollens, tariff reduction and price; farm implements, reduction of duty, 2990; reduction in output and advance in prices; moderate protection; free trade sentiment not making progress; United States competition, 2991; protection cannot be abandoned; reciprocity offer; no change in opinion on question; arguments against reciprocity; geographical considerations; industrial and agricultural competition; organization and production; no guarantee of permanency, 2992; abrogation of the treaty of 1854; termination of recent trade arrangement; trade reprisals, 2993; Liberal platform of 1919, repudiation of; fidelity to political pledges flouted; statements of Mr. Euler, Mr. Stewart (Argenteuil) and Mr. Fielding; responsibility of Minister of Finance for Liberal Convention; Prime Minister and the "chart"; declaration of Prime Minister in 1920, 2994; con-

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
vention of Alberta Liberals; endorsement of Liberal platform, 2995; double-dealing policy; appeal to the farmer, assurance to the business man; stability; apostacy of western ministers; declaration for free food and implements of production, 2996; vote in 1919 on the resolution of Mr. McMaster; new taxation unaccompanied by economy; sales tax; declarations of Prime Minister in 1921, 2987; business profits and luxury taxes; pyramiding of taxes; cost of living, comparison of Canadian and United States prices; whole tax passed on to consumer; exempted articles, 2998; addition of newsprint to list; raw wool; agricultural implements; review of government taxation records; necessities of life; implements of production; luxuries; French treaty; embroideries; boots and shoes; wines and brandies; cost of living, 2999; descending curve succeeded by upward movement; professions of economy; direct taxation and "invisible" tariff; political shilly-shally; government losing ground; heroic policy needed; needs of the West and the Maritime provinces, 3000
Speech,
Comment on, 3047, 3077
Revenue statements omitted, 2860, 2898
Burrard Inlet bridge, 4709
Business of the House, 179
Adjournments
Early, 74
Hour of, 382, 3208, 3261
Bills
Alteration of, 3449
Not printed, proceeding with, 3968, 3976
Business for to-morrow, 3750
Closure, Rule 17B, 1301, qu. 1867, 3667
Committees
Conduct, review by House, 3270
Discussion of questions not referred, 3268
Voting in, 4611
Legislation
Old age pensions, 2518
Pending, 2518, 3265, 3452
Motions
Anticipatory, 3327, 3329
Non-debatable, ruling of Mr. Speaker, 4076
Order of, 4163

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Business of the House—*Con.*
Post office estimates in absence of minister, 1314
Private members' day, 1158, 1161-2
Privilege—Mr. Clark, 1911
Questions
Answers to, 343, 1385
Dropping of, 4511
Passed as orders for returns, 939, 1139, 1385, 4303
Right to put on Orders of the Day, 734
Redistribution bill, motion to refer, 488
Resolutions, explanations on, 3483
Returns, inquiry for, 2208, 2394, 3324, 3962, 4513
Cattle embargo, correspondence, 4295
Rules
Closure, 17B, 1301, qu. 1867, 3667
M. (Mr. Johnston) for special committee, 1301
Supply
Amdt. to amdt. 1301
Motion to postpone, 3667
Procedure, 179
Undiscussed items not appearing in official report of debates, 3285
Canada Colonization Association. *See under this title,* Immigration
Canada Gazette, 1707
Canada Grain Act administration, 4710
Canada Highways bill, 2339
Canada's participation in war, M. (Mr. Power) 1537
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2425
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Advances, 3827, 3830
Construction without tender and contract, 957
Cost per ton, 957
Policy, 3827
Vote under closure, 4598
Canadian National parks and historic sites
Expenditure, 3941
Water powers, 3939
Canadian National Railways
Advances, $13,099,493.34, 1753
Amalgamation, 18, 28, 34, 58, 2471
Economies resulting, 1616
Audit staff, transfer from Moncton, 575
Branch lines construction bill, 3265, 4303-39, 4397, 4689
Expenditure, appropriation of, 4303, 4339, 4397
Amdts. 4337, neg. 4339; 4398, neg. 4401
Finance, 4329, 4337
Rejection by Senate, 4695

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
Canadian Northern, 57, 1615
Acquisition of, 1937
Coal purchases, 4708
United States, 3494
Committee on, 2473
Deficits, 1613
Directors, board of. *See also under this title,* Management
Additional director, Quebec, inquiry, 34
Labour representation of, 1653
Removal of late, correspondence, 3962
Dominion Express Company, 2470
Equipment orders, 2701
Estimates, 1620
Expenditure, 4304
Express and electric lines, 2470
Fixed charges, 1614
Grand Trunk and, 1562
Arbitration, 60
Gratuities to directors and officials
Royal commission 1665, 1668, 1976
Condon, Mr. F. T., K.C., 2297, 2502
Operating results, 1613
Shareholders, list of, 940
Hanna, Mr. D. B., resignation, 1666
Insurance, 1616
Mortgaged premises, 1635, 2048
Management. *See also under this title,* Directors
Changes in, 1612
Flavelle, Sir Joseph, 1612
Kelley, Mr. Howard G., 1612
Non-interference with from day to day, 2473
Responsibilities and powers, 3653, 3677 3687
Resolution of 1921, 3688
System of, 2472
Thornton, Sir Henry, 1612
Minister's annual statement, 1612
Paris offices, purchase, 3208, 3653, 3676, 3683, 3687
Amdt. (Mr. Stevens), Chairman's ruling, 3667
Forke, Mr., reference to, 3675
Property, purchases and sales, 3324
Real estate transactions, 2518
Revaluation, 2860
Robb, Mr. 2471
Securities, approval of, bill 4403, 4516
Expenditure to be voted by parliament, amdt. 4527, neg. 4528
Thornton, Sir Henry, 1612
Appointment, correspondence, 495
Traffic staff, removal to Halifax, 4708

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Canadian National Railways—*Con.*
Transcontinental, 1615
Unification of systems, 1616
Canadian National Safety League, 3953
Cape Breton North and Victoria, vacancy, 2469
Carruthers, Mrs. James. *See under this title,* Labour, International Labour Conference
Cattle embargo, removal of, 575
Cecil, Lord Robert, adjournment for lecture, 1685
Cheque tax, 3923
Chinese immigration, 1441
Estimates, 1443
Chinese immigration bill, 2327-34, 4536
Cigarette duty, 2988, 3230
Civil Service
Appointments, 208
Bonus, 1811, 1814
Commission, appointment of postmasters, 1798, 1829
Political partisanship, 286
Reform, 409
Superannuation, 3402
Work outside regular duties, 1675
Civil Service Act
Abuse of, 3254
Combines staff, appointment, 2661
M. (Mr. Power) for repeal, 345, 356, 368, 374, 529, 550
Special committee, 937
First report, 1256
Civilization, evolution of, 1856
Clementsport postmaster, 1798
Coal. *See also under this title* Fuel,
Anthracite and lignite, duty, 3493
Reciprocity, 3497
Combines, 2989
Printing, 1623
Combines bill, 496, 990, 992, 2519, 2556, 2604, 2607, 2624-29, 2660-68
Attorney General vs. Wholesale Grocers, 2051, 2560
Civil Service Act, violation of, 2661
Commissioners, appointment of, 2627
Contempt of registrar or commissioner, 2660
Criminal legislation, 2559
Discussion, reservation of right, 2520
Legislation, history of, 2557
Privy Council judgment, 2559
Registrar, appointment of, 2628
Commissioner, and, 2558
Senate amendments, 3505

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Combines and Fair Prices Act, 2559
Appeals, 2051
Compensation for slaughtered animals, 484
Conferences, 3411
Congdon, Mr. F. T., K.C., appointment, 2297, 2502
Conscription of fire fighters, 3410
Copper bounty bill, 4370, 4374
Copyright Act Amdt. bill, 2345
Corn laws, abolition of, 1858, 1860
Cost of living, 1684, 1812, 2999
Increase of, 1812, 1853
Sales tax and, 1813
Cotton fabrics for pneumatic tires, 3487
Criminal Code Amdt. bills
Inquiry, 1483
Publication of evidence in marriage and divorce proceedings, 1971
Crowsnest pass agreement, 1620, 1929. *See also under this title* Freight rates
Extension, 2741
"Cuckoo" government, 3451, 3510
Customs duties, reduction, 90
Customs tariff items, passing of, 3486
Dairy Industry Act, Amdt. bill, 3325, 3449
Deceased members, tributes to, 6
Deputy ministers, French-speaking, 1805, 1808
Deputy postmaster general, appointment, 1806
Desbarats, Mr. G. J., 3342
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 2364, 4678
Distressed seamen, relief of, 3332
Dominion archives building, 1730
Dominion arsenals, 887, 1752
Dominion Lands Act Amdt. bill, homesteads, 4365
Dominion lands and parks
Contingencies, 3408
Medicine Hat office, 3250
Salaries, 3250
Dominion Textile Company, stock, 1853
Dredging. *See also under this title,* Harbours and rivers
Expenditure, 1012
Manitoba, 1013
Ontario and Quebec, 1011
Unification of work, 3341
Dry Dock Subsidies Act Amdt. bill, 3583
Dry red lead, etc., duty, 3481
Duke and Duchess of York, congratulations, 2252
Editorial Committee 1670, 1675-86, 1714
Edmundston bridge, 1014
Emigration to the United States, 211, 1093, 1657

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Emigration—*Con.*
Montreal, from, 2216
New York Tribune, reported statement of, 2790
Esquimault dry dock, 2671
Estimates.
Canadian National Railways, expenditure, 4304. *See also that title*
Commitments, 4598
Obligations maturing 1754
Supplementary, 4420
Time of presentation, 4420, 4422, 4594, 4605, 4703
Excise taxes, payment with postage stamps, 1817
Experimental farms, 484
Export Act Amdt. bill, pulpwood, 4012, 4354
Fielding, Right Hon. Mr.
Complimentary reference to, 2013
Congratulations on being called to Imperial Privy Council, 4742
Finance Act, 255
Firebrick duty, 3482, 3896
Fiset Sir Eugene, retirement, 3342
Fisheries Act 1914 Amdt. bill 4009
Forest protection, 3415
M. (Mr. Michaud) 820
France
Imports and exports, 2015
Trade arrangements, termination, 1999
War losses, 2215
Free trade
Great Britain in, 1860
Not making progress, 2991
Freight rates, 3194
Crowsnest pass agreement, 1620, 1948
Suspension of, 1948
Equalization, M. (Mr. Clark) 1307, 1928
Manitoba, 1931, 1932
Shipping. *See also under this title,* Lake Grain Rates
Legislation, 3265, 4710
Westward from prairie provinces, 1158
French-speaking deputy ministers, 1806, 1808
French treaty, 440, 456
Analysis 449
Border states, 440, 450, 2215
British preference, 453
Concessions to United States, 449
Consideration of, inquiry, 1740
Luxuries, 450
French treaty bill, 2013, 2209, 2239, 2242, 2259-63, 2299-2304, 3910
Agricultural implements, 2246
Boots and shoes, 2240
Brandy, 2302
Bronze powder, 2016, 2217

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
French Treaty bill—*Con.*
Butter, 2217
Buttons, 2214
Canadian Manufacturers' Association, 2209
Embroideries, 2214
Exports and imports, 2222
Exports to France, 2210, 2213
Favoured nation, 2210, 2213, 2402
Inconsistent laws, 2303
Livestock, 2211
Luxuries, 2213, 2259
Modus vivendi of 1921, 2212, 2259
Revenue, loss of, 2209
Sales tax, 2299
Silks, 2215
Specific duties 2215
Treaty of 1907, 2212
Value of, 2210
Watches and clocks, 2214
Wines, 2302
Fuel supply, 790
Children, death of, 751, 1657
Geodetic survey, 3245
Geological survey estimates, 2504, 2508
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 338
Government commissions, appointments of, 2502. *See also under this title,* Grand Trunk, Gratuities
Government publications. *See also under this title,* Editorial Committee
Reduction in number and volume, 1671
Waste, Judge Snider's report, 1715
Grain and grain trade
Grain inquiry commission, 1210, 4710
Delay in appointment, 2254
Scott, Mr. D'Arcy, 4711
Grain sample market, 304
Grain shipments, Quebec elevator, 3768
Halifax elevator, 4713
Grand Jury system, abolition of, 2695
Great Britain
Depression in, 1854
Free trade, 1860
Taxation, 2796
Great Lakes disarmament, 244, 247, 494
Grant, Dr., civil service, 558
Graving docks, 2682
Grazing inspectors, appointment, 3254
Grondines wharf, 959
Haileybury armoury and post office, 4616
Halibut fishery treaty, 4456-79
Correspondence with British government, 1032
Inquiry for papers, 1212
Lapointe, Hon. Mr., visit to Washington, 857

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Halibut fishery treaty—*Con.*
Rider inserted by United States Senate, 1308
Signing of, 858, 1308, 4480
Harbours and rivers. *See also under this title,* Dredging
Estimates, 2671
Manitoba, 993
Nova Scotia, 941
Ontario, 981
Saskatchewan and Alberta 1001
Tenders for repair work, 950
Hayes, Mr. John J., dismissal, 1692
Hector celebration grant, 4636, 4705
Helmer, Mr., appointment, 3254
Hemp bounty bill, 3912, 4378, 4384
High Commissioner's office, London, 4630
Hindu immigrants, franchise, 4658
Homesteads
Inspectors, 3252
Second, 4365
Hoppe and Isenberg leases, 3226
Hopper barge construction, 3350
Housing legislation, 2518, 2987
Hudson Bay railway
Construction vote, 4683
Correspondence, 208
Feasibility of route, 1069
History of, 1076
Letter to Melfort Journal, 1062
McArthur J. D. & Co., claim, 4690
M. (Mr. Knox) 1075
Motherwell, Hon. Mr., reported statement at Moose Jaw, 1686
Rail removals, qu. 203
Senate investigation, 1076
Welland canal and, 3787
Hydrographic survey, 3336
Immigraton. *See also under this title,* Emigration
Advertising, 1085
Black, Mr. W. J., appointment, 2664
Canada Colonization Association
Agreement with, 1321
Letter to Mr. M. A. Brown, 1333, 1334
Field supervisors, Soldier Settlement Board, 1090-2
Chinese. *See under this sub-title,* Oriental
Estimates, 1387
Hindu, 4640, 4658
Ingram, Mr., appointment, 2664
Late administration and, 1335
Lemont, Mr. Arthur, 1086
May, Mr., appointment, 2663
Oriental
Chinese, 1441, 1443, 2327-34, 4536

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Immigration—*Con.*
Oriental—*Con.*
Disallowance of British Columbia legislation, 1262
Japanese, 1450
Legislation, principle of, 2328
Policy, 1164, 1335
Immigration Act Amdt. bill, 2430, 2669
Legislation of 1919, 2431
Undesirable classes, 2669
Vessel crews, 2671
Imperial Conference
Agenda, 1976, 4638-63
Opportunity for discussion, 3453
Egypt, British policy, 4663
Representation of Canada, 1686
Imperial Economic Conference
Agenda, 1976, 4638-63
Opportunity for discussion, 3453
Representation of Canada, 1686
Income tax. *See under this title,* Taxation
Income War Tax Act Amdt. bill, 4495, 4504
Indians, 2154
Agents, 2162
Perth, N.B., 2154
Cattle, 2162
Doctors, Portage la Prairie, appointments, 2160
Education, 2158
Greater production, 2155
Kitsilano Indian reserve, 383
Reorganization, 2162
St. Peter's reserve, hay lands, 2154
Treatment of, 2158
Industrial Disputes Investigation bill, 4359
Inland Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 3230, 3969, 4528
Inspection of livestock shipments, 3334
Insurance Act 1917 Amdt. bill, 3045
International boundaries, surveys, 3246
International Labour Conference. *See under this title.* Labour
Italian treaty bill, 2401-04, 2701
Favoured nation, 2402
Lord Curzon, signature, 2403
Japanese fishing licenses, 1547
Johnson, Mr. R. M., status of, 202
Judges Act Amdt. bill, 3265
Kennedy, the late Hon. W. C., 6
King's Printer, Mr. F. A. Acland, 1668
Labour
Department
Estimates, 1621
Reduction of officials, 524
Drift to United States, 1812. *See also under this title* Emigration

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Labour—*Con.*
International Labour Conference, 1386
Carruthers, Mrs. James, 1442, 1648
Incomplete return, 1539
Report of last meeting, 1442
Liberal Convention of 1919, 1651
Organizing power of, 1857
Labour Gazette, cost of printing, 1621, 1708, 1712
Lack of confidence, M. (Mr. Irvine) 227
Lafortune, the late Mr. D. A., M.P., 6
Lake Grain Rates Commission, 3265, 4710
Lake of the Woods
Control, M. for papers, 247
Levels, 247, qu. 2700
Lake of the Woods bill, 2886, 4163, 4165
Land. *See also under this title,* Dominion Lands, Immigration
Homesteads, 3252, 4365
Soldier settlement, 2019. *See also under this title,* Soldier Settlement
Speculation and taxation, 1395
Laurier monument, 1017
Legislation, record of, 407, 408
Lewis, John L., correspondence, 250
Liberal appointments by late government, 2503
Liberal Convention of 1919, 2994
British preference, 454
French treaty, 2211
Labour res. 1651
Liberals-Conservatives, alleged union on Bank Act, 4143
Library of Parliament, 2693
Life-saving service, 3335
Lindsay arsenal, 884
Linen yarn duty, 3898
Lumber, sales tax, 4419
Macdonald, Hon. E. M., appointment, 1764
McKenzie, Hon. D. D.
Appointment to Bench, 1764, 1810
Retirement, 2392
Magazines and periodicals, M. (Mr. Hocken) 849
Manitoba Pulp and Paper Company, 3254
Marine and Fisheries
Committee report, 3084
Unforeseen expenses, 3334
Marshall, Mr. Duncan
Appointment, 3293, 3303, 3320
British Empire exhibition, 4704
Live stock shipments, 3334
Salary, 3287
Speeches, 2615
Masters and mates, examination, 2610

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Mennonites
Contract with, 1885
Emigration of, 1884
Merchants' bank investigation, 4159
Militia and Defence disbursements, 345
Militia Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3976
Mines department, salaries, 3207
Minister of Justice, absence, 4514
Minister of Railways, appointment, 519
Ministers' and officials' travels, 343
Moderate protection, 2991
Moose Jaw election
Motherwell, Hon. Mr., alleged statement, 1686
Murdock, Hon. Mr., 1714
National Defence
Ammunition, 887, 1742
Clothing and necessaries, 883
Dominion arsenal, Quebec, bonus, 887, 1752
Estimates, 1751
Pay of staff, 890
Salaries and contingencies, 902
National gallery, 1019
National ownership, 93
Natural resources, western provinces, 2782
Expenditure upon, 2510
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2188, 2191, 2195, 2440-63
Judges, 2446, 2451
Favourable report necessary to issue of certificate, 2440
Secretary of State
Administration by, 2440
Certificates, issue, 2440
Powers of, 2188
Naval service, 902
Department, 3341
Navigation schools, 3332
O'Hara, Captain Marshall, salary, 3331
Near East crisis, 25, 31
New departmental building, Ottawa, architects, 4633
Newspaper postage, 4436, 4528
North Essex by-election, 4595. *See also under this title,* Belle River
Alleged statement, 670, 708, 2014
Fielding, Hon. Mr. and, 2013
Northern Pacific Halibut Fishery bill, 4480, 4487. *See also under this title,* Halibut
Nova Scotia strikes, troops, 868, 898
Offensive partisanship, 3344
Oil bounty, 2511
Old age pensions, legislation, 2518
Oleomargarine
Dairy Industry Act Amdt. bill, 3449

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Oleomargarine—*Con.*
Discussion, 3327
Drawback on materials, 3503
Further legislation, 2927
Inquiry, 1309, 2519
M. (Mr. Carroll) 2519, 3526, 3536, 3573
Amdt. (Mr. Kay) 3521
Sub-amdt. (Mr. Good) 3571
Precedence, 3271, 3451
Point of order, Mr. Sutherland, 3327
Ontario
Elections and Petawawa camp, 3976, 4162
Number of members, 252
Orders in Council, 1027
Government by, 1652, 1655, 4354, 4487
Repeal by statute, 3504
Ore flotation, 2509
Ore-testing plants, British Columbia, 2509
Ottawa-Hull bridge, 1015
Ottawa Typographical Union, copyright, 2144
Owen Sound wharf, 2690
Pan-American union, 496
Paper. *See also under this title,* Pulpwood
Control, 2573
Newsprint, exemption from sales tax, 2999
Prices in Canada and United States, 829
Parliament buildings, cost, 1725
Parliamentary government, 1652
Patents of Invention bill, 2129
Penitentiaries, 771
Penny Bank of Toronto bill, 2052
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 4703, 4746, 4748
Pensions
District board of review, 4703
Federal appeal board, 4703
Old age, 1651, 2518
Women, 1651
Petawawa camp and Ontario elections, 3976, 4162
Petition of right, fiats, 3226
Petroleum and Naptha Inspection bill, 3969
Pledges, violation of, 2220
Point of order, relevancy, 2663
Pointe aux Trembles wharf, 974
Policies, review of, 408, 409
Political patronage, 2160, 3344
Population, increase of, 1398
Port Arthur and Fort William harbours, 2675
Port Elgin breakwater, 2690
Portage la Prairie
Indians, medical service, 2160
Sewerage system, 993, 2679
Postmaster General, absence of, 1314, 1538
Post Office Act Amdt. bill, 4436, 4528

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Post Office department
Administration, 1817
Coulter, Dr. R. M., retirement, 1825
Revenue attributable to postal service, 1817
Ross, Mr. George W., retirement, 1825
Verrett, Mr. Hector, retirement, 1826
Preston, Mr. W. T. R., 249
Prices. *See also under this title,* Budget; Cost of living
Agricultural products and manufactured goods, 1853
Producer and consumer, 1853
Prince Edward Island car ferry claim, 4678
Printing
Contracts to newspapers, etc., 2394
Reduction in cost, 1671
Printing bureau, new building, 1735
Fire hazard, 1736
M. to reduce item, 1737, 1738
Privilege
Carroll, Mr., 3267
Committee, discussion, anticipatory, 3267
Production costs and labour organization, 1857
Progressive party, Union government and big interests, 1853
Promissory notes, tax, 3923
Proportional representation
Alternative vote, 389, 410
M. (Mr. Good) 406, 430
Protection, increase in industries, 2798
Public buildings
New departmental, 1729
Nova Scotia, 4612
Renting or building, 1736
Public debt, responsibility for, 2920
Public expenditure. *See under this title,* Address; Budget; Estimates
Public Service Act Amdt. bill, 3402
Public Works Act, tender and contract, 950-5
Public works, committments, 962
Publication of evidence, etc., 1971
Publicity agent, London, Mr. W. T. Cranfield 2927, 2983, 4707
Pugsley, Hon. William, appointment, 2501
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4012, 4354
Royal commission, 3412, 3413, 4709
Purchasing Commission, 4704
Quebec
Champlain dock, 2675
Grain elevator, 3768
Statutes of, 1660
Radiotelegraph Act Amdt. bill, 2467
Railway Commission, 3192

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Railway Commission—*Con.*
Carvell, Hon. F. B., alleged statement of Minister of Agriculture, 3192
Criticism of, 3192
Railways. *See also under this title,* Canadian National
Branch lines, 1735
Financial situation, 1753
Railways and Canals, Minister, appointment, 1081
Raisins and dried currants, duty, 3474
Reciprocity with United States
Agreement of 1911, 3902
Agricultural implements, 3499
Macdonald, Right Hon. Sir John A., 2922
"No truck or trade with the Yankees" 3080
Offer to negotiate, 3901, 3908
Permanency, 3079
Request for information, 3504
Redistribution, 27, 162, 487
Ivel, Mr. W. M., 733
Special Committee on bill, 937
Printing of proceedings, 3399
Report, 4736
References to, 89-96. *See also speeches* on Budget
Returned soldiers
Appointment, 1800
Civil Service appointments, 1797
Revised Hansard, inquiry, 122
Riordan Pulp and Paper Company, tax, 4490
Robb, Hon. Mr., trip to Australia, 1849, 3475
Royal Canadian Mounted Police
M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 1149
Reason for increase in force, 1149
Royal Canadian navy, 902
Recruiting for volunteer reserve, 2898
Rural credit system, 4144
Rural population, 1854
St. John and Quebec railway bill, 3403
St. John harbour improvements, 2677
St. Laurent, the late Mr. A., 1006
St. Lawrence river waterway, qu. 204, 3786
St. Lawrence ship channel, 3339
Sales tax. *See under this title,* Address; Budget; Special War Revenue; Taxation
Second homesteads, 4365
Secretary of State dept. estimates, 2392
Seed grain advances, 4367
Seed testing bill, 2304
Senate estimates, 2694
Sheguindah wharf, 2690
Sinclair, Hon. J. E., reference to, 2996

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Singapore naval base, 3822
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment
Expenditure, 2894
Walkerville, alleged statement at, 2014
Reference to, 670, 708
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment Act Amdt. bill, 2892
Soldier settlement, 2987
Advertising, 2023
Expenditure, 2018
Land taxation, 3260
Legal expenses, 2018
Sorel shipyard, 3343
Dismissals, 3344
Special War Revenue Act Amdt., 4364, 4409
Stewart, the late Hon. J. A., 7
Stumping machines, duty, 3486
Tariff. *See also under this title,* Budget; French Treaty
Agricultural implements, 2756
Election pledges, violation, 1658
Figures, 90
Luxuries, 2015
Policy of government, 3492
Reduction of duties, 2561
Rural population and, 1854
Taxation. *See also under this title,* Address; Budget; Income Tax; Special War Revenue
Increased burden of, 1854
Sales tax, 4409
Imports, 4410
Increase in, 2213
Necessaries of life, 94-5, 2999
Telegraph and telephone lines, 2682
Terrebonne public building, 2690
Thornton, Sir Henry, qu. 284, 495. *See also under this title,* Canadian National Railways
Director Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, 3208, 3845
Three Rivers harbour bill, 3964
Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner) 1288
Tobacco duties, smuggling, 2989, 3230
Topographical surveys, 2509, 3244
Toronto
Breakwater protection, 984
Harbour improvements, 985, 2678
Viaduct, 4441
Treaties. *See also under this title,* French; Halibut; Italian
Government and, 1850
Signing of, 4457
Tree-planting, 3416
Troops, use of in labour troubles, 868, 898

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Trusts, 3231. *See also under this title,* Combines
Typewriters and parts, duty, 3485
Unemployment, 2987
Minister of Labour, responsibility, 1657
Order in council No. 220, 436
United States. *See also under this title,* Reciprocity
Borrowings from, 95
Industries in Canada, 4380
Liquor laws, 4295
Obligations to, 23, 93
Unrest, western Canada, 4514
Vancouver harbour bill, 259
Victoria dry dock, 1002
Vimy Ridge memorial, 182
War claims, adjustment, 900, 1747
War profiteering, 2921
Waste paper, sale by government, 1714
Water powers, forest reserves, 1256
Welland canal construction, 3786
Western provinces, conditions, 1854
Wharves, revenue, 977
Wheat board
Establishment of, 409
Extension of legislation, 2696
Proceedings under act of 1922, 1636
Wines. *See also* French Treaty
Native, 2011
Wingham postmaster, 1800
Wrecking plant subsidies, 3334

Melita, Man. bank robbery, 1147

Melville, Mr. G. D., Hudson Bay railway, 1064

Members of Parliament. *See* House of Commons

Memorials. *See* Monuments and Memorials

Mennonites. *See* Emigration; Immigration

Mental Tests, 1219

Merchants' Bank. *See* Banks and Banking

Merchant Marine. *See* Canadian Government Merchant Marine

Mercier, Mr. Paul (Westmount-St. Henri)
Bankruptcy Act M. (Mr. Casgrain) 1508
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3091
Immigration policy, 1115
Lachine canal bridge, 2299
Senate and House of Commons bill, 4244
Transcontinental, Montreal branch line, qu. 2392

Mergers. *See* Bank Act Amdt. bill; Combines bill

Merit System. *See* Civil Service

"Metagen" analysis of, qu. 1867

Metals. *See* Mines and Minerals

Meteorological Service. *See* Marine

Metric System, qu. 914

Mewburn, Hon. S. C. (East Hamilton)
Ammunition, 887
Annual training, 859, 867
Hamilton public building, 4628
Harbours and rivers, Ontario, 4588
Oleomargarine, discussion, 3329
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3859
Port Maitland pier, 4589
Sales tax, 4418

Meyerscough, Mr. Thomas, detention of, 2297, 2469

Michaud, Mr. Pius (Restigouche and Madawaska)
Bankruptcies among farmers, 1495
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3105
Capital punishment, 769
Civil Service salaries, qu. 2086
Dorchester penitentiary, supplies, qu. 494
Export Act Amdt. bill, pulpwood, 4345
Forest protection, M., 816
Fuel supply, qu. 203
Indian agent, Perth, N.B., 2155
Marketing of grain, M. (Mr. Millar) 310
Amdt. 311
Mechanics, qu. 203
New Brunswick forest fires, relief, 4010
Pensions, European war, 3713
Political patronage, 3348
Potatoes
Exports, qu. 621
Industry, 310
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4345
St. John river, sawdust pollution, 701
Steel, L. R. Company, qu. 1994

Michell, Professor, cost of living, 1700, 1812

Michigan Central Railway, bridge, qu. 1257

Middleman. *See* Prices

Midland wharves, 983

Migration. *See* Emigration

Migratory Birds Convention Act, administration, 3443

Militarism, 4652. *See* National Defence, Annual Drill, Cadet Services

Military Camps. *See* Petawawa

Military Decorations. *See* Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner); War

Military Expenditures. *See* National Defence

Military Hospitals. *See* Hospitals

Militia Act, aid to civil power. *See* Labour, Strikes; National Defence

Militia and Defence. *See* National Defence

Militia Pensions. *See* Pensions

Militia Pension Act Amdt. Bills
1. Retired war officers in Public Service.
Res. 1740, 2052; 1r., com., 2053; 3r., 2086
2. Period of service entitling to pensions.
Res. 3582, 3975; 1r., 2r., com., 3976; 3r., 3977

Milk. *See* Dairying Industry; Prices

Mill Feeds, adulteration. *See* Agriculture; Feeding Stuffs Act; Grain and Grain Trade; Milling Industry

Millar, Mr. John (Qu'Appelle)
Address in reply, 50. Unemployment question, 50; immigration; soldier land settlement; Canada Colonization Association, 51; lake grain rates; deep waterways; Sir Henry Thornton and Canadian National Railways; com. on agricultural conditions, 52; marketing of grain, 53
Agricultural expenditure, 3239
Agricultural implements, standardization, 789, 805
Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt. bill, 2135, 2137
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4081-4113
Barnjum, Mr. Frank J. D., work of, 3412
Binder twine industry, 4386
Canada Grain Act, administration, 784
Canadian Air Force, Saskatchewan, 1784
Canadian National parks and historic sites, 3407, 3434
Canadian National Railways
Branch lines construction bill, 4336
Paris offices, 3610
Cattle shipped to Great Britain, 2135
Report as to tuberculosis, 2469
Civil Service Commission, 3986
Cold storage companies, 188
Combines bill, 2546
Copper bounty, 3239

Millar, Mr. John—*Con.*
Dairy Industry Act 1914 Amdt. bill, 3152
Deputy ministers, salaries, 4670
Dominion Lands Act Amdt. bill, homesteads, 4368
Dominion lands and parks, 3252
Dominion lands, reclamation, 3431
Experimental farms, 469, 485
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4549
Finance Act 1914 Amdt. bill, 4407
Freight rates, shipping, 3763, 3787
Fuel supply, 792, 805, 3205
Government publications, distribution, 3266
Grain and grain trade
Elevators
Dockage, 784
Government, mixing, 2036
Screenings, 2039
Sheep feeding, 2040
Weights, difference in, 2037
Grain commission, appointment, 1763
Marketing and shipment, 53, qu. 494
Amendment, 311
Insurance, 3764
Motion, 288
Shipping rates, 3787. *See also under this title*, Lake Grain Rates bill
Grants to military associations, 889
Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia, 4561
Health of animals, 576
Historic sites, 3407, 3434
Hogs
Cholera contracted from whey, 3299
Grading, 591
Homestead inspectors, 3252, 3254
Hudson Bay railway, M. (Mr. Knox) 1057
Immigration, Canada Colonization Association, 51
Income War Tax Act Amdt. bill, 4497
Interest rate, 4111
International boundaries, surveys, 3248
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4221-33
Lightkeepers salaries, 3352
Live Stock Acts Amdt., 276
Live stock industry, 469
National gallery, 1019
National monument, Connaught place, 2688
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2457, 3985
Foreigners, attitude towards Canada, 2458
Judges, 2457
Naturalization, obstacles in way of, 2457
Oil-drilling, southern Alberta, 2508
Penitentiaries, 773
Pensions, European war, 3722
Public expenditure, 4422
Public works, apportionment of, 4561
Quebec wharves, 980
Rural mail delivery, 1790

Millar, Mr. John—*Con.*
St. Lawrence river
Ship channel, 3340, 3343
Waterway, report, 3428
Sales tax, 4422
M. (Mr. Stevens) 922
Saskatchewan wharves, 1001
Seed Purchasing Commission, qu. 279
Settlers' relief, 3448
Soldier settlement, qu. 206, 2021
Special war revenue, 4422
Tree-planting stations, 3413
Tuberculous cattle, fraudulent trade, 485, 576
Vancouver harbour bill, 262, 263
Wages, 3205
Water power leases, 3426
Welland canal construction, 3763, 3787
Wharves, revenue, 976
Winnipeg sample market, qu. 345

Miller Bill. *See* Race Track Betting

Miller, Mr. Roger, claim, 4676

Millerand, Mons. A., President French Republic, 1538

Milling Industry. *See also* Feeding Stuffs Act; Flour; Grain and Grain Trade
Millers, conference, 604
Millfeeds. *See also* Feeding Stuffs Act
Adulteration of, 600, 2875
Legislation, inquiry, 2795
Milling in bond, 2960
Protection, 146-147
Selection of wheat for milling, 2980

Milne, Mr. Robert (Neepawa)
Binder twine, price, 4387
Experimental farms, 470
Fuel oil, standardization, 808
Fuel supply, 808
Gasoline, short measure, 810
Hemp bounty bill, 4387
White Mud river, fishway, 3362

Milner, Lord, credit and industry, 627

Mines and Minerals. *See also* Coal; Fuel; Geological Survey
Asbestos, 460, 2750
Assay office, Vancover, 3207
Cobalt, 2750. *See also* Treaties, French
Committee, 3204
Changes in membership, 1483, 2047
Failure to function, 1271
Reports
Coal on, 4514, 4743
First, 1384, 1738
Second, 1738
Third, 4436, 4592

Mines and Minerals—*Con.*
Consolidated Mining and Smelting Company, 3235
Copper bounty on bars or rods, 2646, 2778, 2827, 2861, 2931, 2943, 3035. *See also* Bounties; Copper
Customs drawback, 2655
Rod mill, opening of, 2943
Copper Mountain, 2504
Department
Deputy minister, Mr. Camsell, 1265
Estimates, 2504, 3197
Publications, 3197
Salaries and contingencies, 3207
Dome Mines Company, 4209
Explosives division, 2514
Fuel-testing division, 3197
Gaspé, 1242
Gold. *See also that title*
Labrador gold discovery, 1995, 2611, qu. 2696
Output, 2750
Percentage of national wealth, 2720
Gypsum, 2349
Plaster quarries and, 1010
Hudson bay region, 1049, 1076. *See also* Hudson Bay railway
Institute of Mining and Metallurgy
Alberta coal, 1163
Edmonton, 1268
Iron ores
Alberta 2512
Deposit, Vancouver island, 2514
Irrigation, rights of leaseholders. *See* Irrigation Act Amdt. bill
Mineral and oil rights, 2510
Miners' strikes. *See* Labour
Mining companies
Dividends. *See* Companies Act Amdt. bill
Shares, 4208
Mining rights. *See* Dominion Lands Act Amdt. bill
Nickel, 2750
Shipments to Germany during war, 4371
Ontario Goldfields, 4209
Ores
Flotation, 2509
Ore-dressing division, 3197
Ore-testing, Nelson, B.C., 2505
Shipment to Ottawa testing plant, 2505
Precious metals, content of, 4371
Quartz mining in Yukon, 249
Queen Charlotte islands, 150
Revenue from leases, 2510
Shale deposits, Maritime provinces, 2513
Silver production, 2750
Sudbury copper mines, 4371

Mines and Minerals—*Con.*
Trail, B. C., smelter, 2861, 3235
Refractory ores, 2506
Yukon, 86-89, 249. *See also that title*
Exhibit, British Empire exhibition, qu. 3143
Mayo silver strike, 3943

Mining Companies. *See* Companies Act Amdt. bill

Mining Leases. *See* Irrigation Act Amdt. bill

Mining Rights. *See* Dominion Lands Act; Yukon Act Amdt. bill

Ministers of the Crown
Absence of, 2934, 3043. *See also* Murphy, Hon. Charles
Graham, Hon. George P., appointed Minister of Railways and Canals, 2295
Macdonald, Hon. E. M.
Appointed acting Minister of National Defence, 2295
Sworn as member of Privy Council, 1764
Number of, 3043
Salaries, 4671. *See also* Senate and House of Commons Act
Proposed reduction of 12½ per cent, M. (Mr. Leader) 1153, 2915
Travels of, qu. 283, qu. 343
Robb, Hon. Mr., trip to Australia, 1848-9 2815, 3017, 3474-5

Minorities, Senate and, 1377

Miramichi River fishing. *See* Fish and Fisheries

Miscellaneous Private Bills. *See* Private Bills

Miscou-Shippegan Steamship service, 2173

Mitchell, Mr. A. J. *See also* Canadian National Railways
Interest in insurance companies, 2050

Mitchell, Mr. Walter (St. Antoine)
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4140, 4145
Banking and Commerce Com., Mr. D. C. Macarow, 4145
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 2390

Mixing of Grain. *See* Grain and Grain Trade

Modus Vivendi. *See* Fish and Fisheries; United States

Moncton, N.B.
Canadian National Railways
Audit staff, 1756
Transfer to Montreal, 574
Headquarters, 13, 2971
Dairy cattle, testing, 1307

Moncton and Buctouche Railway, qu. 203, 3646, 4197

Money. *See also* Banks and Banking; Credits; Finance; Prices; Public Expenditure; Purchasing Power
Gold standard, 4249, 4405, 4666
Origin and function of, 632, 633
Paper, 635
Purchasing power, 44, 1167, 1168, 4666

Money Bills. *See* Appropriation; Supply

Monk, the late Hon. F. D. *See* Proportional Representation

Monopolies. *See* Combines

Monte Grappa, foundering of, qu. 912

Montreal (city)
Canadian National headquarters, suitability, 62-63
Chamber of Commerce, Bankruptcy Act, 1492
Coal situation, 254
Customs house and revenue, 3280
Daylight saving, post office, qu. 3143
Emigration, 2216
Skilled mechanics, 2790
Montreal Unemployed Workers' Association, 2719
Ordnance stores building, 1022
Post office
Appointments, 1800
Bolte, Mr. Camille, 1032, qu. 1138
Daylight saving, qu. 3143
Inquiry branch, qu. 2516
Postal stations
Number of, qu. 3135
Postal station "G", qu. 623
Promotion examinations, qu. 2298
Public Works employees, 381
Transcontinental railway, connection, qu. 2393
Unemployment, 42, 2719
Union stockyards, 2762

Montreal (port). *See* also Vancouver Harbour Bill
Cold storage warehouse, 185, 272, qu. 1633, qu. 1488, qu. 2204, 3289. *See also* Cold Storage Act Amdt
Grain elevator
Capacity, 3767
Grand Trunk, qu. 1974
New, qu. 1663
Grain shipments, 1768, qu. 1973, 1974, 4230
Shortages, complaint of British importers, 1764, 2037
United States grain handling, 1760
Wheat shipments, qu. 385

Montreal (port)—*Con.*
Harbour commission. *See also* Montreal Harbour Commissioners Bill
Advances, qu. 812, 4363, 4508
Lumber importations, qu. 1867
Names and salaries, qu. 1137
Harbour master, qu. 1867
Montreal Corn Exchange, lake tonnage, 4289

Montreal Harbour Commissioners Bill
(Advance of $10,000,000.)
Res. 4363; 4508; 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 4508

Montreal Shipping Federation. *See also* Immigration Act Amdt. Bill
Vessel crews, 2670

Montreal Standard editorial, Bank Act, 4125, 4142

Monuments and Memorials. *See also* Canadian National Parks and Historic Sites; War
Baker, Late Lieut Col. G. H., M.P., 435, 730
Champlain monument, Orillia, 4705
Dollier and Galinee, Fathers, cairn at Port Dover, 3433
Laurier, the late Sir Wilfrid, 1017
Law, the late Bowman B., 1020
National monument, Connaught place, Ottawa, 1020, 2685
Peguis, Saulteaux Indian chief, 4704
Vimy Ridge monument, 811. *See also that title*

Moore, Mr. Tom, President Dominion Trades Congress, 1170
Immigration, 1167
Labour
Eight-hour day, 1427
Representative on Canadian National board, 1652-6, 3636

Moose Jaw. *See also* Elections; Johnson, R. M.
By-election, 2224, 2760
Announcement of vacancy, 615
Certificate, Registrar of Supreme Court, 515
Eggs, price of, 1852
Hopkins, Mr. E. N.
Congratulations to, 2760
Introduction, 2417
Hudson Bay railway
Alleged statement of Mr. Motherwell. 1686, 2774, 2787, 4683
Promises, 1073
Murdock, Hon. Mr. 1714
Oleomargarine, 3536
Results, 2760

Moose Jaw—*Con.*
By-election—*Con.*
Return, delay, 2295
Tariff, one of main issues, 2714
Income tax office, qu. 2699
Member for and reciprocity agreement, 3010
Public building, 1023
Stockyard, 2779

Moose Mountain
Forest reserve, 3453
Pleasure resort, 3408, 3453

Moose Range drainage, qu. 3144, 3259

Morel, Mr. E. D. *See* Germany, Reparations

Morin, Mr. L. S. René (St. Hyacinthe-Rouville)
Bankruptcy Act Amdt bill, 3211
Canada, constitutional development, 4469
Halibut fishery treaty, 4469
Imperial Conference, 4653
Macphail, Miss, members and party funds, 4238
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4238
Translation of bill, 4435
Treaties, signing of, 4469

Morinville postmistress, qu. 1028

Morrisburg and Waddington ferry, qu. 1029

Morrisburg dam, 1270

Morrison, Mr. D. W., postmaster, St. Peter's, N.S. qu. 1488, 1489

Morrison, Mr. John (Weyburn)
Budget, 2928. Congratulations to Finance Minister; agricultural conditions; prices of agricultural and manufactured products;purchasing power; manufacturing overhead; "calamity howlers"; British preference; further increase; combines; shipping; Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 2928; trade with Great Britain and the United States; high duties interfering with trade; cigarettes; immigration; branch lines; emigration to the United States; farm credits; rural credits; commission on banking and credits; unjust treatment of farmers by banks; United States credit service; amortization plan; Canadian Pacific railway, land sale contracts; copper; artificial silk and hemp bounties; assistance to capitalists

Morrison, Mr. John—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
but nothing for the farmer; budget a step backwards; high protectionists in Liberal party; camouflaged Tories masquerading under false colours; reciprocity, defeat of in 1911, 2931; Conservatives true to false principles; Liberals false to true principles; election promises not carried out; Liberal platform of 1919 treated as scrap of paper, 2932
Cold Storage bill, 187, 189, 275
Economic conditions, 1238
Farm labourers, wages and dwellings, 1240
Forestry, fire prevention, 4346
Hudson Bay railway, 98
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1240
Literature, 1239
Policy, 1238
Immigration Act Amdt. bill, 2668
Land, sale of to immigrants, 1091
Postmasters, appointment of returned soldiers, 1799
Tariff as it affects East and West, 2753
Western provinces, conditions in, 1238
Woollen industry
British preference, 3471
Protection, M. (Mr. Drummond) 933

Morrison, Mr. T. D., Little Anse breakwater claim, 4572, 4722

Mortgaged Premises, Insurance. *See* Canadian National Railway Bills

Mortgages. *See* Bank Act Amdt. bill; Farms, Mortgages

Moss, Mr. H. R., illegal arrest, 2030

Mothers' Pensions. *See* Pensions

Motherwell, Hon. W. R. (Minister of Agriculture)
Accredited herd system, 577. *See also under this title,* Health of Animals
Agricultural conditions, 2763
Special committee, 667, 706
Agricultural instruction grant, 607
Agriculture department
Dairy branch activities, 3283
Deputy minister
Deduction for rent of house, 4669
Salary, 611
Estimates, 456, 575, 3283, 3988, 4674
Salaries and contingencies, 610
Watson, Dr., chief pathologist, 579

Motherwell, Hon. W. R.—*Con.*
Air service, insect pest control, 597
Alberta coal, freight rates, 3201
Alderson claim, hog cholera, 582
Animal Contagious Diseases bill, 666, 2047, 2131. *See also under this title,* Health of Animals
Archibald, Mr. E. S., purchase of thoroughbred stock, 3290
Bacon
Grading, 593
Salty, 3301
Bees, suppression of foul brood, 4675
Bounties, copper and hemp, 2778
Budget, 2756. Tariff of Sir John Macdonald on agricultural implements; civil service, increase of; Department of Agriculture, staff; civil government, cost of; estimates, preparation of, 2756; grain shipments; stream of wealth from the West; wheat board; demands from the West; idle statements and threats; no turning back; cattle shipments, space on ships; Manitoba Free Press, 2757; Canadian Government Merchant Marine and cattle shipments; letter from Mr. R. B. Teakle; letter from Sir Henry Thornton, 2758; fictitious demand for space; rates, 2759; cattle embargo, removal of; Moose Jaw election; Atlantic shipping rates; conference in Great Britain; report of North Atlantic Conference; rate on Canadian and United States flour, 2761-2; union stockyards, 2762; agricultural conditions; Maritime provinces; specialized farming; potato-growing in New Brunswick; fruit industry, 2763; Quebec; co-operative cold storage; silos and ensilage; farming on poor land; farm credits, 2764; dairying; Ontario fruit-growing; pre-cooling plants; dairy industry; modernized methods; antipodean competition; butter and cheese, 2765; grading; western provinces; dairying; improved methods; cold storage; diversified farming; chief industry; grain-growing, 2766; failures and successes, 2767; debt, 2768; farm credits; dairying; Holstein cow at Agassiz farm, record production; debts of municipalities; unpaid taxes, 2769; Saskatchewan farm loan bonds bought by farmers; Premier Dunning on economic conditions, 2770; wheat production; cost and selling price; Premier Dunning and the

Motherwell, Hon. W. R.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
budget, 2771; tariff stability but not finality; agricultural questionaire and answers; mixed farming, 2772; grain unsold, 2773; insect and fungus pests; grasshoppers; live stock and dairy industry; Moose Jaw election; Hudson Bay railway; immigration, 2774; disparagement of the country; opportunities and prospects, 2775; amdt. (Mr. Forke); tariff reduction, Progressive party and; British preference, list of articles admitted at 40 per cent or over of present general tariff rate, 2776; Liberal and Progressive tariff planks; free trade with Great Britain, 2777; reciprocity agreement of 1911; revenue; land values tax; not a protectionist budget; bounties, 2778; assistance to new industries, 2779; excise tax on luxuries; hemp bounty; binder twine, 2780; discrimination against the West; protection of no essential value to prairies; cause of discontent; bad farming, 2781; natural resources; cost of administering; transfer of to western provinces, 2782; terms of settlement discussed with Alberta and Saskatchewan, 2783
Speech, reference to, 2845, 3064
Canadian Council of Horticulture, 2307
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Advance, 3819
Cattle shipments. *See also under this title* Cattle
Canadian National Railways
Branch lines construction bill, 4316
Management, responsibility and power, 3657
Paris offices, 3657
Canned meats, inspection, 2202
Carvell, Hon. F. B., statement regarding, 3188
Cattle
Cattle embargo
Breeding cattle, 3291
Correspondence, 4295
Removal of, 575, 2760
Shipments
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 2758, 3040, 3819
Cattle boats, unsanitary conditions, 2613
Chilled beef, trial shipment, 3091, 3291, 4675
Fat cattle, trial shipment, 3091, 4675

Motherwell, Hon. W. R.—*Con.*
Cattle—*Con.*
Shipments—*Con.*
Tuberculosis, report as to, 2469
Stockers and fat cattle, 2135
Vessel space, 1869, 3040
Fictitious demand for, 2759
Cereal rust, 595
Civil Service
Commission, appointments, delay, 3292
Increase of, 2756
Codling moth, 597
Cold Storage Act Amdt. bill, 184, 271-6, 2054, 2055, 2086, 2199
Cold storage plants, 3289
Cheese, 2055
Co-operative, 2764
Pre-cooling, 2056, 2765
Compensation for slaughtered cattle, 484. *See also under this title,* Animal Contagious Diseases
Dairy Industry Act 1914 Amdt. bills
Butter substitutes, 2518, 3150, 3325
M. for discharge of order, 3325, 3449
Renovated butter, 2961, 4251, 4270, 4344, 4510
Dairying industry, 609, 2765, 3283
Butter grading, 2766, 3283
Butter, pasteurization, 3298
Certified milk, 3300
Cheese grading, 2766, 3283, 3295
Dairy produce graders, appointment, 3289
Milk
Filled, 3152
Pasteurizing, 3283
Research laboratory, 3297
Dehydration of fruits and vegetables, 4674
Destructive insect pests, 595, 2774, 3988
Dryden, Mr. W. A., trip to South America, 3294
Experimental farms, 456-485
Buildings, 4631
Ottawa Central, 481
Farm and Ranch Review, fraudulent stock-yard practices, 576
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4012, 4271, 4273, 4538
Fertilizer Act, administration, 601
Field crop competitions, 602
Fruit and Fruit Containers bill, 193, 277, 2105, 2131, 3150
Fruit industry, 598, 2763
Fruits and vegetables, new varieties, 2307
Grain
Grain-growing, 2766
Marketing, M. (Mr. Millar) 301
Unsold, 2773
Grasshopper plague, 596, 2774

Motherwell, Hon. W. R.—*Con.*
Health of Animals, 575-87, 4676. *See also under this title,* Animal Contagious Diseases; Cattle; Live Stock
Contagious diseases, 484
Tuberculosis, 484, 580, 2134, 2469
Eradication, 3989
Tuberculin test, 3300
Veterinary inspectors, 3989
Hemp bounty bill, 4382
Hog grading, 594
Horses
Horse-breeding, 589
Market for, 590
Shire horses from Great Britain, 2253
Hudson Bay railway, 2774
Alleged statement, 4683
Immigration
Hebridean immigrants, 3594
Policy, 2774
Progressive members, 2774
"Someone with more money than brains" 1205
International Institute of Agriculture, 599
Live Stock, 587. *See also under this title,* Cattle; Horses
Commissioners, visit to South America, 1213
Tuberculosis. *See under this title,* Health of Animals
Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill, 192, 276-7, 2200, 2292, 3150
Penalties, 2203
Marshall, Mr. Duncan
Activities, 3310
Appointment, 2614, 3305, 3310
Cattle embargo, reported statements on, 2614
Political partisanship, alleged, 3316
Qualifications, 3306, 3310
Salary, 608, 3287
Speeches, 2615
Great Britain, in, 3595
Stornoway, 2181
Trips
Florida, to, 3311
Great Britain, 3291, 3310, 4675
Millfeeds, adulteration, 2795. *See also under this title,* Feeding Stuffs Act
Moose Jaw by-election, reported statement, 1686, 2774
Moose Mountain forest reserve, 3453
Noxious weeds, 2305
Oleomargarine. *See also under this title,* Dairy Industry Act
Attitude on, 3576
Dairy Industry Act, correspondence, 3327

Motherwell, Hon. W. R.—*Con.*
Oleomargarine—*Con.*
"Manna" 3152
M. (Mr. Carroll) 3574
Quebec harbour, cold storage, 2055
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 746
Renovated butter, 3151, 4251. *See also under this title,* Dairy Industry Act
Riordan Pulp and Paper Company, tax, 4490
Ruddick and Wilson, Messrs. visit to Australia, 3283, 3288
Seed, feed and fertilizer control, 599
Seed potatoes, inspection of, 2306
Seed purchasing commission, 599
Seed testing bill, 195, 277, 2304
Seeds, purity of, 601
Speeches, pre-election, 2952, 3188
Spruce bud worm, 596
Stock Growers' Protective Association grant, 588
Supply, undiscussed items, 3285
Tariff, attitude on, 2996
Thunderhill branch line railway, 4316
Toronto seed branch building, 4621
Tuberculosis in cattle *See under this title,* Animal Contagious Diseases; Health of Animals
Winnipeg Free Press, 2790
Woollen industry protection, M. (Mr. Drummond) 935

Mounted Police. *See* Royal Canadian

Moving Pictures, fisheries publicity, 3365

Mowat, Capt. Henry, St. Croix harbour, 2900

Mulgrave-Guysboro steamship service, 2173

Mulligan, Mr. D. B., qu. 1257.

Multi-Member Constituencies. *See* Proportional Representation

Mulvey, Mr. Thomas. *See* Secretary of State

Municipalities
Extravagance, 2797
Historic sites, 3432
Municipal cold storage. *See* Cold Storage
Municipal government in park areas, 3436
Soldiers, hospital treatment, 673
Taxation, 4493. *See also that title*
Irritating, 2804
Land taxes, 1395
School taxes, 3445, 4205
Unpaid, 637, 2953, 2961, 3445, 4205
Tax sales, 2961

Murdock, Hon. James (Minister of Labour)
Annuities
Agents for, 1642
Basis of computation, 1683, 1694
Old age pensions and, 1639, 1651, 1682
Board of Commerce, 2564, 2570
British Empire Steel Corporation employees, 1705
Canada Gazette, 1707
Canada National Railways, printing, 1623
Canadian National Safety League grant, 3953
Combines bill, 2562, 2616-34
Definition "combine" 2616
Distribution of report, 2634
Registrar, inquiry, 2620
Combines and Fair Prices Act, 2565
Cost of living, 2569
Reference to, 1812
Statistics, 1684
Michell, Prof., 1700
Dominion-provincial labour conference, 1442
Editorial committee, cost, 1669
Emigration to United States, 1657
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 321
Government publications
Distribution, 1712
Waste paper sold, 1713
Hansard
Distribution of, 1715
Revised, inquiry, 122
Immigration, contingencies
M. to reduce, agreed to, 1908
Industrial Disputes Investigation bill, 1361, 2061
Senate amdts., non-concurrence, 4357
King's Printer, 1669
Labour
Concilliation and Labour Act, 1621
Conference, 1678
Department
Annuities branch, 1639, 1682
Cooperation with provincial departments, 1678
Estimates, 1621, 1637, 1668
Decrease in, 1643
Salaries, 1657, 1668
Staff, reduction of, 1671
Statistics, 1682
Eight-hour day, 1650
Employment offices, 1674
Employment Offices Co-ordination Act, 1630
Employment service director, 1676
St. John, 3453
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1627, 1629, 1646, 1702, 1707, 1716

Murdock, Hon. James—*Con.*
Labour—*Con.*
International Labour Conference, 1386
Carruthers, Mrs. James, 1442
Incomplete return, 1539
Delegates and expenses, 1642
Draft conventions and recommendations, 1441
Papers tabled, 1483
Recommendations
Federal-provincial jurisdiction, 1645
Text, tabled, 1631
Report of last meeting, 1442
Joint Industrial councils, 1654
King's Printer, 1668
Liberal Convention of 1919, 1651
Provincial departments, 1706
Right to organize, 2889
Strikes, 1628, 1702
Nova Scotia miners, 915, 1627, 1716
Sydney steel workers, 287
Thetford Mines, 2207
Year, 1922. M. (Sir Henry Drayton) 245 495, 815
Technical Education
Administration, 1637
Director of, 1674
Labour Gazette
Correspondents, 1626
Editor, 1671
Expenses, 1624
Hooper, Mr. Ronald, 1625-6
International Labour Conference, report, 1442
Printing, cost of, 1621, 1625, 1708, 1712
Ministers of the Crown, number, 3043
Moose Jaw, by-election, 1714
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3456
Pensions, old age, 1648. *See also under this title,* Annuities
Post office supplies, purchase, 3953
Powell River Paper Company
Labour organization, 2889
Speech, reference to, 3072
Printing bureau
Employees, 1623
New building, 1731, 1735
Plant
New, 1710
Repairs and renewals, 1710
Reorganization, 1731
Retiring allowances, 3949
Printing contracts to newspapers, 2394, 2614
Purchasing Commission, 3953, 4002
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 764
Reference to, 3067
Returned soldiers, unemployment relief, 1679

Murdock, Hon. James—*Con.*
Riley's army, transportation, 3042
Unemployment
Federal-provincial responsibility, 1678
Meighen, Mr., responsibility, 1657
Order in council No. 220, 436
Relief, 1644, 1658
Calgary, 1683
Expenditure, 1655
Responsibility for, 1657, 1678
Returned soldiers, 1679
Winnipeg, 435

Murphy, Hon. Charles (Postmaster General)
Absence through illness, 1538, 1816, 1826
Boulay, Mlle., Sayabec postmistress, 3706, 3756
Newspaper postage, 4436, 4528
Parliament buildings committee, 1718
Patronage, 1795
Postal treaties, 4529
Post Office Act Amdt. bill, 4436, 4528
Railway mail service, 4529

Murray Bay Point au Pic wharf, 973

Murray Stewart, steamer. *See* Marine; Vessels

Musgrave, Governor, 1916

Musk Ox in Barren Lands, evidence of Mr. Stefansson, 1073

Mustapha Kemal. *See* Near East Crisis

Naphtha. *See* Petroleum and Naphtha

Nappan, dairy herd, 2863

Napoleon, Code. *See* Code Napoleon

Napoleonic Wars
Agricultural products and rents, 1858
Conditions following, 1231

Narcotic Drugs
Export of, 698
International conference, 698
Opium and Narcotic Drugs Act
Administration, 697, 1443
Enforcement by Mounted Police, 1142
Prosecutions, 698

Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. Bill
(Consolidation; appeals; identification; penalties)
1r., 1136; 2r., com., 2114; 3r., 2124; Senate amdts; 3149

Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. Bill—*Con.*
Sections and subjects discussed:
Appeal, restriction of, 2120
Certificate of Dominion analyst, 2119
Definitions, 2114
Deportation, convicted alien, 2123
Importing or exporting without license, 2114
Licenses and fees, 2114
Liniments, ointments, etc. 2117
Onus of proof, 2117, 3149
Opium
Resort, being in, 2117
Smoking, 2117
Penalties, 3149
Persons to whom drugs may be sold, 2115
Physicians, veterinary surgeons, dentists, 2115
Power to search for drugs, 2120
Records, not keeping, 2115

National Council of Women, Mrs. James Carruthers, 1647

National Dairy Council. *See* Dairying

National Debt. *See* Public Debt

National Defence
Accounts, qu. 205
Active militia, pensions, 2166, 3706
Ammunition, 884
Artillery, 1740
MacBrien, General, 1742
Great Britain from, statement, 1740
Quantity in store, 1741
Small arms, 1741, 1743
Annual training. *See under this title,* Militia
Armouries
Fittings and alterations, 1024
Haileybury, 4615
Minto Street, Winnipeg, qu. 2084
Army, mental tests, 1219
Arsenals, 2165
Lindsay, 883, 1744
Quebec, 884, 1740
Bonus to employees, 1751, 1772
Boy Scouts, 879
Cadet services, 877, 1743
Canadian Air Force, 1748
Camp Borden, 1749
Approaches to, improvement, 1749, 4565
Building and equipment, acquisition of, 1777
Desertions, 2418
Hospital accommodation, 1777
Repair shops, 1750, 1774
Central repair shops, 1750
Equipment, new, 1774, 1748

National Defence—*Con.*
Canadian Air Force—*Con.*
Expenditure, 2970
Forest patrol, 1776
Royal air force, aeroplanes, gift, 1748
Vickers company, 1748
Clothing and necessaries, 883
Colt machine guns, inventions, 4635
Department
Acting Minister, 2710. *See also* Graham; Macdonald
Desbarats, Mr. G. J., financial controller, 1806, 3342
Estimates, 859, 1740, 1772, 4635
Expenditures by provinces, 3891
Fiset, General Sir Eugene, 1806
Retirement, 891, 3342, 3135
Macdonald, Hon. E. M., appointment as Acting Minister, 2295
Naval Service, amalgamation, 3342
Salaries and wages, 900, 901
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, amalgamation, 3893
Staff reduction, 1773
Survey work, 2508
Disbursements, qu. 344
Engineer services and works, 4638
Fort Osborne barracks, 4628
Grants to associations, 889
Hector celebration, 4636, 4705
May, Miss H. M., compassionate grant, 900
Militarism, 866
Military districts, reduction, 868
Military expenditure, 858, 873, 901, 2921, 3076, 3238
Reduction of, M. (Mr. Lanctot) 866, neg. 876
Military properties, maintenance, 889
Military signal service, 3338
Militia
Annual training, 859, 4635
Expenditure and results, 2933
Militia camps at harvest time, 3976
Payments since 1922, 386
Pensions. *See* Militia Pensions bill; Pensions
Petawawa Camp and Ontario elections, 3976, 4005, 4162
Regimental funds, qu. 4010
Services, 859, 1747
Use of in strikes. *See under this title,* Troops
Militia Act, aid to civil power. *See under this title,* Troops
Naval Service, 1744
Consolidation with National Defence and Marine depts., 3341
Curtailment of, 2933

National Defence—*Con.*
Naval Service—*Con.*
Esquimalt
Naval college, 1744
Navy yard, qu. 1634
Stores, 4638
Expenditure, 3076
Naval colleges, Esquimalt and Halifax, 1744
Royal Canadian naval reserve, recruiting, 2897, 2950
Royal Canadian navy, 900, 902
War claims, adjustment, 900
Llandovery castle, sinking, 1745
Vickers Company, contract, cancellation, 1746
Northover, Major H. R., Colt machine guns, 4635
Ordnance
Arms, lands, etc. 890
Montreal stores building, 1022
Pay of staff, 890
Peachy, Mr. C., Regina, grant, 4638
Permanent force, 892
Physical training, 877
Royal Canadian regiment, 4638
Schools of instruction, 900
Tecumseh barracks, London, 4638
Topographical surveys, expenditure, qu. 1865
Troops, use of in labour troubles, 495, qu. 624, 861, 866, 893, 1627
Valcartier camp grounds, qu. 2298
War claims, adjustment, 1745
Militia services, 900
War medals, 1743
Warlike stores, 900
Wireless stations, 3337
Wolseley barracks, London, 4638

National Fuel Policy. *See* Fuel

National Gallery, 1018, 2688

National Industrial Conference. *See* Labour

National Monument. *See* Monuments and Memorials; Ottawa

National Parks. *See* Canadian National Parks and Historic Sites; Dominion Lands and Parks

National Parks and Reservations Bill
(Separation of parks from reservations; administration as recreation grounds; bird and wild animal sanctuaries; historic sites) 1r., 3131

National Policy. *See also* speeches on Budget
Adoption by Liberal party, 2838
Agriculture and, 2786
Anti-national and anti-social, 3018
Budget in accordance with, 2718
Canada's development due to, 2818
Permanency of, 4652
Results, 3060
Rural interests, unjust to, 2786
Special privileges, 2786

National Railways. *See* Canadian National Railways

National Trust Company, 57
Statement of president on immigration, 1123

National Status. *See* Canada's Participation in War; Imperial Conference; Treaties, Halibut Treaty

National Transcontinental. *See* Canadian National Railways

Nationalists, Conservative alliance with, 2924

Nationality. *See* Naturalization
Mental tests according to, 1219

Natural Gas. *See* Natural Resources

Natural Resources, 1880-1, 2836. *See also* Coal; Forests and Forestry; Fuel; Hudson Bay Railway; Immigration; Mines and Minerals; Timber
Alberta, revenue from, qu. 2515
Development, 2785
Capital necessary for, 2744, 2802, 3027
Estimate of value, 2719
Valuable only when developed, 2744
Drainage, 3256
Forests, 3416. *See also* Forests and Forestry
Gaspe, 1242
Hoppe leases, 3128. *See also* Hoppe
Interchange with United States, 2910
Maritime provinces, equity of, 2972
Minerals, 3198. *See also* Coal; Mines
Investigation of, 3197
Natural gas, well-drilling machinery, 3487
Ownership and taxation, 2729
Paternalism, 3071
Per capita value, 2714
Regaining of, 2728
Unemployment, 629
Water powers, 3420
Western provinces, 21, 2782, 2972, 3424
Expenditure upon, 2510
Immigration policy and, 1092. *See also* Immigration

Naturalization. *See also* Aliens; Immigration
Administration of acts, 2495
Judges and. *See* Naturalization Acts Amdt.
Jurisdiction over. *See* Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill
Oriental. *See* Immigration, Oriental
Repatriation, M. (Mr. Carroll) 1379, withdrawn, 1382
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 778. *See also* Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill

Naturalization Acts Amdt. Bill
1r., 1384; 2r., com., 2107; com., 2182; 2437; 3983; 3r., 3985
Sections and subjects discussed:
Application for naturalization, 2109
Arbitrary powers, 2456
British system, 2438
Citizenship, obstacles in way of, 2455
Consolidation, 2110, 2182, 2199, 2437
Correspondence, Secretary of State and county court judges, Vancouver, 2199
Denaturalization, 2332, 2451, 2456
Foreigners, attitude towards Canada, 2458
Japan, nationality, 2443
Japanese, 1899
Judges, 2437, 2446, 2451
Application for naturalization, 3983
Investigations, "huge joke," 2446
Judicial and executive authority, 2462
Nationality, dual, amdt. (Mr. Neill) 2442, 2451, 2456, 2463
Natural-born British subject, definition, 2107
Naturalization
Imperial, 2463
Limited, 2461
Politics and, 2438, 2466
Orientals, 2461
Relationship, naturalization law to Immigration Act, 2455
Repeal, 3983
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 2438
Secretary of State, 2437
Administration by, 2437, 2453
Discretion, 2447
Winnipeg Free Press, editorial, 2454

Naval Defence. *See under* National Defence, Naval Service

Naval Protection. *See* Canada's Participation in War

Naval Service. *See* Imperial Conference; National Defence

Navigation. *See* Marine and Fisheries; St. Lawrence

Navy. *See* Canadian Government Merchant Marine; National Defence

Near East Crisis. *See also* Canada's Participation in War; Imperial Conference
Canada's participation, 12-13, 25, 40, 45, 71, 105, 120-121, 141, 162, 169, 1266, 2815, 4655
Prime Minister, statement, 29-33

Necessaries of Life. *See* Address; Budget; Combines; Consumer; Cost of Living; Prices; Tariff; Taxation

Negro Point breakwater, 4587

Neill, Mr. Alan W. (Comox-Alberni)
Address in reply, 174; the two amendments, 174; economy and free trade, 175-176; policy of moderate protection, 177
Agricultural conditions in West, 1192
Alaskan, wreck of, 1212, 1659, 3160
British Columbia fishing licenses, 1550
Business of the House, M. to increase taxation, 3937
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill, 3971
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2408
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, 114
Canadian National Railways, agents for labour supply, 1191
Canadian Pacific railway, labour supply, 1191
Certificated masters, coasting vessels, 3971
Cheque tax, 3925, 3931
Amdt. 3935
Payment with postage stamps, 1818
Chinese Immigration bill, 2310-36, 4537
Children born in Canada, 2323
Head tax, 2323
Merchants and students, 2323
Fraudulent entry, 2324
Merchants
Definition of, 2483
Retail, attitude towards, 2322
Scope of, 2323
Coal, bituminous, duty, 1278, 3495, 3499
Eight-hour law, conference, qu. 207, qu. 279
Excise taxes, payment with postage stamps, 1818
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4274
Fish and fisheries
British Columbia fishing licenses, 1550
Freight rates, 1953
Norwegian fishermen, 1192
Free trade, Progressives and, 1196
Freight rates
Oliver, Hon. John, 1952
Railway rates, equalization, M. (Mr. Clark), 1951
Original motion, effect of, 1953

Neill, Mr. Alan W.—*Con.*
Fuel oil, competition with coal, 807
Fuel supply, 807
M. (Mr. Church) 1278
Hindu immigrants, franchise, 4643
Immigration
Attitude of labour towards, 1193
Canadian National and Canadian Pacific agents, 1191
Commonwealth Club of California, 1195
Labour employers and, 1193
Norway and Sweden from, 1191
Oriental. *See also under this title,* Chinese Immigration
Chinese, registration certificates, 1452
Exclusion from United States, 1194
Japanese
Anglo-Japanese treaty, 1450
Lemieux agreement, 1450
Naturalization, 2442
Registration system, 1452
Supposed special privileges to landholders, 1450
Violation of regulations, 1451
Policy, 1191
Population not increased by, 1195
Propaganda, 1192
Railways and, 1193
"Unseen Hand", the, 1193
Immigration Act Amdt. bills, 3981
Intending immigrants, 74, 497, 4441
Imperial Conference, 4643-49
Income tax, 1195, 4501
Japan, trade with, 1450
Labour. *See also under this title,* Immigration
Discontent, 1194
Right to organize, 2896
Macphail, Miss, members and party funds, 4240
Naturalization. *See also under this title,* Immigration
Japanese, 2442
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2109, 2442, 2465
Amdt. 2442
Nationality, dual, 2442
New Zealand Immigration Act, 497
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3516, 3564
Opium and Narcotic Drugs Act, 700
Pacific coast steamship services, 4003
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3860
Pensions
Appeal boards, 680
Committees, 288
Powell River Paper Company, 2886, 2896
Promissory notes tax, 3925

Neill, Mr. Alan W.—*Con.*
Proportional representation, 393
Railway Commission, steamship services and, 4003
Reciprocity with United States, 1196
Renovated butter, 4266
Revenue stamps, 1818
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4240
Seymour Narrows, obstruction to navigation, 3333
Steamship services
Canada-West Indies, 3388
Competition, 3398
Railway Commission, control, 4003
Tax exempt bonds, qu. 342
Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner) 1291, 4645
Amdt. (Mr. Neill), 1292
Seconder, 1308
Uchucklesit-Ecoole telegraph line, 1017
Unemployment, 1193
Hoboes, 1194
Wheat bounty, 1196

Nelson, B.C.
Board of Trade, Mounted Police, 2943
Ore-testing plant, 2505, 2507

Netherlands, The. *See also* Holland; Immigration
Senate, constitution of, 1372

New Brunswick. *See also* Maritime Provinces
Agricultural conditions, 2763
Assignments and Preferences Act, 3087
Bonded warehouses, 1212
Canadian Air Force, 1748
Capital punishment, execution of sentence, 768
Coal, 804
Dredging, 4951
Employment offices, 1630
Forest fires, relief, 4010
Gas and oil fields, 2949, 3920
Geological survey, 2504
Harbours and rivers, 945
Highways, 3182, 4587. *See also* Canada Highways; Highways
Immigration, 1086, 1198, 1476
Bowder, Mr., representative, Great Britain, 1086
Indians, 2124, 2153
Kent Northern railway, 4189
Labour scarcity in lumber camps, 1125
New Brunswick Gas and Oil Fields, 2949, 3920
Permanent force, strikes, 1627
Petroleum bounty, 2648
Potatoes, 137-139, 2763

New Brunswick—*Con.*
Public buildings, 4613
Representation, Canadian National board, qu. 282
Shale deposits, 2513
Veniot, Premier, statement, qu. 1488

New Carlisle, Que., wharf, 973

New Ontario. *See* Ontario

New Westminster, liquor sales, 2415

New York
Canadian customs officer at, 1213, 1920, 2419, qu. 2611, 3272, 3275

New York Tribune, reported statement, Mr. Meighen, on immigration, 2790

New Zealand
Butter competition, 2863
Dairying industry, 3297
Immigration
British, 2932
Chinese, 2313
Empire settlement scheme, 1473
Immigration Act, 497
Policy, 1882
Land settlement policy, 1406
Legislative council, constitution, 1371
Participation in Eastern Crisis. *See* Near East Crisis

Newcombe, Mr. E. L., K.C.
Opinions
Canada Temperance Act, 2408
Naturalization, 2440
Wholesale Grocers' Case, 2521
Visit to United States, 3823

Newfoundland steamship service, 2171, 2173, 3377

News Items, dissemination of. *See* Press

News Service. *See* Press

Newspapers. *See* Press

Newsprint. *See* Pulp and Paper

Niagara and St. Catharines Railway, 2475

Niagara Falls
Michigan Central bridge
Construction contracts, qu. 1864
Remission of sales tax, qu. 1257
Power. *See* Welland canal

Niagara District, Grape-growers, competition, 452. *See* Treaties, French; Wines

Nickle Resolution. *See* Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner)

Nickle, shipments to Germany during war 4371

Nicolet
Descoteaux, Mr. J. F., election, 2837
Vacancy, 2178

Nicomen Island, protection, 626

Nipissing Indian reserve, 1307

Nitti, Ex-Premier, of Italy, 46, 313

"Noble Eighteen". *See* Reciprocity

Noble Foundation Farm, 2813

Nolin, Mrs. J., St. David postmistress, 1489

Nominative Scheme. *See* Immigration

Nominative Senate. *See* Senate

North Atlantic Trading Company. *See* Immigration

North Atlantic and U.K. Conference. *See* Freight Rates, Shipping

North Essex Election. *See* Elections

North Vancouver. *See* Vancouver

Northern Ontario. *See* Ontario

Northern Pacific Halibut Fisheries Protection Bill. *See also* Treaties, Halibut
(Close season; use of Canadian ports; seizures; International Fisheries Commission)
Res. 4480; 1r., 2r., com., 4485; 3r., 4489

Northover, Major H. R., Colt machine guns, 4635

Northwest Rebellion. *See* Pensions

Northwest Territories
Administration, 3944, 3948
Indians, 2145
Procedure in criminal matters, qu. 1974
Purchase and maintenance of new ship, 4702

Northwest Territories Act Amdt. Bill
1r., 180; 2r., com., 270; 3r., 271; Senate amdts., 2050

Norway
Immigration from, 1191
Storthing, constitution of, 1372

Notes, Tax. *See* Taxation

Nova Scotia. *See also* Maritime Provinces
British Empire Steel Corporation, employees, 1705,
Coal, 1269, 1273, 1277, 3199. *See also* Coal; Fuel Supply
Coke and, 1268
Freight rates on, 1277, 2828
Production, qu. 490
Resources, 800
Confederation, attitude towards, 1376
Disallowance of statute. *See* Disallowance
Dredging, 4591
Emigration from, 1404
Expenditure, 4555
Experimental farms, 460
Harbours and rivers, 941, 4554, 4560, 4635, 4722. *See also that title*
Hector celebration, 4636, 4705
Highways, 3183. *See also that title*
Hydrographic survey, 3336
Immigration, 1086, 1200, 1476
Indians, 2124, 4702
Markets for, 2243
Miners
Strike, 495, 1627, 1716
Troops, use of, qu. 624, 866, 869, 892, 2893
United States delegates, detention, 3155. *See also* Howat; Meyerscough
Nova Scotia Historical Society, 3406
Ports, used by United States fishermen, 3906
Public buildings, 4612
Redistribution and, 73. *See also that title*
Representation, reduction. *See* Redistribution
St. Margaret's Bay road, qu. 3135
Secession, 2057, 2177
Resolution, 2243
Senate, elective or nominative, 1368-76
Sessional indemnity, reduction in, 1155
Steel bounties, 4371
Steel-workers strike, 1643
Supreme Court, Hon. D. D. McKenzie, appointment, 1810
Telegraph and telephone lines, 4590
Windsor, site of Fort Edward, 3406

Noxious Weeds. *See* Seed Inspection

Nursery Stock. *See also* Horticulture
Insects and pests, 596
Sales tax, 4432

Oaths of Office Bill, 1r., 3

Observatories. *See* Astrophysical; Interior

Ocean and River Service. *See* Marine

Ocean Freight Rates, 69. *See also* Freight Rates, Shipping

Ocean Ports. *See* Canadian National Railways; Ports

O'Connor, Mr. P. J., qu. 2085

Official Report of Debates. *See* House of Commons

Officials, travels of. *See* Government; Marshall

Ogilvie Milling Company, mill feeds, 2875

O'Halloran, Mr. George F. *See also* Patents
Copyright Act Amdt. bill, 2346

O'Hara, Captain Marshall. *See* Marine

Ohta, Hon. T. *See* Immigration, Oriental, Jananese

Oil. *See also* Bounties; Natural Resources; Petroleum
Alberta, 2802
Bounty, 2510
Prospecting and development, 780
Revenue from, qu. 2515
Southern, 2508, 3423
British Columbia oil companies, 2505
Coutts Sweet Grass Company, drilling, 2508
Customs drawbacks, 2655
Drilling operations, 2505
Fort Norman, 3423
Fuel oil
Competition with coal, 807, 1245
Importations, 1245
Shale deposits, Maritime provinces, 2513
Standardization, 808
Hudson's Hope, 4699
Imperial Oil Company, 4380
Leases, 3423
Lubricating, standardization, 808
Mineral and oil rights, 2510
New Brunswick Gas and Oil Fields, 3920
Petroleum. *See also that title*
Bounty, 2648, 2510, 3914
Duty, 2653, 2644
Oil companies, stock selling, 781
Search for, 2802
Speculation in claims, 3423
Southern Alberta, 2508, 3423
Used in manufacture of manila rope, 3901
Drawback, 3502
Well-drilling machinery, 2653, 3487

Oil Springs, Ont., postmaster, qu. 518

Old Age Annuities. *See* Labour, Annuities

Old Age Pensions. *See* Pensions

Oleomargarine. *See also* Dairying Industry
Agriculture and Colonization Com., discussion in, 3266
Butter and, 386. *See also* Dairying Industry
Canada Food Board, 3520
Canada only country prohibiting, 3531
Canadian Lumberman's Association, 3508
Class interests, 3534
Dairy Industry Act Amdt. bill, M. (Mr. Motherwell) that order be discharged, 3325, 3449. *See also that title*
Dairying industry and, 3296
Denmark, 3515, 3523
Difference of opinion in government, 3530
Duty, 2777
French treaty, 1984
Great War Veterans' Association, 3547
Health and, 3558
Ingredients, 3562
Labelling, 3152
Local Council of Women, 3513
"Manna," 3152
Manufacture, 3153, 3553
Manufacture, importation and sale
Further legislation, inquiry, 230, 1309, 2519, 2927
M. (Mr. Carroll) 1382, 3508; agreed to as amended, 3581
Amdt. (Mr. Kay), reversion to status quo ante, 3520, agreed to, 3580
Point of order, amdt. direct neg, 3521
Sub-amdt. (Mr. Good) govt. to submit legislation before end of session, 3567; neg., 3581
Point of order, 3571
Opportunity for discussion, 3510, 3519
Point of order, anticipatory motion, 3326
Precedence of, 3451
Materials for, imports, duty and drawback, 3503, qu. 3505
National Dairy Council, 3269, 3509
Order in council suspending prohibition, 3520, 3525, 3526
Pledge to dairymen, 3525, 3531
Propaganda, 3266, 3402
Protection, 3534, 3546
Regulations, 3517
Restaurants, sale in, 3517
Restrictions, 3517
Retail Merchants' Association, 3508, 3551
Substitute, 3522
Victoria Board of Trade, telegram, 3513
War measure, 3520, 3525
Western farmers and, 1423
Women, 3508

Oliver, Hon. Frank, Hudson Bay railway, 1053

Oliver, Hon. John
Freight rates, 1915, 1952
Kitsilano Indian reserve, 383

Olivier, Hon. Mr., Senate, elective or nominative, 1367

Olympic Games, Canadian team, 4706

One-Sixth Vote. *See* Supply, Interim Supply

Ontario
Agricultural conditions, 2765
Attorney General
Betting information, 1483
Combines, 2585
Wholesale Grocers case, decision, 2051 2521
Bootlegging, 2410
Canadian Air Force, 1748
Coal, reported discovery, 2512
Court of Appeal, decision, 2051, 2521
Dredging, 1011, 4590
Drury government, expenditure and debt 2824
Experimental farms, 459
Farm labour, scarcity, 1416
Farmers and protection, 2818
Farmers' government and immigration, 1420
Government house, 4628
Government savings offices, qu. 1488
Interest rate, 1697
Grain elevators, 2037, 4716, 4719
Harbours and rivers, 981, 4588, 4594
Highways, 3177. *See also* Canada Highways; Highways
Expenditure, 2489
Home markets, 2818
Hydro-electric development, 426, 3056. *See also* Hydro
Hydro Power Commission, 1270
Immigration, 1085, 1096-8, 1320, 1428, 1475, 1476. *See also that title*
Child, and foster homes, 1099
Domestic servants, 1099
London office, 1428
Indians, 2124, 2146
Lake of the Woods. *See that title*
Legal, fees, expenditure, 1155
New Ontario
Agricultural conditions, 1401
French-Canadian settlement, 1401
Market for agricultural products, 1402
Northern Ontario
Colonization and settlement, 1401
Conditions and possibilities, 3037
Immigration into, 1097, 1112, 1320
Indians, 2151
Opportunities for settlers, 1097

Ontario—*Con.*
Oil bounty, 2510
Ontario elections and Petawawa camp, 3976, 4005, 4162
Ontario Factory Act, printing bureau, 1763
Ontario Temperance Act, 2410
Petroleum bounty, 2648
Protection sentiment, 2852
Public ownership, 3056
Pure-bred sheep, qu. 3141
Radial railways, 3056
Raney, Hon. W. E., Attorney General
Native wines, reduction of duty, 3035
Race-track betting, 712
Letter from, to Mr. Good, 2181
Rural mail carriers, remuneration, qu. 1255
See also Post Office
Soldier settlement, qu. 492
Timiskaming and Northern Ontario railway, 1071, 3056
United Farmers, co-operative stores, 4068
Water powers. *See* Lake of the Woods

Opium and Narcotic Drugs. *See* Narcotic Drugs

"Opium Joint". *See* Criminal Code Amdt.

Opposition. *See* Conservative Party; Meighen

Orders in Council
Canadian National Railways, 815
Civil Service Commission
June 29th, 1922, qu. 278
September 22nd, 1922, 380-1
Depreciated currency, 2988
Duties against United States, reduction by, 2649, 2650
Exemptions by, 359
Expenditure by, 949, 950
Government by, 1652, 1655, 4354
Marking of goods, 2988
Lead pencils, 2988
Lithographic works, 2988
Northern Pacific Halibut Fishery Protection bill, 4487
Number passed, 1921 and 1922, qu. 1488
Numbers
P. C. 220, unemployment, 435
P. C. 223, 815
P. C. 1053, qu. 516
P.C. 1566, 249
Oleomargarine, suspending prohibition of, 3520, 3525, 3526
Peace treaty, under, 767
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4349, 4393
Raisins and dried currants, duty, 3474, 3479
Repeal of by statute, 3504
Tariff reduction under, 3049
Wheat Board, 3046
Legislation extended, 3045

Ordnance Lands. *See* Interior

Ore-Testing. *See* Mines and Minerals

Orient, Trade with. *See* Trade; Vancouver Harbour Bill

Oriental Immigration. *See* Immigration

Orientals. *See also* British Columbia; Fish and Fisheries; Immigration; Labour; Narcotic Drugs Act; Naturalization
British Columbia in, 1541, 1893-1903
Deportation. *See* Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt.
Fishing licenses, reduction, 1548
Naturalization of, 2442. *See* Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill

Orillia, Champlain monument, 4705

Orthopedic Boots. *See* Customs Tariff Items

Ostrea Lake, N.S. wharf, 943

Ottawa
Canadian Press, Limited, 2523
Chateau Laurier, deficit, 2976
Daly building, purchase, 1023
Dominion Archives building, addition, 1730
Dominion observatory, 3242
Government workshops, 4616
National Gallery, 2688
National monument, Connaught place, 1020 2685
New departmental building, 1729, 4617
Architects, compensation, 4633
Newspaper combine, 2522, 2630
Ore-testing plant, 2505
Ottawa-Hull bridge, 1015, 4590
Parliament buildings, 1716
Printing bureau, 1022. *See also that title*
Too much government from, 3434

Ottawa Dairy Company, 2526, 2569

Ottawa Free Press Company, Labour Gazette, 1622

Ottawa-Pembroke highway, qu. 2085

Ottawa Printing Company, Labour Gazette, 1622

Ottawa River
Water powers, qu. 1974
Point Fortune, qu. 1974
Water storage, 815

Ottawa Typographical Union, copyrights, 2144

Overages. *See* Grain and Grain Trade, Elevators

Overseas Settlement Board. *See* Immigration

Owen, Admiral Sir W. F. W., St. Andrew's harbour, 2899

Owen Sound Wharf, 2690

Oxford Paper Company, Rumford, Maine, 835-6

Pacaud, Mr. L. T.
Appointment, 2710
International Labour Conference, 1539, 1647
Pacific Cable Board, representative, 1832

Pacific Cable Board, 1832

Pacific Coast Trade. *See* British Preference; Customs Tariff; Trade

Pacific Fisheries. *See* Japanese; Treaties, Halibut

Pacific Ocean ports. *See* Vancouver Harbour

Pacific Salvage Company, payments, qu. 1763

Paddle, Mr. J. W., claim of, 1832

Paints, 2739. *See also* Customs Tariff Items

Pairs. *See* House of Commons, Divisions

Panama Canal. *See also* New York, Customs Officer
Canadian customs regulations, 2519, 2615
Canned salmon via, 2615
Duty on goods passing between Canadian ports, 2519, 2615
Grain shipments, 77, 1921. *See also* Grain
Imports through to British Columbia, 1921
Rail and water competition, 1920
Trade from western to eastern Canada, 2868
Trade, Great Britain to Pacific ports, 3053

Pan-American Union, 496

Panet, Mr. L. C., appointment. *See* House of Commons

Paper. *See* Press; Prices; Pulp and Paper

Paper Control. *See* Pulp and Paper

Paper Makers. *See* Powell River Company

Papineau, Mr. L. J. (Beauharnois)
Estimates, time of presentation, 4555
Public expenditure, 4554

Parent, Mr. George (Quebec West)
Arctic expedition, 4012
Arctic islands and northern Quebec, 814
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4094

Parent, Mr. George—*Con.*
Canadian Pacific railway, Quebec terminals, 815
Cold storage Act Amdt. bill, 2054
Demers, Mr. Amedee, qu. 1868
Ottawa river, water storage, 815
Patents of Invention bill, 2102
Quebec Harbour Commission, cold storage, 2055
Raisins, imports, qu. 2699

Pari-Mutuel System. *See* Race Track Betting

Paris Agency, expenses, 4001

Paris Offices. *See* Canadian National Railways

Park-Davis Company, Metagen, qu. 1867

Parks. *See* Canadian National Parks and Historic Sites; Dominion Forest Reserves and Parks; Dominion Lands and Parks; Interior

Parliament
Farmers in, 2732. *See also* Progressive Party
Function of, statement of Edmund Burke, 3018
Opening of, 1
Prorogation, 4755

Parliament Buildings, 1716
Architects, settlement with, 1716
Baker, the late Col. G. H., memorial, 435, 730, 1256, 1991
Central column at entrance, memorial, 2685
Committee, 1718
Common meeting room, 1727
Commons chamber
Accoustics, 1721. *See also* House of Commons
Lighting, 1728
Members' galleries, 1729
Estimates, M. (Sir Henry Drayton) to reduce, 1727, neg. 1728
Expenditure
To complete, 1716
To date, 1718
Law, the late Mr. Bowman B., tablet, 1020
Marchand, Mr., architect, commission, 1718
Members' rooms
Allocation of, 1729
Lighting, 1728
Ventilation, 1728
Old walls, destruction of, 1723-24
Pearson, Mr. John A., architect, 1716
Policing, 778
Tower, 1722
Chimes, 1722
Completion of, 1719

Parliamentary Documents. *See* Government Publications

Parliamentary Library. *See* Library

Parliamentary Practice, amending of. *See* Lack of Confidence, M.

Parliamentary Procedure. *See* Deputy Speaker; House of Commons; Speaker

Parliamentary Responsibility. *See* Canadian National Railways, Branch Lines, Management Lack of Confidence

Parliamentary Restaurant, Committee, 53, 382

Parole System. *See* Justice

Participation in War. *See* Canada; Near East Crisis

Partisanship. *See* Political Partisanship

Party Funds, members and, 4237

Party System of Government, 1235, 1254

Passamaquoddy Bay, harbour, 2899, 2938

Passports
Immigrants, 1170
Passport office, 4707
Requirements as to, 3988

Pasteur, Louis, scientific contributions, 1287

Patent Medicines. *See* Health

Patents. *See also* Patent Act Amdt. bill
Revocation of, 2528
Under Combines Act, 2522

Patents and Copyright Branch. *See* Trade and Commerce

Patents of Invention Bill. *See also* Trade Marks and Designs Bill
(To amend and consolidate acts)
1r., 331; 2r., 2064; com., 2064, 2086; 2128; 3r., 2131; Senate amdts., 3154
Sections and subjects discussed:
Appeals, 2129
Exchequer court, 2079
Application for patents, 2067
Conflicting
To be decided by Exchequer court, 2079
To be submitted to arbitration, 2129
Joint, assignments, 2057, 2104, 2130
Particulars required, 2073
Withdrawal of, 2079

Patents of Invention Bill—*Con.*
Section and subjects discussed—*Con.*
Assignments, refusal to execute, 2069
Berne convention, 2064
Commissioner, duties and powers, 2064, 2104, 2128
Conditions, 2089, 2104
Definition, 2064
Domicile, election of, 2070
Food or medicines, 2078
Foreign patents, 2068
Form of issue, 2082
Government use of patented inventions, 2100
Improvements, patenting of, 2069
Inspection by the public, 2101
Issue of new or amended patents, 2082
Models and specimens, 2076
Oath of inventor, 2069
Patent agent or attorney, 2102
Patent office, 2064
Patents for inventions by persons in Public Service, 2082, 2104
Patents to be assignable, 2083, 2086
Register of attorneys, 2101
Repeal, 2102
Restoration and revival of patent, 2100
Revocation of patent, time limit, 2099
Right of appeal, 2100
Special methods or processes of manufacture, 2076
Specifications, drawings, etc., 2073
Suit pending, 2102
Tariff of fees, 2100
Term limit, 2082
What patents shall contain, etc., 2082

Paternalism, excess of, 1133. *See also* Legislation

Patronage. *See* Civil Service; Political Patronage

Patterson, Hon. J. C., investigator of titles, 3360

Peace Relations. *See* Imperial Conference; League of Nations

Peace River District
German settlers, 1184
Immigration literature, 1433
Railways, 4324
Construction, 1433, 1440, 3006
Grande Prairie railway, 4200
Prince George railway, 1434, 4701
Survey, 4698
Settlement in, 1184
Soldier settlers, 1185

Peace Treaty. *See* Germany, Reparations; Treaties

Pearson, Mr. John A., architect. *See* Parliament Buildings

Peat. *See* Fuel Supply

Pecuniary Claims Convention, with United States, 779

Peel, Sir Robert, Corn Laws
Abolition of 3050
Reversal of policy on, 3007

Pelee Island steamship service, 2174

Pelletier, Mr. F. J. (Matane)
Belanger, Mr. A. C., 1489
Boulay, Mlle, postmistress, Sayabec, 3751, 3759
Matane harbour improvements, 971
Printing committee, fourth report, 4510

Penitentiaries. *See* Justice

Penman's Limited, securities and dividends, 3463

Penny Bank of Toronto Act Amdt. Bill
(Change of name)
1r., 1739; 2r., com., 3r., 2052

Pension Act Amdt. Bill
(Cases subject to review; district appeal boards; federal appeal boards)
Res. 3401, 3748; 1r., 3748; 2r., com., 3848; 3r., 3887; Senate amdts. 4744
Sections and subjects discussed:
Appeals to district review board, 3875
Recommendations final, amdt. (Mr. Black, Yukon), 3875, neg. 3881
Time for, 3881
Extension from 3 months to one year, amdt. (Mr. Logan) agreed to, 3881
To be decided under Pension Act, amdt. (Mr. Marler) 3881, neg. 3882
British expeditionary force, members, 3873
Date of coming into force, 3873
Death within five years, 4745
Amdt. (Mr. Clark) 3884, agreed to, 3885
Disability
Attributable to military service, 4745
Amdt. (Mr. Ladner) 3850, neg. 3870
Extent of, how estimated, 3873
In respect of which pensions claimed, 3848
Pensions according to, 3873
Pre-enlistment, 3849
Time of appearance, 3872

Pension Act Amdt. Bill—*Con.*
Section and subjects discussed—*Con.*
District review boards, 3874
Staff or ex-staff officer not eligible, amdt. (Mr. Black), Yukon) 3875, neg. 3875
Federal appeal board, 3875
Insurance principle, 3851
Payment of expenses, 3881
Pension payable to descendants, amdt (Mr. Manion) agreed to, 3886
Review of pension legislation, 3851
When no deduction of pension, 3873
Widow, 4745
Bigamous marriage, 3732, 3886
Who marries after disability appears amdt. (Mr. Caldwell) 3882, agreed to 3884
Widowed mother, 3870
Mother whose husband is helpless, amdt. (Mr. LeSueur) 3870, agreed to, 3871

Pensions. *See also* Canadian National Railways; Judges; Militia Pension Act; Ministers' Salaries and Members' Indemnities; Pensions Act Amdt. Bill
Appeals
Appeal boards, 77, 3875
Dominion Veterans Alliance, com. 3860
Federal, 4703
Attributability, 3850
British expeditionary force, members, 3873, 3885
Committee, re-appointment, inquiry, 288
Commutation of, qu. 4132. *See under this title,* European War
Decrease in amount, 23
Disability entitling to, 677
District boards of review, 4703
European war and active militia, 2166, 3706, 3707
Estimates, suggested postponement, 2166
Expenditure, 2987
Fenian raid, 3742, 3873
Great War Veterans' Association, 2167, 4535
Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railway employees, 3195
Judges, qu. 492
McDougall, Mrs. William, 3949
Malone, late Lieut.-Col. qu. 206
Medical examination of prisoners, 670
Militia. *See* Militia Pension Act. Amdt bills
Mothers, 2827
Conference with provincial governments, 3046
Northwest rebellion, 3742

Pensions—*Con.*
Old age, 1646, 2817, 2827, 3032. *See also* Labour, Annuities
Conference with provincial government, 3046
Federal and provincial jurisdiction, 1646
Inquiry as to legislation, 733, qu. 2517, 2518
Liberal convention of 1919, res., 1652
Pension Act. *See also* Pension Act Amdt.
Administration of, 3706
Suggested amendments, 2166
Pension Commissioners, board of
Appeal from, 677
Charges against, 685
Estimates, 2166
Interpretation of Pension Act, 2639, 2943
North Essex election and, 670, 708, 2014
Report, 516, 4736
Res., Victoria, B.C., for removal, 3399
Salaries and contingencies, 2168, 3742
Pension legislation, review of, 3851
Petition from veteran organizations, 4535-36
Pilots, 3359
Ralston report. *See under this title,* Royal Commission
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 774, qu. 1362
Royal commission
Expenses, 691
Recommendations of, 2394, 2942, 3733
Legislation to be introduced, 2394, 2519, 2639, 3400. *See also* Pensions Act Amdt. Bill; Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act Amdt. Bill; Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment Act Amdt. bill
Inquiry as to, 2639, 2983
Opportunity to discuss, 674, 2394
Reports
First interim report, 2166, 2926, 2983
Final, inquiry, 2516
Printing, qu. 207, 288, 1631, 3401
M. for 1992, 2128
Senators, 1376
South African War, 3873
Tuberculous patients, 3850
Unemployed relief, expenditure, 2168
Women, 1651
Widows, 681

Perfumery. *See* Treaties, French

Peribonka, Que., wharf, 973

Periodicals. *See* Magazines and Periodicals;

Permanency. *See* Reciprocity; Tariff

Permanent Force. *See* National Defence

Peru, Senate, constitution of, 1373

Petawawa Camp, Ontario elections and, 3976, 4005, 4162

Peterborough, weights and measures inspection, qu. 492, 810

Petition of Right Act Amdt. Bill. *See also* Dominion Lands Act Amdt. Bill (Coal Leases)
(Revocation of fiat obtained by fraud)
1r., 2639; 2r., com., 3127; 3r., 3130
Sections and subjects discussed:
Fiats, issue and publication of, 3222, 3224
Hoppe leases, 3127
Isenberg estate, 3128
Revocation of fiat obtained by fraud, 3127

Petroleum. *See also* Oil
Administration of act, 780
Bounty, 2510, 2648, 2949, 3914, 3963
Duty, 2644, 2653, 3035, 3963
New Brunswick Gas and Oil Fields, 2949
Production and payment, qu. 3262

Petroleum and Naphtha Inspection Act Amdt. Bills
1. Regulations governing sale of naphtha
Res. 3749; order discharged, 3969
2. Sale of naphtha
1r., 4248; 2r., 4249; com., 4276; 3r., 4276

Petroleum Bounty Act Amdt. Bill
(Reduction and discontinuance of bounty)
Res. 2657, 3914, 3963; 1r., 3963; 2r., com., 3r., 4392

Pharmaceutical Preparations. *See* Health

Physical Training. *See* National Defence, Cadet Services,

Piche Point, Que. wharf, 973

Pictou, N.S., dredging, 4584. *See also* Harbours and Rivers

Pictou-New Glasgow-Antigonish steamship service, 2174

Pictou-Souris-Magdalen Islands steamship service, 2174

Pictures. *See* National Gallery

Pierreville, Que., postmaster, qu. 4511

Pilotage. *See* Canada Shipping Act; Marine and Fisheries

Pineapples, production in Fiji Islands, 1848

Pioneer, the, recognition of, 1394, 2870

Piracy. *See* Copyright Act Amdt. Bill

Pitt, William, reciprocity treaty, France, 3050

Plains of Abraham, Battle of, soldiers who became farmers, 1188

Plaster Quarries. *See* Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute

Playgrounds. *See* Canadian National Parks and Historic Sites

Plebiscites. *See* Canada Temperance Act

Pocket Boroughs. *See* Labour, Right to Organize

Pointe à Elie, Que. wharf, 974

Point au Pic, Murray Bay, wharf, 973

Pointe aux Trembles, Que. wharf, 974

Pointe Shea (Amherst) pier, 977

Poland
Immigration, 1204
Treatment of Ukrainians. *See* West Ukrainian Republic

Political Offenders, imprisonment, 3157

Political Parties. *See also* Conservative; Liberal; Progressive
Big interests, contributions, 2856, 3070
Capital and, 2810
Liberal and Conservative, 2793, 2812

Political Partisanship. *See also* Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power)
Costly, 2787
Dismissals for, 3344

Political Patronage. *See also* Civil Service; National Policy
Alberta, 522
Appointments, 2710. *See also* Post Office
Boulay, Mlle, dismissal of, 3706, 3750
Canadian National Railways, 134-135
Charlotte county, N.B., 945
Civil Service, 519
Indians, medical service, doctors, 2160
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, appointment, 3303. *See also that title*
Patronage list, 946
Political supporters, jobs for, 2710
Post offices, 3316. *See also* Post office
Sorel shipyard, 3344, 3374

Political Policies. *See also* speeches on Budget; Conservative Party; Liberal Party; National Policy; Progressive Party; Reciprocity
Appropriation of, 2781
Big interests and, 2856, 3070
"Doubtful virtue of consistency," 3056
Economic group organization, 3003
Graft, big interests and old parties, 2855
Liberal and Conservative, 2812
Platforms
Repudiation of, 2973, 2994
Value of, statement, Mr. Euler, 2852, 2974, 2991
Proposed, Hon. Mr. Tolmie, 2870
Reversal of, 3007
Two parties but one policy, 2793

Pollution of Boundary Waters. *See* Health

Pollution of Rivers. *See* Marine

Pool Rooms. *See* Race Track Betting

Pool Selling. *See* Criminal Code Amdt. Bill

Pope, Sir Joseph. *See* External Affairs

Population. *See also* Budget; Emigration; Immigration
Birth rate, 1197
Death rate, 1197
Distribution of, 2747
Immigration
Natural increase and, 1871-1921, 1207
Not increased by, 1195
Increase, 1398, 2819
Net, 1173
Loss of, 119, 1439, 3018. *See also* Emigration
Ratio of public employees to, 3027
Representation by. *See* Proportional Representation
Tax burden upon, 3001. *See also* Taxation
Triplets, bonus for, inquiry, 3145

Pork Products. *See* Bacon; Meats

Port Arthur
Grain shipments, 1114. *See also* Grain
Harbour improvements, 2675, 4610

Port Arthur Shipbuilding Company, 3354

Port Burwell harbour works, 983, 1012

Port Colborne elevator, 4690. *See also* Grain

Port Dover, Fathers Dollier and Galinee, monument, 3433

Port Elgin breakwater, 2690

Port Greville, N.S. breakwater, 944

Port Mulgrave-Bras d'Or Lakes steamship services, 2174

Port Nelson. *See* Hudson Bay Railway

Port Renfrew, B.C. wharf, 1008

Portage la Prairie
Assiniboine river floods, 993, 998, 3041
District board, resolution, 3039
Indians medical service, doctors, 2160
Sewerage outlet, 993, 2679

Portage River, N.S. breakwater, 950

Porter, Mr. E. G. (East Hastings)
Belleville harbour commissioners, dismissal, qu. 491
Vancouver harbour bill, 269

Portland, Maine. *See also* Canadian National Railways, Terminals
Grain shipments via, qu. 1484

Ports. *See* British Preference; Canadian National Railways; Freight Rates, Shipping; Grain and Grain Trade; Imports and Exports; Shipping, *and also* their individual titles
Canadian, 2898. *See also* Lake Grain Rates
British preference and, 140, 2948, 3053, 3454. *See also* British Preference; Budget
Direct importation by, 3454, 3895
Discrimination against, 2960
Loading of grain cargoes at, 3974
Shipments via, 4714
Use of. *See also* Northern Pacific Halibut bill; Treaties, Halibut treaty
United States fishermen, by, 2735, 2940, 3361, 3906, 4480
Montreal. *See that title*
Ocean ports, 2937. *See also* Halifax; St. John
Comparative mileages, 2939
Passamaquoddy bay, 2938
St. Croix, 2899, 2938
Shippigan, 2938
Comparative mileage, 2939
Pacific, trade through Panama canal, 3053
Quebec. *See that title*
United States, grain shipments through, 3764
Vancouver. *See that title*
Wardens. *See* Canada Shipping Act

Portugal, Upper Chamber, constitution, 1372

Postal Conference. *See* Post Office

Postage Stamps. *See* Post Office

Postmaster General, absence through illness, 1314-15, 1538, 1816, 1821, 3067

Post Office
Aeroplane mail service, 1775
British mails, delay in, 2639, 2694, 2695
Canadian federation of postal employees, salaries, 1794
Daylight saving, qu. 3143
Department
Acting Minister, 2710
Annuities branch, 1640-42
Transfer to Labour dept., 1639
Bolte, Mr. Camille, correspondence, 1032 qu. 1138
Coolican, Mr. P. T., General Superintendent of Postal Service, 1816
Deputy Postmaster General
Appointment of, 1805, 2710
Coulter, Dr. R. M.
Retirement, 1822, 1825
Service and superannuation allowance, qu. 3135
Estimates, 1778, 1814
Proceedings in minister's absence, 1314
Hayes, Mr. John J., dismissal, 1687
Lemaire, Mr. E. J., 1822
Purchasing Commission and, 4001
Revenue
Gross, 1818, 1825
Not connected with postal service, 1815
Salaries and contingencies, 1793-4, 1814
Staff, 1824
Superintendeent of mail services, 1814
Superintendent of postal services, Mr. George Ross, retirement, 1825
Supplies, purchase of, 3951
Surplus claimed, 1817
Verrett, Mr. Hector, retirement, 1826
Dismissals and appointments. *See under this title,* Postmasters
International Postal Conference, 4529
Letter carriers
Bonus to, 1784
Salaries, 1780
Mail contracts. *See also under this title,* Rural Mail
Demers, Mr. Amedee, qu. 1868, 1977
Sporting Mountain, N.S., qu. 707, 856
Trois Pistoles, qu. 4302
Mail service, 1778
Mail subsidies and steamship subventions. *See* Steamship Services
Ocean mail, pilot boats and, 3359
Pacaud, Mr. Lucien T., 1832
Patronage, 1794. *See also under this title,* Postmasters

Post Office—*Con.*
Postage rates
Letter rate
United States and Canada, comparison, 2745
War tax, 2744, 2858
Newspapers and periodicals, 4436, 4528
Public libraries, 1809
Reduction of, 1779, 2824, 2945
Special delivery, 1872, 2933
Postage stamps
Commission on sale of, 1819
Payment of excise taxes with, 1815, 1818, 1820, 2979, 3927, 3937, 4435
Sale of, 2979
Selling cost, 1818
Postal contracts. *See under this title,* Mail, Rural Mail
Postal service
Quebec district, extra service compensation, 1832
Postal Treaty with United States, 2, 4529
Postmasters
Agents for annuities, 1641-42
Appointments and dismissals, 1809, 1827, 4534
Appointments
List of, 1830
Members' recommendations, 1799-1829
Political patronage, 3316
Returned soldiers, 1799
Dismissals, 4534
Angouleme, Quebec, qu. 3139
Blondin, Mr. C. E., Pierreville, qu. 4511
Boucher, Mrs., Pierreville, qu. 4511
Boulay, Mlle. Adrienne, Sayabec, 3706, 3750
Brussels, 1800
Chicoutimi-Saguenay, qu. 3138
Clementsport, qu. 1363, 1795, 1831, 4534
Frenette, Mr. George, qu. 2698
Herbertville, qu. 3139
Labarre, Que. dismissals, qu. 3138
Larouche, qu. 3137
Levis county, qu. 519
Mara, B.C., qu. 1489, qu. 1739
Midland, qu. 623
Morinville postmistress, qu. 1028
North Oakville, 914
Oil Springs, Ont., qu. 518
Portsmouth, Ont., 1832
Rawding, Mr., dismissal, 1795
Renfrew, qu. 205
St. Barnabe Nord, Que., 1830
St. Bruno, Que. qu. 3140
Ste. Claire, Que., qu. 1031

Post Office—*Con.*
Postmasters—*Con.*
Dismissals—*Con.*
St. Joseph d'Alma, qu. 3140
St. Peters', N.S., 1795
Morrison, Mr. D.W., qu. 1488
Sorel, qu. 1487
Tadoussac, Que., qu. 3139
Wingham, 1800
Woodbridge, 1821
Commission on stamp sales, 1818
Patronage, 3316
Residence, 1796
Post office money orders, tax, 3923
Post Offices
Grade Three, qu. 4300
Montreal. *See also that title*
Appointments, qu. 1361
Bolte, Mr. Camille, correspondence, 1032 qu. 1138
Inquiry branch, qu. 2516
Number of post offices, qu. 3135
Postal station "G," qu. 623
Promotions, qu. 2298
Saskatoon post office, 1785
Toronto
Postal station "A," 4624
Post office building, 3277
Revenue, 1779
Radio equipment, 1780
Railway mail service, 1783, 4529
Payments to Canadian Pacific, qu. 3143
Rural mail service
Anderson, Mr. G. C., 1821
Carriers
Compensation for loss, 1832
Paddle, Mr. J. W., claim, 1832
Legal holidays, 1804
Names and addresses, 3144, 3264
Remuneration, 1780, 1822, 3070, 3076
Ontario, average, qu. 1259
Contracts, 1781
Extension of, 1802
Improvement of, 1780, 2830
Spur lines, 1826
Western provinces, 1441, 1790, 1801
War loan dividends, delivery of, 1804
Winnipeg postal employees, salaries, 4672

Post Office Act Amdt. Bill
(Rates on newspapers and periodicals)
1r., 4436; 2r., com., 4528; 3r., 4535

Potatoes. *See this title under* Vegetables

Potlatch. *See* Indians

Potter, Mr. Howard G., Clementsport postmaster, qu. 1363, 1795

Poultry. *See also* Eggs
French treaty, 1983
Turkeys, dressed, importation, qu. 1139

Powell River Paper Company, labour organization, 3071
M. (Mr. Neill) to adjourn House, 2886; withdrawn, 2897

Power, Mr. C. G. (Quebec South)
Ammunition, 887
Annual training, 861, 872
Canada's participation in war, M., 1529
Civil Service Act, M. for repeal, 345, 371, 519, 520, 568
Copper bounty bill, 4371
Export Act Amdt. bill, pulpwood, 4346, 4348, 4395
Amdt. six months' hoist, 4396, neg. 4397
Forests, preservation of, 4349
Grondines wharf, 965
Labour troubles, use of troops, 861, 893
League of Nations
Activities and policies, 3998
Withdrawal, M., 1529, 3999
Military expenditure, 873
National Defence, pay of staff, 890
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3849-87
Pension commissioners, removal, 685
Pensions, commutation of, 3725
Permanent force, 892
Petawawa camp and Ontario elections, 3976
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 4346, 4348, 4395
Quebec riots, 893
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 712
Returned Soldiers' Insurance bill, 3744
Saar valley, administration of, 4000
Soldiers 'Civil Re-establishment bill, 3747
Vocational loans and training, 688

Power Development. *See* Hydro Electric; St. Lawrence River Waterway; Water Powers

Prairie Provinces. *See* Alberta; Manitoba; Saskatchewan; Western Provinces

Pre-Cooling Plants. *See* Cold Storage

Pre-emptions, sale of. *See* Lands

Preferential Tariff. *See* British Preference; Reciprocity; Treaties, French, Italian

Press
British and foreign news service, 4712
Canadian Press Limited, 1464, 2555, 4735
British cable service, 4727
Canadian telegraph service, 4727

Press—*Con.*
Canadian Press Limited—*Con.*
Franchises, granting of, 4728
Ottawa franchise, 4730
Payments to, qu. 3703
President, 2630
Subsidy, 2631, 4535, 4728
Control, 3074
Capitalistic, 2726
Fisheries publicity, 3364
Gambling in staples, justification of, 3059
Hearst syndicate, 828
Magazines and periodicals, Canadian, encouragement, M. (Mr. Hocken) 826
Newspapers
Alleged combine, 2522, 2555, 2580, 2587, 2591, 2630, 4728
Postage rates on, 4436, 4528
Printing contracts with government, 2298, 2394, 2614
Quotations from. *See* Deputy Speaker; Speaker
Registration of ownership, 615
Size of, 4534
Statement as to treaties, 245
Newsprint, exemption from sales tax, 2979. *See also* Pulp and Paper
Publishing business, difficulties of, 4415
Reuter's news service, 4712
Subsidy to, 2631
Windsor Telegram, Canadian Press and, 2630

Preston, Mr. R. F. (Lanark)
Introduced, 3

Preston, Mr. W. T. R., qu. 206, 247, 1362. *See also* Freight Rates, Shipping

Prevost, Mr. Jules E. (Terrebonne)
Canadian National Railways
Branch lines construction bill, 4312
Grande Freniere-Rinfret Junction, 4312
Laurentians, the, 4312
Quebec highways, qu. 814
Railway commissioners, qu. 1260

Price Waterhouse & Company, report, 2954

Prices. *See also* Address; Agriculture; Budget; Combines; Cost of Living; Customs Tariff Items; Finance; Immigration; Markets; Taxation; Trade
Agricultural products, 2731, 2835, 2862, 3068-9
Higher south of boundary, 2715
Manufactured products and, 1403, 1407, 1851, 1853, 1885, 1907, 2747, 2787, 2873, 2928 3018, 3024
Past and present, 2978

Prices—*Con.*
Agricultural implements, 2739, 2836, 2991, 3070
Comparative, 1407
Babson, Mr. Roger, report, 1084
Bacon, 2933
Banks and, 4047
Binder twine, 4377
Building materials, 2164, 3004
Butter, 2821, 3513, 3533. *See also* Dairying Industry
Canada and United States, 2801, 3025
Comparison of, 2738, 2742, 2836, 2916, 3025
Canadian Pacific railway lands, 3704
Cattle, 2871
Cheese, 3295
Coal, 1812, 2824, 3198. *See also* Coal; Fuel Supply
Combines and, Jenks, Professor, 2600
Combines in restraint of trade. *See* Combines bill
Commodity, 1167
Agricultural and, 1083
Consumer. *See also that title.*
Producer, and, 1813, 2727, 2829
Control of, 2812, 4226
Cost, 1851
Cotton goods, 3463
Credit inflation and, 4226
Dairy supplies, 2740
Denims, drills, ginghams, 2738
Electric energy, 3784
Farm products. *See under this title,* Agricultural
Fencing and poultry netting, 2740
Fixing, 2520, 2606, 2786
Food, 2584, 2824, 2933
Clothing and, 2873
Freight rates and, 1958. *See also that title*
Furnaces, warm air, 2739
Gasoline engines, 2740
Harness, 2739
High, 2583, 2737, 2748, 2812
Hogs, Chicago and Toronto, 2865
Increase, 2713
By taxation, 2716
Since 1912, 1408
Indians, charged to, qu. 3142
Inflation and deflation, 64, 647, 2800, 3024, 4226
Interest rate and, 4166
Live Stock. *See also that title*
Producer and consumer, 2877
Lumber, 2875, 3036
Manufactured goods, 2823, 2836, 2972, 3018, 3029, 3068
Higher, north of boundary, 2715
Middleman and, 1230, 2972

Prices—*Con.*
Milk, 2569, 2591
Monopolies and, 2521
Nails, 2740
Oleomargarine, 3513
Paints, 2739
Paper, 829, 2888
Potatoes, 2820
Price level, inequality of, 629
Producer and consumer, 1853, 2727, 2829
Pulpwood, 3036, 3417, 4345. *See also* Pulp and Paper
Railway ties, 3036
Re-sale, fixing of, 2525, 2546
Rubber boots, 2740
Safety razors, 2740
Sewing machines, 2739
Silks, 2397-2400
Spread
Producer and consumer, 1852, 2713, 3029
Wholesale and retail, 1230
Stabilization of, 4069, 4666
Sugar, 2646, 2888, 2933, 3069
Gambling in, 3058
Tools, 2740
United States. *See under this title,* Canada and United States
Washing machines, 2740
Wheat, 628, 3004. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade
Wheat Board, 2857
Woollen goods, 2990, 3459

Prime Ministers' Conference. *See also* Imperial Conference
Imperial Shipping Committee, qu. 3137

Prince Albert stockyards, 2779

Prince Edward Island. *See also* Maritime Provinces
Aeroplane mail service, 1775
Agricultural conditions, 2763, 2972
Car ferry terminals claim, 4676
Emigration from, 1404
Experimental farms, 460
Fox industry, 2763
Harbours and rivers, 945, 4586
Highways, 3184. *See also* Canada Highways; Highways
Immigration and, 1200
Land settlement policy, 1406
Potato-growing, 131, 2763
Public buildings, 4614
Railway employees' pensions, 3195
Railway facilities, 128
Telegraph and telephone lines, 2682

Prince George-Peace River projected railway, 1434, 4701

Prince Rupert, 110, 115
Civic employees union, 2086
Development of port, 261, 2734
Dry dock, qu. 1664
Dry Dock and Shipbuilding Company
Creditors, 4708
Guaranteed bonds, qu. 1138
Fishing industry, 2734

Printing. *See also* Government Publications; Printing Bureau
Combines, 1623
Contracts, 1974
Newspaper and printing companies, 2298, 2394, 2614
Copyright, 2140. *See also* Copyright Act Amdt. bill
Government publications, 3266
Government, Winnipeg, 3144, qu. 3323
Immigration publications, 1873
Interior dept. reports, 3443
King's Printer, audit of outside accounts, 1623
Parliamentary and departmental publications, 811
Postage stamps, 1818
Presses
Duty, 2653, 2858, 3486
French treaty, 1981
Railway department, 3197

Printing Bureau. *See also* Editorial Committee; Labour
Boilers, condition of, 1736-38
Canada Gazette, 1708
Depreciation, 1711
Draper, Mr. P. M., Director of Printing, 1668
Employees, 1623
Grievances, opportunity to present, 1654
Retiring allowances, former, 3949
Fire hazard, 1736
Govt. publications, distribution, 1712
Immigration publications, 1873
Improvements, 1022
King's Printer, Mr. F. A. Acland, appointment, 1668
Labour Gazette, 1621, 1712
Miscellaneous printing, 1716
New building, 1712, 1730
M. (Mr. Beland) to reduce 1730, agreed to, 1737
Ontario Factory Act, 1736
Outside printing, cost of, qu. 3131

Printing Bureau—*Con.*
Plant
New, 1710
Repairs and renewals, 1710
Post Office department, 1818, 1820
Publications and documents, distribution, 1712
Purchasing Commission, 1674
Reorganization, 1731, 1735
Stationery, embossed, 1716

Printing, Joint Committee, 53, 202
Reports
First, 1156, 1361
Second, 2252, 2295
Third, 3261, 3581
Fourth, 4436, 4510

Prison Reform. *See* Justice, Penitentiaries

Pritchard, Mr. John (North Wellington)
Agricultural conditions, 1842
Binder twine, price of, 4380
Budget, 2730. Speeches in Parliament; divergence of views as to policy; condition of agriculture; failure of fiscal policy; unemployment; wages and prices, 2730; farmer, unsatisfactory condition of; farm labour; markets; agricultural products, price of; the tariff; natural resources; agricultural production; national debt, 2731; burden upon the farmer; education, cost of; immigration policy; contrast between treatment of native-born and immigrant; farmers in Parliament, 2732; financial influence and class rule in politics; economy, 2733;
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4544
Hemp bounty bill, 4380
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 743, 751
Rural mail carriers, remuneration, 1793
Vocational loans, 689
Vocational training, 689

Pritchard, Capt. William, Hudson Bay route, 1052

Private Betting. *See* Race Track Betting

Private Bills, Committee
Reports, 936, 2204, 2417, 3323, 3887, 4391
Suspension of rules, 4248, 4308

Private Bills Discussed
Buffalo and Fort Erie Public Bridge Company, 1834
Canadian Press Limited, 1464
Huron and Erie Mortgage Corporation, 2281
La Societe des Artisans Canadiens Francais, 1027
Woodmen of the World, 3982

Privilege. *See* House of Commons

Privy Council
Appeal from Railway Commission, 1284, 1307, 1912, 1926, 1936
Combines, decisions. *See* Combines Bill

Producers' Dairy Company, Vancouver, 2526

Producers' Dairy Company, Ottawa, 2569

Production. *See also* Agriculture; Industries; Manufacturers; Textiles
Annual, statement of, 2720
Costs, 640, 2748, 2815, 2835, 2836. *See also* Labour; Manufacturers
Lower, 2748
Public debt, 640
Exceeding demand, 2957
Implements of, control, 2722
"Produce more, consume less," 4054
Production for use, 2727
Want and, 4053

Professional Men, charges and standard of living, 2813

Profiteering, 2578. *See also* Combines Bill

Progressive Party. *See also* Address; Budget; Forke; Immigration
Alberta, 2799, 2810
Attitude, extreme, 3065
Budget amendments
Forke, Mr., 2717-18, 2809
Opportunity to move, 2711
Constitution and policy, 2791, 2793
Criticism of, 3070
Crowsnest pass agreement and, 2971
Appropriation of Liberal policy, 2781
"Concession forced by Progressives," explanation, Mr. Forke, 2971
Demands, alleged selfish, 3030
Economic, not political, group, 1863, 3003
Expenditures suggested, 3076
Farmers in Parliament, 2732, 2787
Farmers' movement, 2884
Free trade and, 1196, 2818, 3024, 3030
Grand Trunk gratuities, 1666, 1687
Hammell, Mr., 2884
Immigration policy, 1413. *See also* speeches on Immigration
Attitude of some Progressive members on, 2774
Leader of. *See also* Forke
Campaign of 1921, 1853
New, references to, 11, 17, 27
Liberal platform of 1919, opposition, 2925
Manitoba, 2799, 2810
Organization, 2815

Progressive Party—*Con.*
Platform, 2845
Tariff, 2777
Policy and action, 2935
For Western provinces only, 2817
Predicament, of, 2814
Proportional representation, 424
Right to move amendment, 1299-1307
"Stronger and more menacing enemy," 2976
Speeches, pessimistic, 2936
Tariff and, 1421, 2737, 2745
Concessions to, 2743
Reduction of, 3024
Taxation, 2837
Union government and big interests, 1853
Withdrawals from, 2976

Prohibited Classes. *See* Immigration Act Amdt.

Prohibition. *See also* Canada Temperance Act Amdt. Bill; Liquor; Race Track Betting
British Columbia Association, control of liquor, 2409
Native wines, reduction of duty, 3035
Ontario Temperance Act, 2410
Plebiscite, cost of, 2495

Promissory Notes. *See* Taxation

Promotions. *See* Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power)

Proof, Onus of. *See* Narcotic Drugs

Proportional Representation, 171
Alternative vote in single member constituencies, 388, agreed to, 389
Effect on public ownership, 426
Multi-member constituencies, M. (Mr. Good) 389, neg. on div. 434
Single transferable vote, 1660, 2181

Proprietary Medicines. *See* Health

Prorogation, 4736, 4755
Probable date of, 2166

Prosecutions. *See* Combines Bill

Protection. *See also* Bounties; speeches on Budget; Industries
Adequate, 2957
Agricultural depression and, 1837-64
Agricultural implement industries, 2975
Applications for, 3235
Basis of government policy, 2718
Budget and, 3077
Case for to be heard publicly, 2718, 3016
Class privilege, 3069

Protection—*Con.*
Conditions
Comparison before and after adoption, 2819
Solution for, 3013
"Dismal failure," 3018
Double standard of buying and selling, 2872
"Economically and fundamentally wrong," 2973
Free trade and, 2806, 2922. *See also that title*
Granted without investigation, 3492
Great Britain, 2752. *See also that title*
"Illogical absurdities of," 3014
Inequity of, 2792
Laurier, Sir Wilfrid on, 2872
"Legalized robbery," 3071
Minister of the Interior and, 2805
Money and moral cost of, 3070
Oleomargarine, 3534, 3546
Ontario, 2852, 2856
Political contributions, 3071
Principle of, 2792
Intact, 2990
Unsound, 2718, 2836
Protected industries and, 2957
"Protectionist budget," 3068, 3077
Quebec, 2852
Rigid adherence to by government, 2988
Sugar refiners, 2987
Suggested remedy for conditions, 1253
Tariff stability, 2648
United States and, 2751
Vancouver Creosoting Company, Limited, 3231
Wheat Board, 3235
Woollen industry, 3458

Providence, R.I. *See* Canadian National Railways; Terminals

Provinces, federal representation. *See* Redistribution

Provincial Governments. *See also* Immigration
Conferences on source of revenue, 65
Extravagance, 2797
Senators, nomination of, 1377

Provincial Jurisdiction. *See* British North America Act; Disallowance; Jurisdiction

Provincial Legislation. *See* Legislation

Provincial Rights. *See also* Disallowance; Jurisdiction; Legislation
Anglo-Japanese treaty, restriction of, 1453
Bankruptcy, 3097
Senate and, 1377
Water Powers. *See* Lake of the Woods

Public Accounts. *See* Board of Audit Bill

Public Archives, 3985
Building, addition to, 1730
Doughty, Dr. Arthur, Dominion Archivist, salary, 4673

Public Buildings. *See also* their respective titles; Public Works; Supply
Alberta, 1023
Calgary post office, 1024
Armouries, fittings and alterations, 1024
British Columbia
Bamfield, 1024
Victoria, old post office, 1024
Charlottetown, 4614
Coal purchases, 496
Economy in. *See* Printing Bureau
Experimental farms, 4629
Generally, 1025
High Commissioner's office, London, 4629
Improvements, repairs, 1024
Installation of fuel-saving devices, 4629
Manitoba, 4628
Brandon, 4628
Emerson, 4628
Winnipeg, 4628
Mansfield, Mr. William, dismissal, qu. 4512
Maritime provinces generally, 1022, 4614
Military hospitals, 4629
Montreal ordnance stores, 1022
Moose Jaw, 1023
New Brunswick, 4613
Nova Scotia, 4612
Ontario
Haileybury, 4615
Hamilton, 4628
Ottawa government workshops, 4616
Rideau hall, 4627
Royal Military college, 4628
Toronto, 4624
Casualty clearing station, 4621
Seed branch building, 4621
Ottawa, 1716
Daly building purchase, 1023
Departmental buildings, 1729, 4617
Compensation to architects, 4633
M. (Mr. Beland) to strike out, 1729 agreed to, 1730
Dominion archives, 1730
Parliament buildings, 1716. *See also that title*
Printing bureau, improvements, 1022
Policing, 778
Power for running elevators, 1025
Prince Edward Island, 4614
Quebec, 4614
Terrebonne, 2690, 4615

Public Buildings—*Con.*
Rents, 1025
Rockhead hospital, Halifax, 4613
St. John quarantine building, 1021, 1457, 4613
Sackville, 4613
Saskatchewan, 1023, 4629
Souris, 4614
Sussex, N.B., 4613
Tracadie lazaretto, 4613

Public Debt. *See also* Address; Budget; Debt; Finance; Immigration; Loans
Additions to, 2641, 2985, 3078. *See also under this title,* Increase
Budget, particulars of, 2898
Canadian National Railways, fixed charges, qu. 3323
Deficit, 3028
Increase of, 23, 91, 2814, 3072
From 1896-1922, 1173
From 1914–1923, 2842
Inheritance of present government, 2831
Interest, 2963, 2967, 3061
Magnitude of, 2963
Maturing obligations, 3822
Net debt and estimated additions, 2926
New York loan, 1922, 630, 649
Per capita debt, 2797, 2814, 2956, 2986
British Columbia, 2941
Problem of, 2784
Production cost and, 640
Reduction of, 2825, 3064
Responsibility for, 2920
Tariff reduction and, 2857
Taxation and, 2964
War burden, 2967, 2985
Years 1896, 1911, 1922, qu. 914

Public Expenditure. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget; Canadian National Railways; Estimates; Government, Economy
Administration, cost of, 2785
Apportionment of, 1072, 4560
Audit. *See* Board of Audit Bill
Civil government, cost of, 2968
Demand for, 3076
East and West, 3436
Economy. *See* Ministers, Salaries
Estimate for 1923-24, 2642
Expenditure, 1896-1922, qu. 914
Extravagance, 3043
Immigration, on, 1208
Increase, 1913-23, 2842
In excess of revenue, 1230
Profitable and productive, 3005
Public Works on, 2785
Railways, appropriation by Parliament, 4397

Public Expenditure—*Con.*
Reduction of, 2986, 3064
Responsibility for, 2920
Retrenchment, 2784
Special bills instead of estimates, 4304
Supplementary estimates, 4420
Taxation and, 3001
Total of $548,750,714, 4554
War, 2920
1914-1922, qu. 914

Public Harbours. *See* Harbours and Rivers

Public Health. *See* Health

Public Lands. *See* Dominion Lands; School Lands

Public Libraries
Postal rates, 1809
Sales tax, 1870

Public Life
Integrity of,3021
Rewards of, *See* Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner)

Public Ownership, 4190. *See also* Address; Budget; Canadian Government Merchant Marine; Canadian National Railways; St. Lawrence River Waterway
Canadian National Railways, 1614, 1618
Coal mines, 2727
Elevators, 2956
Proportional representation and, 426
Public utilities and large-scale industries, 2728
Railways, 1770, 2727, 2859, 2905, 2956, 3007, 3056, 3622, 4190
Radial, 2475
Tariff taxation, 2905
Toronto street railways, 2475

Public Service. *See also* Civil Service
Militia pension to retired officers in. *See* Militia Pensions

Public Service Retirement Act Amdt. Bill
(Extension of Calder Act for one year)
Res. 3323, 3402; 1r., 3403; 2r., com., 3r., 3977

Public Utilities. *See also* Public Ownership
Industrial disputes, 1703

Public Works. *See also* Public Buildings; Supply
Applications for, 2830
Bridges. *See that title*
Commitments, 961, 962

Public Works—*Con.*
Department
Chief Architect's branch, qu. 2517
Engineering branch, salaries, 1017
Engineers' reports, 4571
Morrison claim, on, 4723
Estimates, 941, 993, 1009, 1716, 2671, 2684, 4554, 4594.
House of Commons furniture, qu. 1138
Hunter, Mr. J. B., deputy minister, salary, 4671
Paymaster, qu. 1257
St. Laurent, Late Mr. A., appreciaton, 1006
Salaries, 2684
Sullivan, Mr. A. W., 381
Dredging, 1009, 4590
British Columbia, 1014
Manitoba, Alberta, Saskatchewan, 1012
Maritime provinces, 1009, 4591
Ontario and Quebec, 1011
Plamondon, Alberta, 1012
Port Burwell, 1012
St. Lawrence ship channel, 3339
Dry docks. *See also* Dry Dock Act Amdt. bill
Champlain, 2681
Esquimalt, 2671
Prince Rupert, qu. 1664
Vancouver, 2671
Expenditure, 3073, 3076
By provinces, qu. 3387
Graving docks, locks, etc., 2681
Harbours and rivers. *See that title*
Local improvement taxes
Calgary, 1023
Kitchener, 1022
National gallery, 1018
National monument, Connaught place, 2685
Public Works Act, tender and contract, 950
Roads and bridges, 1014. *See also* Bridges; Highways
Rugs for departmental offices, qu., 1486
Surveys and inspections, 1020
Telegraph and telephone lines, 1017, 2682, 4590. *See also that title*
Wharves. *See also* Harbours and Rivers
St. John river, statement of Premier Veniot, qu. 1488
Wireless stations, 3337

Publication of Evidence. *See* Criminal Code Amdt. bill

Publications. *See* Government Publications

Publicity. *See also* Immigration; Press
Advertising, United States firms. *See* Magazines, M. (Mr. Hocken)
Agent in London, Cranfield, Mr. W. T., 2927, 2983, 4707

Publicity—*Con.*
Racing information. *See* Race Track Betting

Publishers. *See* Copyright Act Amdt. bill

Pugsley, Hon. William
Alien enemy property, 3823
Appointment, under Inquiries Act, qu. 1486, qu. 1993, 2498, 2494, 2710, 3043
Meighen, Right Hon. Mr., and, exchange of compliments, 2503
Reparation claims, investigation, qu. 4753
Salary, 3043

Pulp and Paper. *See also* Export Act Amdt. bill; Forests and Forestry; Lake of the Woods bill; Labour; Lumber; Magazines and Periodicals, M. (Mr. Hocken); Natural Resources; Timber
Fort Frances Pulp and Paper Company, 2572
Gaspe, 1242
Hudson Bay region, possibilities, 1072
Kipawa Pulp and Paper Company, 1402
Manitoba Pulp and Paper Company lease, 3254
Newsprint. *See also under this title,* Paper
Exemption from sales tax, 2979, 2999, 3046
Ten per cent duty proposed, 1267
Paper
Book paper, price in Canada and United States, 829
Control, 2572
Cost and sales tax, 2888
Magazine paper, prices, Canada and United States, 829
Manufacturers, payment of sales tax, 4415
Products, French treaty, 1981, 1987
Powell River Paper Company, labour organization, 2886
Pulpwood
Destruction by spruce bud worm, 818
Export of, 2711, 2950
Duty on, 2828
Freight rates, 3036
Permit to cut, 4206
Prices, 3036, 4345
Prohibition of export, 2648, 2750, 3416, 4012
See also Export Act Amdt. Bill
Royal commission to inquire into, 2648, 2711, 2948, 2950, 3412, 3413, 4709
Settlers and farmers, 4513
Riordan Company, business profits tax, qu. 1974, 4490

Pulpwood. *See this title* under Pulp and Paper

Purchasing Commission, 114, qu. 1385, 1674
Authority for, qu. 2699
Beer, Mr. L. H., 4704
La Fleche, Col. L. R., 4001
Salary, 3950
Salaries and contingencies, 4704
Supervision, government purchases and sales, 3950, 4001

Purchasing Power, 629, 637, 2928. *See also* Address; Budget; Civil Service; Cost of Living; Combines; Credits; Imperial Economic Conference; Money: Prices
Dollar, 3024
Europe, depreciation of, 1859
Farmers, 1408, 1851
Lack of, 4053
Limitation of, 2716
Money, 1168, 4067, 4666
Reduced, 2737, 2812
Tariff and, 2737
Unemployment and, 2725
Work and saving, necessary to increase, 2743

Pure-Bred Cattle. *See* Live Stock, accredited herds

Putnam, Mr. Harold (Colchester)
Address in reply, mover, 9. Visit of their Excellencies to West; deceased members, 10; beauty and history of Maritime provinces, 10-11; natural resources; new leader of Progressive party, 11; Vimy Ridge site donated by France; trade relations with France and Italy; Near East crisis, 12-13; Canadian National Railways, new board of directors; Moncton Intercolonial headquarters, 13; Sir Henry Thornton, 13-14; pension rights of Grand Trunk employees; Great lakes shipping investigation, 14; cattle embargo; diminution of unemployment; improved economic conditions; member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Rheaume) 15
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4061
British preference, attitude of Mr. Senn, 2959
Canadian national parks and historic sites, 3440
Canadian National Railways
Grand Trunk, Portland terminal, 1769
New board of directors, 13
Cheque tax, 3034
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 525
Civil Service appointments, 376

Putnam, Mr. Harold—*Con.*
Combines bill, 2597, 2618, 2626
Registrar, inquiry, 2626
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 2382
Farmers' earnings, 2813
French treaty bill, 2248
Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia, 4561
Lack of confidence, M. (Mr. Irvine) 242
Liberal party pledges, 3035
Macphail, Miss, members and party funds, 4238
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2437, 2445, 2457, 2463
Judges, 2464
Nationality, dual, 2445
Secretary of State
Administration, 2464
Power of, 2457
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3515, 3569
Patents of Invention bill, 2071
Reciprocity agreement of 1854, 2918
Renovated butter, 4268
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4238
Trade commissioners, 856
Truro
Park, 3440
Subway, 4454

Quarantine. *See* Health

Quebec (city)
Arsenal, 884, 1740
Bonus to employees, 1751, 1772
Champlain market station, 4446
Civil Service employes, 387
Demers, Mr. A., mail contractor, qu. 1868
Immigrants, supplies, 496
Immigration dept. employees, qu., 2517, qu. 3141, qu., 3144, qu., 4302, qu. 4752
Quebec battlefields commission, 3432
Historic sites, 3406
Riots, 893

Quebec (port)
Cattle shipments, 2807
Champlain graving dock, 2675, 2682
Cold storage, 2055
Grain
Congestion, 3765
Diversion to, 3765
Elevator, 3768
Shipment, 4233
Wheat, qu. 3820
Harbour commissioners, names and salaries, qu. 1136
Lorne graving dock, 2682
St. Charles river improvement works, 4446
Transcontinental railway and, 3681

Quebec (province)
Agricultural conditions, 1908, 2764
Bankruptcy. *See* Bankruptcy Act
Bonded liquor warehouses, 2404
Canadian Air Force, 1748
Civil Code. *See* Bankruptcy Act
Community of property, 2880
Dairying industry, cold storage, 2764
Dredging, 1011, 4590
Emigration to United States, 1404, 2834
Experimental farms, 459
Harbours and rivers, 950, 1008, 4588. *See also that title*
Highways, 814, 2341, 3180. *See also* Canada Highways; Highways
Immigration, 1085, 1104, 1198, 1200
Indians, 2124
Labelle county development, 4199
Legislature , Bankruptcy Act, 3091
Northern, conditions, 3037
Protection sentiment, 2852
Public buildings, 4614
Railways, 4189
Repatriation of Canadians, 1085

Quebec Conference, 2348

Quebec-North Shore St. Lawrence steamship service, 2175

Quebec Savings Bank Act, 4405

Quebec Savings Bank Act Amdt. Bill
1r., 4183; 2r., com., 3r., 4392

Queen Charlotte Islands, 150

Questions. *See their several titles.* For rulings, *See* Deputy Speaker; House of Commons; Speaker

Questions Passed as Orders for Returns
Agriculture dept. officials attending fairs (Mr. Leader) 285
Arctic expedition (Mr. Parent) 4012
Bacon imports and exports (Mr. Kennedy, Edmonton) 938
Canada Temperence Act, correspondence (Mr. Stevens) 1032
Canadian National Railways
Coal purchases (Mr. Hanson) 4303
Doctors, employment (Mr. d'Anjou) 814
Dorchester employees (Mr. Cannon) 2088
Fixed charges (Mr. Euler) 708
Hotels, (Mr. Coote) 938
Mileage (Mr. Tobin) 914
Statistics, (Sir Henry Drayton) 207
Canadian Pacific Railway, (Mr. Kellner) 626; (Mr. Lucas) 625, 3704
Civil Service
Inside and outside (Mr. McQuarrie) 3264

Questions Passed as Orders for Returns— *Con.*
Civil Service—*Con.*
Quebec city and district, (Mr. Cannon), 387
Returned soldiers (Mr. McKillop) 386
Statistics (Mr. Crerar) 207
Temporary employees, (Mr. Archambault) 1385
Made permanent (Mr. Archambault) 814
Customs and excise duties (Mr. Black, Huron) 814
Customs officials, Halton county (Mr. Anderson) 914
Dominion lands, pre-emption area (Mr. McTaggart) 1032
Dorchester penitentiary, (Mr. Michaud) 494
Exports and products, agricultural (Mr. Garland, Bow River) 814
Fuel
Joint Peat Com. (Mr. Irvine) 387
Lignite Utilization board (Mr. Irvine) 387
Grain and grain trade
Elevator overages (Mr. Millar) 494
Terminal elevators (Mr. Stevens) 3821
Highways
Dundas street (Mr. Anderson) 708
Projected, Ontario (Mr. Wilson) 624
Quebec, (Mr. Prevost) 814
Immigration, staff transfer, (Mr. Lavigueur) 2517
Income tax collections (Mr. Black, Huron) 733
Indian reserves, grain production (Mr. Evans) 1139
Levis
Dry dock, (Mr. Archambault) 1261
Postmasters (Mr. Bourassa) 519
Montreal, grain shipments, (Mr. Coote) 1974
National Defence, payments (Mr. Boys) 386
Oleomargarine, butter and (Mr. Sutherland) 386
Purchasing Commission, (Mr. Kennedy, Edmonton) 1385
Railway grades, etc. (Mr. McBride) 625
Railway statistics (Sir Henry Drayton) 207
Sales tax exemptions (Sir Henry Drayton) 708
School lands (Mr. McTaggart) 1032
Soldiers' Settlement Board, Edmonton, (Mr. Boys) 3506
Soldier settlement, Missisquoi and Brome (Mr. Kay) 4012
Valcartier camp grounds (Mr. Delisle) 2298

Race Equality. *See* Immigration, Oriental; Naturalization

Race Track Betting, 3059. *See also* Criminal Code Amdt.
M. (Mr. Good) 494, 709-764, neg. on div. 766

Radial Railways. *See* Canadian National Railways

Radiotelegraphy, 3337. *See also* Telegraphs and Telephones; Wireless
Licenses, 3338
Revenue, 3337
Manitoba, arrangement with, 3338
Military signal service, 3338
Post office and, 1780
Radio-direction finding, qu. 3820
Radiotelegraph regulations tabled, 3045
Radiotelegraph service, 3374
Wireless service, etc., 3374

Radiotelegraph Act Amdt. Bill (License fees)
Res. 2086, 2284; 1r., 2287; 2r., 2467; com., 2468; 3r., 2468
Sections and substitutes discussed:
Apportionment of fees, 2468
Broadcasting stations, 2468
Licenses, 2467

Railway Act 1919 Amdt. Bills
1. Freight rates, discrimination (Mr. Stevens) 1r., 54
2. Return tickets (Mr. Jacobs) 1r., 615
3. Rates, equalization of; grain movement. (Mr. Kennedy, Edmonton), 1r., 730

Railway Commissioners, Board of. *See also* Crowsnest Pass Agreement; Freight Rates; Railways
Appeal from to Privy Council, 1284, 1307, 1912, 1926, 1936
Branch lines, approval of, 4327
Canadian National Railways, and, 666
Carvell, Hon. F. B.
Alleged statements, 1869, 1910
Appeal to Privy Council, 1912
Calgary speech, 3191
Letter to boards of trade, British Columbia, 1915, 1945
Letter from Vancouver Board of Trade, 3189
Motherwell, Hon. Mr., alleged statement, 3188
Removal of, 3188
Commissioners
Addresses and occupations previous to appointment, qu. 1973
Names, salaries, etc., qu. 1260
Establishment of board in 1903, 1929
Estimates, 3188
Judgment, June 30th, 1922, 1914
Lake grain rates, 4218. *See also that title*

Railway Commissioners—*Con.*
Langley, Hon. Mr., statement, 3190
Maclean, Mr. S. J., pamphlet, 3194
Manitoba—Canadian Northern agreement, 1932
Parliamentary interference with, 1762
Rates, fixing, 1761
Report, eighteenth annual, 1659
Rutherford, the late Dr., 3192
Shipping rates, control of, qu. 2611
Subsidized steamboats, rates, 2174, 4003
Western Canada, representation, 3192

Railway Mail Service. *See* Post Office

Railways. *See also* Address; Budget; Canadian National Railways; Freight Rates; Hudson Bay Railway
Accidents, 3957
Annual statement by Minister of Railways, 1558
Appropriations, statement, 2926
Baltimore and Ohio, promotion, 2828
Branch lines, 1568, 1735, 3006. *See also* Canadian National Railways
Expenditure, appropriation of, 4339, 4344
Gaspe, 1243
Calgary & Edmonton Railway Company, qu. 624
Canadian National Railways. *See that title*
Caraquet and Gulf Shore, purchase, qu. 1258, 2938, 2939
Construction, 1440
Co-operation of, 1965
Deficits, 2747
Department. *See* Railways and Canals
Drayton-Acworth commission, 1761
Earnings, flour transportation, Buffalo-New York, 2960
Electrification, 3422
Excursion tickets, qu. 1485
Express charges, 2876
Freight rates. *See that title*
Gaspe-Edmundston, 1243
Gaspe peninsula, 4186
Grades, rates, qu. 625, 1917
Grain shipments, diversion, 2898. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade
Great Britain, 1618
Highways and motors, 1619
Immigration and land settlement, 1180, 1193, 2801, 1337
Interstate Commerce Commission, 3059
James Bay railway, 1036-49, 1073, 1402
Labour, organized, 126, 1426. *See also* Labour
Land grants to, 1353
Lands, purchases, sales, 1739
Late Minister of. *See* Kennedy, Hon. W. C.

Railways—*Con.*
Maritime provinces, 4186
Michigan Central bridge, Niagara Falls, qu. 1864
Minister of, appointment, Hon. Mr. Graham, 2295
New York Central, promotions, 2828
Pacific-Great Eastern, 4700
Peace River district, 1433, 3006. *See also that title*
Pennsylvania, promotions, 2828
Pools and running rights, 3058
Prince Edward Island, car ferry claim, 4676
Problems of, 1880. *See also* Address; Budget; Freight Rates
Public ownership, 2956. *See also* Canadian National Railways
Quebec and Saguenay railway, 4190
Radial, 3056
Railway labour, wages, 2876, 3190
Railway mail service, 4529. *See also* Post Office
Payments for, qu. 3143
Railway rates, equalization. *See* Freight Rates
Railway subsidies, 2902, 4303
St. John valley railway, 4311
Settlement, western provinces, 2833
Settlements far removed from, 3431
Shipping facilities. *See* St. John; Vancouver
Statistics, 207
Strikes. *See* Labour
Surveys and inspections, 4691, 4698
Temiskaming and Northern Ontario, 1071, 3056
Ties
Freight rates, 3036
Prices, 3036
Transfer charges, 2876
United States, 1618. *See also that title*
Company-owned, 3057
Winnipeg-St. Croix across Maine, 2902

Railways and Canals. *See also* Canals; Railways
Canadian Government Merchant Marine. *See that title*
Canadian National Railways. *See that title*
Canals. *See that title*
Department
Bell, Major Graham A., deputy minister, salary, 3195, 4557
Canada Highways Commission, 2489. *See also* Highways
Contingencies, further amount, 3377
Estimates, 1619, 2489, 3173, 3188, 3195, 3376, 3650, 3610, 3676, 3760

Railways and Canals—*Con.*
Department—*Con.*
Graham, Hon. George P., appointed minister, 2295
Intercolonial-Prince Edward Island pensions, 3195
Minister, appointment of, 519, 2295
Inquiry, 1081
Printing and stationary, outside service, 3197
Railway surveys and inspections, 3648
Salaries, 3195
Water powers, 3421
Wedge, Mr. George, employment, qu. 2697
Expenditure by provinces, qu. 3887

Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines Committee
Change in personnel, 2252
Report, 2252

Rainbow Shingle Mills, strike. *See* Labour, Strikes

Raisins and Dried Currants. *See* Budget; Customs Tariff; Fruit

Ralph Connor, writings, immigration, 1181

Ralston Commission. *See* Pensions, Royal Commission

Ralston, Col. J. L. *See* Disallowance of Nova Scotia Statute

Raney, Hon. W. E. *See* Ontario

Rates. *See* Freight Rates

Raw Materials, free trade in, 2858

Rawding, Mr., Clementsport, N.S., postmaster, 1795

Raymond, Mr. W. G. (Brantford)
Address in reply, 160. Conditions in West as portrayed by western members, 160; congratulations to Mr. Forke; tariff for revenue, 161; the amendments; redistribution; Near East crisis, 162; attitude of Prime Minister, 163-164; status of Canada and foreign policy of Great Britain, 165; Canada's participation in wars of 1763 and 1812, 165-166
Budget, 2741. Cheerful sentiments of member for Skeena; tribute to Minister of Finance; budget acceptable to country; "standing pat"; "tariff stability" 2741; British preference; sales tax; beet sugar tax; wines; criticism of Sir Henry Drayton; French treaty; comparison of Canadian and United States catalogue prices, 2742; emigration to

Raymond, Mr. W. G.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
United States; cost of living; Canadians coming back; election of 1921; tariff issue; tariff concessions to Progressive party; an unresponsive attitude; wealth, levy upon; national debt; banks; widows and orphans; stockholders; capital and labour, 2743; purchasing power; natural resources, valuable only when developed; capital and capitalists, antagonism to; communists, socialists, anarchists, Bolshevists; property, protection of; Russia, example of; sugar, reduction of duty; postal war tax; postal rates, comparison Canada with United States, 2744; tariff, more important questions than, 2745; grain and grain trade; transportation; immigration and tariff go hand in hand; revenue proposals of Progressive party; income tax, proposal to increase; luxuries, taxation of; land tax; free trade, 2745; United States, trade with; tariff not a theoretical question; no surrender of Canadian market, 2746
French treaty bill, 2245
Agricultural implements, 2246
Agricultural products, 2247
Luxuries, 2742
Postage, war tax, 2744
References to speech on budget, 2747, 2756, 2787
Secession, 2244

Raymond and Talbot, Messrs., Rimouski harbour claim, 4588

Readjustment of Representation. *See* Redistribution Bill

Rebellion of 1837, 1365

Receipt Tax. *See* Special War Revenue Act; Taxation

Reciprocity with United States, 85, 1196, 1223, 1246, 2243, 2810, 2948, 2966, 3049. *See also* speeches on Budget; Markets; Trade; Treaties, French Treaty; United States
Agricultural implements, 3017
Amdt. (Mr. Forke) 3016
Authority to negotiate, 3016
Blaine, late Hon. James G., statement, 2922
Boots and shoes, 3016, 3499
Building brick, 3017
Cattle industry and, 3082. *See also Live* Stock; Markets

Reciprocity with United States—*Con.*
"Clear-cut" issue, 3081
Coal, anthracite and lignite, 3493
Commercial union, 3906,3907, 3911
Commission of 1897, 3014
Fetish of, 2952
Fishing interests and, 2906, 3082, 3906
Goods on free list, 3017
Great Britain-France, 3050. *See also Treaties,* French Treaty
Herschell, Lord, 3014
History of, 2842
Leather, 3017
Markets for manufactured products, 2856
Natural and manufactured products, 2910
Natural resources, interchange, 2910
"Noble Eighteen," 2908
Offer to negotiate, 2649, 2650, 2806, 2829, 2831, 2838, 2843, 2847, 2854, 2909, 2910, 2917, 2922, 2934, 2937, 2958, 2972, 2977, 2992, 3011, 3013, 3016, 3060, 3078, 3454, 3473, 3901, 3905
Fruits and vegetables, 2977
New York Times, 2968
Permanency, 3017, 3079
Reciprocity agreement of 1854, 2842, 2910, 2918, 3013
Reciprocity agreement of 1911, 2718, 2778, 2832, 2931
Campaign, 2734, 3014
Defeat of, 1233, 2851, 2922, 2924, 2931
Conservative alliance with Nationalists, 2924
Evidence of attitude, Liberal party, 3010
Herring drawn across trail, 3013
Letter, Hon. Messrs. Fielding and Paterson, 3081
Liberals who opposed, 2851
"No truck or trade with the Yankees," 3015, 3075, 3080
Omissions from proposed agreement, 3902
Western provinces, opposition to, 2854
Screen for failure to implement tariff pledges, 2951
Sentiment towards, 3082
Standing offer by Canada and United States, 3016
Termination of recent arrangement, 2993
Treaty of 1818 weapon in dealing with United States, 2906
Use of Canadian ports by fishing vessels, 2906

Reclamation. *See* Dominion Lands; Interior; Lands

Reconstruction in Europe, 3003. *See also* Germany, Reparations

Recreation Grounds. *See* Canadian National Parks and Historic Sites; National Parks and Reservations

Red Cross Society
Grant to, 2169
Vetcraft shops, 694

Red Deer
Hebridean immigrants, 3584. *See also* Imgration
Valley, Coal Operators' Association, 1275

Red River, Manitoba, wharf, 1000

Redistribution, 27, 40, 162. *See also* Proportional Representation; Redistribution Bill
Delay, 2400
Electoral reforms. *See* Proportional Representation
Intention of government, inquiry, 4250
Ivel, Mr. W. M., reported employment, 733
Marshall, Mr. Duncan and, 3313
Nova Scotia, and, 73
Opportunity for discussion, 4593
Welland, Lincoln, Haldimand counties, 667

Redistribution Bill (Readjustment of representation in the House of Commons)
1r., 250-254; 2r., 436; ref. to Special Com., 487, 572-574
Special Committee, 2979
Leave to report, 857, 937
Number of members, 488-9
Privilege, Mr. Sutherland, 1660
Reference to, 487, 572-4
Reports, qu. 2612
First, 857
Second, 3399
Third, 4510, 4593, concurred in, 4736-42

Reed, Mr. William S. (Frontenac)
Budget, 2830. Tribute to Ministers of Finance and Railways; rural mail system; immigration; public works; Canadian National Railways; public debt; national problems; natural resources; oriental immigration, 2830; western provinces, conditions Ontario and Quebec, industrial development and agricultural depression; Maritime provinces, commercial disadvantage due to remoteness of market; equitable treatment of all provinces; educational opportunities, 2831

Re-Establishment. *See* Pensions; Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment

Reforestation. *See* Forests and Forestry

Reform of Senate. *See* Senate

Regimental Funds. *See* National Defence

Regina Photo Supply Company, sales tax, qu. 518

Registrars. *See* Admiralty Act Amdt.; Bankruptcy Act

Reid, Capt. John, Hudson Bay railway, 1046

Reindeer in "Barren Lands", Mr. Stefansson's statement, 1073

Rejected Immigrants. *See* Immigration

Relief of distressed Canadians, 1456

Relief Work. *See* Unemployment

Renfrew postmastership, qu. 205

Renovated Butter. *See* Dairy Industry Act Amdt. bill

Rents. *See* Cost of Living; Public Buildings

Reparations, 2498, 4653. *See also* Germany, Reparations; Pugsley; War Claims

Repatriation. *See* Immigration; Naturalization Act

Repentigny, Que. wharf, 977

Reports Tabled, 3, 8-9, 33, 54, 74, 99, 122, 202, 250, 331, 574, 812, 767, 911, 936, 986, 1080, 1156, 1307, 1361, 1384, 1539, 1631, 1659, 1686, 1910, 2204, 2252 2611, 2837, 2885, 2926, 4075, 4510

Representation. *See also* Proportional Representation; Redistribution
Irreducible minimum of, qu. 285
Readjustment of. *See* Redistribution

Research. *See also* Mines and Minerals
Central research institute, 788
Helium, discoveries in, 703, 4439
Medical discoveries, 1287. *See also* Banting, Reward for. *See titles,* M. (Mr. Ladner)
Scientific and industrial research
Discoveries, 4439
Honorary advisory council
Expenditure, qu. 731
Oil shale deposits, 2514
Patents of invention, 2082

Reservations. *See* National Parks and Reservations

Reserves. *See* Indians

Resignation of Government. *See* Lack of Confidence

Resolutions, The Ninety-Two. *See* Senate, M. (Mr. Denis)

Resources. *See* Natural Resources

Responsible Government. *See* Lack of Confidence

Restaurant. *See* Parliamentary Restaurant

Restaurants, profiteering, 2586

Retail Merchants' Association of Canada
Oleomargarine, 3551

Retired Officers. *See also* Militia Pension Act Amdt. Bill
Indian Army officers, settlement in British Columbia, 1096

Retirement Act. *See* Civil Service; Public Service

Returned Soldiers. *See* Civil Service; Labour, Unemployment; Soldiers; Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment

Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act Amdt. Bill,
(Application in force though applicant died before delivery of policy; decision to be reviewed)
Res. 3582, 3743; 1r., 3745; 2r., com., 3r., 3892; Senate amdts. 4734, 4750

Returns. *See* House of Commons

Reuters' News Service, 4712

Revenue. *See also* speeches on Budget; Customs and Excise; Imports and Exports; Revenue Bills; Taxation; Trade
Amdt. (Mr. Forke), 3016
Collected during war, 2985
Direct taxation, 2836
Estimate of, 3074
1923-24, 2642
Expenditure and, 3064
French treaty and, 1983. *See also* Treaties, French Treaty
Income tax, 2858
Unearned income, 3026
Luxuries, tax on, 2858
Methods of raising, 2784, 3016. *See also* Taxation
New sources, 2828, 2909
Progressive policy and, 2817
Revenue, 1896-1923, qu. 913
Tariff, 2745, 3025
Reduction and, 2857
Taxation and, 3301
Unearned income, 2954, 3026

Revenue Bills
1. Customs Tariff Act, 1907, Amdt. bill
Res., 2650, 3963; 1r., 3963; 2r., com., 4408; 3r., 4409
2. Income War Tax Act, 1917, Amdt. bill
Res., 4440, 4491; 1r., 4502; 2r., com., 4504; 3r., 4505
3. Inland Revenue Act Amdt. bill
Res., 2655, 3229; 1r., 3242; com., 4392; 3r., 4393
4. Special War Revenue Act Amdt. bill
Res., 2656, 3922, 4181, amended, 4363; 1r., 4183; 2r., com., 4409; 3r., 4435

Revenue Stamps. *See* Post Office

Revised Statutes, procedure in criminal matters, qu. 1974

Rheaume, Mr. J. T. (Jacques Cartier)
Address, in reply, seconder, 16; late Mr. Lafortune, 16; Canada's financial condition; marked progress in industry; necessity for increased immigration, 17
Introduced, 3

Rhineland. *See* Germany

Rice, freight rates, 1915

Richmond and Wolfe Counties
Accredited herds, qu., 813
Soldier settlement, 913

Rideau Canal. *See* Canals

Rideau Hall, expenditure, 4627

Right of Appeal. *See* Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt.

Right, Petition of. *See* Petition of Right

Riley, Mr. E. T., 60

Riley's Army, transportation, 3042

Rimouski Harbour
Claim of Messrs. Raymond and Talbot, 4588
Wharf, 977

Rinfret, Mr. Fernand (St. James)
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4145
Canadian National Railways, branch lines bill, 4195
Canadian Press, Limited, 2587
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 539
Combines bill, 2587
Copyright Act, 2343
M. for amendment of, 495
Deputy Ministers, French language, 1805-08
Deputy Postmaster General, appointment, 1805

Rinfret, Mr. Fernand—*Con.*
Emigration to the United States, 1173
Farm labour, 1174
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1175
Empire settlement scheme, 1175
Policy, 1172
Restriction of, 1174
Newspaper postage, 4535
Population, net increase, 1173
Post offices, number in Montreal, qu. 3135
Public debt, increase, 1896-1922, 1173
Public ownership of railways, 4195
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good), 720
Royal Academy of Arts bill, 281
Rural depopulation, 1174
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4185
Wine and beer excise taxes, qu. 518

Riordon Pulp and Paper Company
Business profits tax, 4490
Arrears, qu. 1974

Riots, Aid of militia in. *See* National Defence; Troops

Rivière du Lièvre wharf, 978

Roads and Bridges. *See* Bridges; Highways; Public Works

Robb, Hon. J. A. (Minister of Trade and Commerce)
Agricultural conditions, 1837, 1846
Agricultural implements, standardization, 796
Australia
Trade treaty with, 1848, 3475, 3476
Visit to, 1848-49, 2815, 3017, 3474, 3475
Belgian exposition, 496
British and foreign news service, 4712
British preference
Canadian ports, direct importation, 3457
Woollen goods, 3459
Business conditions, review of, 1837, 1846
Canada-West Indies treaty, 3378
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, steamship services, 3385
Canadian travelling exhibition in France, 4712
Coasting regulations, suspension of, 4290
Copyright Act Amdt. bill, 487, 2139, 2287, 2343, 2436, 3154
Amdt. clause 2, 2291
Cost of living, 1812
Credit and industry, M. (Mr. Irvine), 651
Dairying industry, 1839
Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 788

Robb, Hon. J. A.—*Con.*
Electric power, exportation, M. (Mr. Deslauriers) 663
Farm mortgages, 1839
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4271, 4549
Fiji islands, trade with, 1848
French treaty bill, 2239
Balance of trade, 2239
Boots and shoes, 2240
Bronze powder, 2017
Favoured nation, 2242
Fuel supply, 796
Gasoline and oil pumps, inspection, 811
Government publications, 811
Grain and grain trade
Adulteration of grain at United States ports, 3649, 3961
Canada Grain Act
Administration, 781, 4709
Litigation, 2045
Validity, 782
Dockage, 783
Elevators
Edmonton, 4718
Government
Grain passing through, 2037
Value, 2037
Halifax, 4714
Lethbridge, 4718
Mixing, 2036
Montreal, short weights, complaint, 2037
Ontario, 2037, 2039
Quebec, grain shipment, 4233
Screenings, 2039, 2041, 2254
Vancouver improvements, 2033
Weights, difference in, 2037
Grain commissioners, board of, 2036
Salaries, 4709
Grain Inquiry Commission, 1764, 4710, 4711
Manitoba Court of Appeal decision, 1210
Rates, 4290
Royal commission to inquire into, 1210
Screenings, 2254
Shipments, congestion, 3767
Transportation, insurance, 3764
Harbours and rivers, New Brunswick, 4587
Immigration Act Amdt. (Mr. Neill) 507
Lake Grain Rates bill, 3960, 4218-35, 4276, 4285, 4290
Lake grain rates, royal commission, 4710
Report, 2885, 3045
London Corn Exchange, complaint, 3649
Oil bounty, Alberta, 2510
Oil companies, stock selling, 781
Oil, fuel and lubricating, standardizing, 809
Oriental immigration, 507
Patents of Invention bill, 331, 2064, 2083, 2087, 3154

Robb, Hon. J. A.—*Con.*
Patents of Invention—*Con.*
Appeal to Exchequer court, 2080
Commissioner, duties and powers, 2065, 2128
Domicile, election of, 2070
Foreign patents, 2068
Petroleum bounties, 780
Raisins and dried currants, 3476. *See also under this title,* Australia
Russian trade mission, 987
Shipping combines, prosecution, 4228
Steamship services, 2171, 3377, 4701
Canada-Newfoundland, 3377
Canada-West Indies-South America, 3377
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 3385
Contracts, 2172
Inspection, 2178
Mackenzie river, 2176
Magdalen islands, 2174
Mediterranean, proposed, 1637
Northern Alberta, 2176
Pictou-Magdalen islands, 2174
Railway Commission and, 4004
Rates, control of, 2174
Subventions, 2171
Victoria-West Coast-Vancouver island, 4003
Toronto seed branch building, 4625
Trade. *See also under this title,* Australia, French Treaty
Annual report, 1910
Commissioners, 1837
Exports, 1838
Oriental, 507
West Indies-Col. Amery, 3392
Trade and Commerce dept.
Canada Grain Act, 2035
Commercial intelligence service, 1837
Estimates, 780, 1837, 2031, 2033, 2171, 3377, 4003, 4701
Patents and Copyright branch, 2035
Salaries and contingencies, 2031
Staff, 2031
Trade Marks and Designs bill, 331, 2063, 2293
Weights and measures, inspection, 810
Wheat board legislation, 2696
Extension by order in council, 3045
Woollen industry, protection, 930

Roberge, Mr. Eusèbe (Megantic)
Introduced, 3

Roberts, Mr. J. H., imprisonment, 1660

Roberts, Hon. W. F., secession, 3145

Roberval, Que. wharf, 978

Robichaud, Mr. J. G. (Gloucester)
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4120
Budget, 2935. Congratulations to Finance Minister; Progressive party; policy futile and action ill-advised, 2935; economic conditions and remedies; "blue ruin" speeches; confidence in future; remedy proposed worse than disease; conditions prior to 1896; return of Liberal party under Sir Wilfrid Laurier; revival of business; depression following war; country again on road to prosperity; trade revival shown by import and export figures, 2936; Banking and Commerce committee, inquiry; British preference, increase of; direct importation; reciprocity with United States; Canadian seaports, 2937; Bay of Fundy; Shippegan; Hudson Bay railway; wheat shipment, facilities of eastern ports; Sir Sandford Fleming, report, 2938; Caraquet and Gulf Shore railway; comparative mileages, 2939; National railway policy; fishing industry; disabilities under United States tariff; legislation; modus vivendi; secession talk, 2940
Canada-West Indies steamship service, 3394
Coastal regulations, suspension of, 2960
Deep sea fisheries, development, 3365
Fish, express rates on, 3365
Introduction, 3
Pensions, 3710
Vimy Ridge memorial, 184
Wharves, revenue, 976

Robinson, Mr. E. W. (King's, N.S.)
Address in reply, 72; redistribution, effect on Nova Scotia; immigration campaign; condition of European markets, 73
Boy Scouts, 879
Cadet services, 879
Magazines and periodicals, M. (Mr. Hocken) 834

Robitaille, Mr. Clement (Maisonneuve)
Montreal post office, daylight saving, qu. 3143

Robson, Judge. *See* Combines

Roche, Hon. W. J., 354-5. *See also* Civil Service Commission

Rockefeller Foundation, hospital standardization, 2934

Rocky Mountain Park. *See* Canadian National Parks and Historic Sites
Stipendiary magistrate, 1739

Rodin's Statue of France, 2832

Rods. *See* Copper Bars or Rods; Steel

Roentgen, discoverer of X-rays, 1287

Rogers, Hon. Robert, St. Croix harbour, 2900

Rombough, Mr. R. M., 387

Rondeau, Ont. pier, 983

Root Vegetables. *See* Vegetables

Root Vegetables, Sale and Inspection, Bill
(Inspection certificate evidence of grade and condition). Mr. Caldwell. 1r., 937

Rosoman, Mr. Cyril E., postmaster, Mara, B.C., qu. 1489, qu. 1739

Ross, Mr. George. *See* Post Office

Ross, Mr. A. E. (Kingston)
Annual drill, 4636
Biological Board Act Amdt. bill, 3974
Breakwaters, appropriations for, 4563
British preference, woollen industry, 3462
Budget, 2932. Amendment; Finance Minister's statement unsatisfactory; Liberal platform of 1919; European unrest and dissatisfaction; British navy best guarantee of peace; exodus; reasons for the movement; preference of British immigrants for Australia and New Zealand, 2932; proposals to disband mounted police, discontinue military training and curtain naval service; pre-election promises and pledges; food prices not going down; tuberculin test; special delivery letters, cost of; military training expenditure and results; cabinet ministers—are they required?; income tax, widows' exemption; reciprocity; domination of United States; educational system; medical course; standardization of hospitals;political and social system; weighing and measuring babies; moral influence; Canada's favourable position; not advisable to open door to United States, 2934; chief reliance upon British stock; confidence in courage and bravery of French-Canadian race, 2935
Cadet services, 879
Canadian offices in London, 4630
Certified milk, 3300
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 540
Grant, Dr., civil service, 541

Ross, Mr. A. E.—*Con.*
Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia, 4563
Hebridean immigrants, treatment of, 3594
Hector celebration, 4636
Immigrants rejected, 706, qu. 1992
Medical advisory boards, 697
Military hospitals, qu. 282, 669, 673
Maintenace cost, qu. 812
Sydenham, qu. 386, 626
Militia Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3975
Milk pasteurization, 3300
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3869
Pensions
European war and active militia, 3724
Pension commissioners, salaries, 3743
Portsmouth postmaster, 1832
Shipping rates, 3783
Soldiers' Civil Re-establshment
Hospitals. *See under this title,* Military hospitals
Salaries, 669
Soldier settlement, 2030
Board, qu. 2180
Ontario, qu. 492
Salaries, 2017
Tuberculin test, 2933, 3284, 3300
Welland canal construction, 3782

Ross, Mr. Thomas E. (North Simcoe)
Canadian National Express, qu. 707
Collingwood harbour dredging, 4578
Feeding Stuffs Act, conference, 606
Great Northwestern Telegraph Company, qu. 707
Millfeeds conference, 606
Postal appointments, 1801
Rural mail carriers
Compensation for loss, 1833
Remuneration, 1792

Roumanian Loan, qu. 623, 2010

Rowell, Hon. N. W., 318

Royal Academy of Arts, Bill respecting, (Mr. Rinfret) 1r., 281

Royal Assent, 1809, 1818, 3829, 4755

Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 866. *See also* Narcotic Drugs; Naturalization
Cape Sabine, post, 3944
Cost and estimates, 1148
Duties, seven day week, 4514
Enforcement of federal statutes, 699, 777
Espionage, 1142
Estimates, 774, 1163
Fitzpatrick, Mr. F. J. E., article in Maple Leaf, 1140
Force and officers, 1141

Royal Canadian Mounted Police—*Con.*
Investigations and convictions by, 1144-5
Legal adviser, Mr. Donald Downie, 777
Motions for disbandment of, 2933
M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 816, 1139, neg. on div, 1152
Naturalization, 779. *See also that title*
Nelson district withdrawal from, 2943
Opium and Narcotic Drug Act, enforcement, 697
Ottawa departmental buildings, policing, 778
Pay, 777
Pensions, 774, qu. 1362
Reorganization, 776
Scrip, qu. 1362
Seizure of books and property, 1142
Strength and work of force, 1144

Royal Canadian Navy. *See* National Defence, Naval Service

Royal Commissions. For individual commissions, *see their titles*
Appointments to, 2710. *See also* Judges Act Amdt.
Federal and provincial jurisdiction, 1209-1212
Judges and, 3604
Lake grain rates. *See* Freight Rates, Shipping

Royal Mail Steam Packet Company. *See* Steamship Services

Royal Military College, 4628

Royal Naval College. *See* Esquimalt

Royal Northwest Mounted Police. *See* Royal Canadian

Rugs, for departmental offices, qu. 1486

Ruhr District, invasion. *See* Germany, Reparations

Rules of the House. *See* House of Commons

Rulings. *See* Deputy Speaker; Marcil; Speaker

Rural Constituencies. *See* Proportional Representation

Rural Credits. *See* Bank Act Amdt. bill; Credits

Rural Depopulation, 35, 1126, 1165, 1174, 1182, 1189, 1234, 1394, 1406, 1432, 1844, 1860, 1906. *See also* Emigration; Farmers; Labour; Population
Causes of, 1133
Economic conditions, 1856

Rural Depopulation—*Con.*
Great Britain in, 1854
United States, 2829
Wealth, production of, 1856

Rural Mail. *See* Post Office

Rural Postmasters. *See* Post Office, Postmasters

Rush-Bagot Treaty. *See* Treaties

Russell, Mr. James, employment, qu. 1868

Russia
Bolshevism, 2744
Immigration, 1340, 2845
Relations with, 44-45, 3401
Russian trade mission, 986, 987

Rutherford Commission. *See* Race Track Betting

Ryckman, Mr. E. B. (East Toronto)
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4140
Budget, 2912. Budget disappointing; accounts not balanced, currency depreciated, exchange unfavourable; trying to satisfy too many factions; incidence of taxation; summer trade; stability not finality; sales tax; pyramiding; passing on to farmer, housewife and labourer, 2912; cigarette tax; income tax; production and revenue lessened; based on fallacy that taxation of rich relieves poor; Mr. Otto H. Kahn; income tax reduction in United Kingdom and United States, 2913; capital diverted from industry to tax free bonds; immigration and investment discouraged; graduated income tax; alternative between new taxation or economy, 2914; ministers' salaries and members' indemnities; aristocracy of spending; civil service; finances complicated; ordinary and war expenses should be specially provided for, 2915; substitution of turnover for sales tax; farmers and the tariff; price comparison between Canada and United States; William Henry Seward on United States tariff, 2916; not enough protection; reciprocity in tariff taxation; imports of agricultural products; farmers' national policy; reciprocity proposals, 2917; reciprocity agreement of 1911; United States out for themselves; war debts; United States would "crash through any agreement"; 2918; Fordney-McCumber tariff, 2919

Ryckman, Mr. E. B.—*Con.*
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill, 2668
Canadian National Railways
New positions and salaries, 2701
Paris offices, 3631, 3680
Cheque tax, 3933
Combines bill, 2630
Appointments, 2665
Technicalities, 2665
Government elevators, value, 2037
Labour dept., economies, 1624
Masters and mates, 2668
Patents of Invention bill, 2070
Domicile, election of, 2072
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3864, 3881
Radiotelegraph Act Amdt. bill, 2468
Toronto harbour improvements, 984, 2678, 4578

St. Alexis wharf, 980

St. Andrew's Dam fishway, 1000

St. Andrew's harbour, 2899

St. Andrew's lock, 2682

Ste. Anne de la Pocatière
Experimental farm, 460, qu. 1028

Ste. Anne des Monts wharf, 979

Ste. Anne's lock, Isle Perrot bridge, 3646

Ste. Anne-St. Charles telegraph line, qu. 3138, qu. 3262

St. Barnabe Nord postmaster, 1830

St. Bruno postmaster, dismissal, qu. 3140

St. Charles wharf, 980

Ste. Claire postmaster, qu. 1031

St. Croix
Harbour, 2899, 2938
River, bridges, 2342

St. David postmistress, 1489

St. Jean d'Evangeliste, postmaster, qu. 2698

St. Jean d'Orleans wharf, 980

St. John, N.B. (city)
Employment office, 3453
Immigration building, 1457, 1464, 1908
Martello tower, 3444
Members of Parliament, visit to, 2503
Quarantine station, Partridge island, 1021, 4613
Water supply, 1022
Station, 2481, 3188, 3645, 4310, 4445
Terminals, train shed, 3188, 3645
Warehouse facilities, 308

St. John, N.B. (port), 2676
Canadian National Railways, 1767
Grain shipments, 261, qu. 1484
Harbour commissioners, qu. 911
Importation through. *See* British Preference; Treaties, French, Italian
Improvements, 109, 4610
Courtenay bay, 109, 2676
Pilots, 3358
Wharfage tolls, 975

St. John and Quebec Railway Bill
(Extension of time)
Res. 3145, 3403; 1r., 2r., com., 3405; 3r., 3406

St. John-Bay of Fundy steamship service, 2176

St. John-Bear River steamship service, 2176

St. John-Digby steamship service, 2176

St. John River
Bridges, 2342
Sawdust pollution, 701, 3362
Wharves, taking over of, qu. 1488

St. Joseph d'Alma postmaster, qu. 3140

St. Laurent, late Mr. Arthur. *See* Public Works

St. Lawrence Ship Canal, surveys, 3647
Hydrographic, 3336

St. Lawrence River Ship Channel, 3339
Dredge No. 12, Capt. Bilodeau, qu. 1487
Maintenance and dredging, 3375, 3339
Sorel shipyard, 3374. *See also* Sorel

St. Lawrence River Waterway, 2979. *See also* Address; Budget; Canals; Hudson Bay railway; Lake Grain Rates; Vancouver Harbour bill; Water Powers; Welland canal
Aerial survey, 1776
Expenditure, 3076
Federal and provincial jurisdiction, 665
International Joint Commission, 3427
Parliamentary discussion of project, 2807
Power
Development, qu. 490, 2682
Dominion Power Board, investigation, 3427
Exportation, 658
Power canal, qu. 204
Water powers, 3782
Shipping rates. *See also* **Freight Rates, Shipping**
Grain, 3343
United States
Agreement with, 3705, 3762
Negotiations with, 665, 3208, 4513

Ste. Marie, Mr. L. T., appointment, qu. 1028

St. Mary's Cape, N.S., breakwater, 941

St. Michel de Bellechasse wharf, 980

St. Moïse, Que., agent, 1489

St. Omer, Que., wharf, 980

St. Père, Mr. E. C. (Hochelaga)
Civil Service Commission, 1188
Emigration to United States, 1188
Immigration
Agents, appointment, 1188
Farmers and farm labourers, 1188
Labour, attitude, 1186, 1187
Policy, 1186
Labour, unemployment, 1187
Repatriation, 1188

St. Peter's, N.S. postmaster, qu. 1488, 1795

Ste. Petronille wharf, 4588

St. Stephen, N.B. industrial centre, 2901

Saar Valley. *See also* League of Nations
Administration, 3995, 4000
Commission, 4653

Sackville public building, 4613

Safety League. *See* Canadian National

Sailors. *See also* Immigration Act Amdt. bill
Distressed. *See* Canada Shipping Act; Marine
Institutions for assisting, 2167

Sale and Inspection of Fruit and Fruit Containers Bill
Res. 193; 1r., 195; 2r., 277; ref. to Agriculture Com. 277; com. 2105; 3r., 2131; Senate amdts. 3150

Sale and Inspection of Root Vegetables. *See* Root Vegetables

Sales, Mr. Thomas (Saltcoats)
Agricultural conditions, 1841
Binder twine, price, 4386
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4549, 4550
Government telegraphs, qu. 383
Grain
Dockage and screenings, 786
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4225-34
Marketing of, M. (Mr. Millar) 304
Hudson Bay railway, 3647
Labour, hours, 1841
Penitentiaries, 773
Railway department, printing, 3197
Saskatchewan Co-operative creamery, 185

Sales, Mr. Thomas—*Con.*
Union bank, 4225
Vancouver harbour bill, 269
Vancouver terminal elevator, qu. 517
Addition to, cost, qu. 621
Yorkton income tax office, qu. 384

Sales Tax. *See* Special War Revenue Bill; Taxation

Saline Lake Deposits, Western Canada, 3198

Salmon Canning. *See* Fish and Fisheries

Salvage Cases. *See* Soldier Settlement

Salvation Army
Immigration, 1430, 1476, 1480-1
Canada Colonization Association, 1093
Child, 1470

Sample Market. *See* Grain, Marketing of

Sanctuaries, Birds and Wild Animals. *See* National Parks and Reservations

Sardine Fisheries. *See* Fish and Fisheries

Saskatchewan. *See also* Western Provinces
Agricultural conditions, 2766
Automobiles in, 82, 148. *See also* Automobiles
Canadian Air Force, 1748-51
Co-operative creameries, 2779
Co-operative Elevator Company, 2779
Dairying industry, production, 1921, 2744
Debentures, sale of, 2770
Dominion forest reserves and parks, 2061, 3942
Dredging, 1012
Dunning, Premier, statement regarding budget, 2770-1
Farm loan bonds bought by farmers, 2770
Hail Insurance Commission, 2770
Harbours and rivers, 1001, 4589
Highways, 3185. *See also* Canada Highways; Highways
Immigration, domestic servants, 1099, 1476
Indians, 2145
Lands
Reclamation, 1065
Southwestern, 1353
Mennonites, 1229
Mixed farming, 2773
Public buildings, 1023, 4629
Resources, report of Mr. Crean, 1060
Saskatchewan Co-operative Elevator Company, Calcutta trade commissioner, 1840
Settlers' relief, 3447
Sunset lake postmaster, claim, 1832

Saskatchewan—*Con.*
Telegraph and telephone lines, 2683
Wheat board, res. of legislature, 3045

Saskatoon post office, 1785

Sastri, Right Hon. V. Srinivasa, Hindu franchise, 508, 4641-65. *See also* Hindus

Saturday Night, statement, labour shortage, 1125

Saturday Sittings. *See* House of Commons, Sittings

Sayabec postmistress, dismissal. *See* Post Office; Boulay

Scandals. *See* War

Scandinavia, immigration from, 1085

Scarfe Varnish Works, qu. 1485

Schofield, Rev. Dr., res. Pension Board, 3399

Scholarships. *See* Students

Schools. *See also* Education
Attendance age, 1179
Capitalistic system and, 2725
Closed for lack of money, 1202, 1342, 1388, 2836
Lack of in the West, 1390
Lands, 3398. *See also* Dominion Lands
Reversion of, 3445
Sections reserved for. *See* Dominion Lands Act Amdt. bill
Unpaid balance of purchase price, 1385, 3982, 4202
New, opening of, 1889
Oriental children, 2326, 2485
Segregation, 1896
School homes for immigrants, 1227
Taxes, unpaid, 3256

Scientific and Industrial Research. *See* Research

Scientific Men, neglect of, 1294. *See also* Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner)

Scientific Research. *See* Research

Scotland, immigration from, 1876. *See also* Immigration, Hebrideans

Scott, Mr. D'Arcy, Grain Inquiry Commission, 4711

Scott, Mr. Frank. *See* Canadian National Railways, Grand Trunk

Scottish Aid Society, immigration, 1876

Scottish Pioneer Association, Hector celebration, 4705

Screenings. *See* Grain and Grain Trade, Elevators

Scrip Frauds. *See* Criminal Code Amdt. bill

Seamen
Desertion of. *See* Immigration Act Amdt.
Distressed. *See* Canada Shipping Act; Marine

Seaports, Canadian. *See* British Preference; Treaties; Ports

Sears-Roebuck, Chicago, price comparison, 2737, 2742

Secession, 2940. *See also* Maritime Provinces; Nova Scotia; Western Provinces
British Empire from, 2244
Nova Scotia; 2057, 2177, 2243-4, 2977
Roberts, Hon. W. F., reported statement of, 3145
Talk of, 2977, 3067
Western provinces, 2808, 2814

Second Homesteads. *See* Dominion Lands Act Amdt. bill

Secondary Amendments. *See* House of Commons; Speaker

Secret Agreement, Japanese immigration, 1448

Secret Treaties. *See* Near East Crisis

Secretary of State
Canada Temperance Act, administration, 2495
Department
Estimates, 2392, 2494, 3985
Mulvey, Mr. Thomas, alien enemy property, custodian, 3823, 4671
Salaries and contingencies, 2392, 2494
Naturalization. *See also* Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill
Correspondence, Vancouver judges, 2199
Certificates, issue, 2182. *See also* Naturalization Acts Amdt.
Naturalization Acts, expenses under, 2495
Public archives, 3985
War claims adjustment, 2495. *See also* Aliens; War

Securities, Issue of. *See* Canadian National Railways Bills

Sedition. *See also* Criminal Code Act Amdt. Bill; Immigration Act Amdt. Bill; Royal Canadian Mounted Police and, 1142

Seed. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade
Fairs, 599, 600
French treaty, 1984
Purchasing Commission, qu. 279, 599, 601
Seed and fertilizer control, 599
Seed grain advances, 3444

Seed Testing and Inspection, Bill
(Grading and qualities of seed)
Res. 195; 1r., 198; 2r., and ref. to Agriculture Com. 277-8; com.. 2304; 3r., 2308
Sections and subjects discussed:
Agricultural or garden vegetable seeds or plants, 2307
Clark, Mr. George H., 2304
New varieties, registration of, 2307
Noxious weeds, 2305
Primary, 2305
Plant, definition of, 2304
Registration through Canadian Council of Horticulture, 2307
Sale of seeds for export, 2307
Samples to be taken in presence of witness, 2308
Seed commission, 2304
Time limit for complaint, 2308

Seeds, Noxious, 2305, 4378. *See also* Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill

Seizures. *See* Customs and Excise; Fish and Fisheries

Select Standing Committees. *See* House of Commons

Selkirk, Man. wharf, 1000

Senate
Abolition of, 1376
Amendments concurred in:
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4508
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 4201
Board of Audit Act, 4733
Canadian National Railways (Securities) bill, 4754
Chinese Immigration Act Amdt. bill, 4536
Combines bill, 3504
Companies Act Amdt. bill, 4736
Copyright Act Amdt. bill, 3154
Criminal Code Amdt. bill, 4733
Fruit Containers bill, 3150
Immigration Act Amdt. bill, 3981
Inland Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 4528
Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill, 3150
Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. bill, 3149

Senate—*Con.*
Amendments concurred in—*Con.*
Northwest Territories Act Amdt. bill, 2050
Patents of Invention bill, 3154
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 4744-50
Returned Soldiers Insurance bill, 4734, 4750
Senate and House of Commons bill, 4734
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment bill, 4750
Amendments, non-concurrence
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 4732
Industrial Disputes Investigation bill, 4357, 4592
Baker, the late Col. G. H., M.P., Joint committee, 730
Canadian National Railways, branch lines bill, 4688, 4689, 4694
Rejection of, 4753
Divorce proceedings, publicity. *See* Criminal Code Amdt. bill
Elective, 2908
M. (Mr. Denis, Joliette) 1364
Estimates, salaries and contingencies, 2694, 3949
Fowler, Hon. Senator, remarks on immigration bill, 3032
Grain-carrying trade, committee report, 2899
Hudson Bay railway report. *See* Hudson Bay Railway, M. (Mr. Knox)
Joint committee. *See* Senate and House of Commons
Lougheed, Senator, remarks on Immigration bill, 3032
Members of House of Commons appointed to, 2710
Progressive party and, 1378
Reform, 2908
Senators
Age limit, 1376
Attendance, 4007, 4008
Indemnity, 4008
M. (Mr. Leader) for reduction of, 1153
Pensions, 1376
Vested right of, 1376

Senate and House of Commons
Joint Committee on matters of common interest, 4007
Appointment, 2794
Message from Senate, 2611

Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. Bill (Indemnity; attendance)
Res. 4184; 1r., 2r., com., 4185, 4236; amdt. (Mr. Gardiner) six months' hoist, neg. 4246; amdt. (Miss Macphail) to refer back, neg. 4247; 3r., 4247; Senate amdts. 4734

Senate and House of Commons—*Con.*
Sections and subjects discussed:
Attendance of senators and members, 4007
Deduction for non-attendance, 4242
Personal explanation—Mr. Gervais, 4249
Sessional allowance, 4185, 4236
Amdt. (Miss Macphail) to reduce, 4240, neg. 4242

Senn, Mr. Mark C. (Haldimand)
Accredited herd system, qu. 492
Agricultural Instruction Act, renewal of, qu. 490
Budget, 2957. Protection, adequate; tariff proposals and Liberal pre-election pledges; need of profitable markets; British preferential tariff, 2957; mistake to penalize Canadian industry; woollen industry affected by increased preference; competition from other countries; artificial silk duty; knitting factories threatened with ruin; petition against increase of British preference and alteration of sales tax; copper and hemp bounties; reciprocity; Canadian and United States duties on agricultural products, 2958; imports; home market for manufactured and agricultural products; unbalanced budget; economy; high standard of living, 2959
Pure-bred sheep, qu. 3141
Seed inspection, 198
Six Nation Indians, 1307

Sergeant-at-Arms. *See* House of Commons

Sessional Indemnity. *See* Senate and House of Commons Act

Settlement. *See* Immigration; Soldier Settlement

Settlers. *See also* Soldier Settlement
Land for. *See* Immigration
Relief, Alberta and Saskatchewan, 3447
Transportation facilities, 2172

Sevres Treaty. *See* Near East Crisis

Sexsmith, Mr. Edward J. (Lennox and Addington)
Budget, 2784. National debt, revenue; methods of raising; deficits; taxation; increase in national business; expenditure; retrenchment; immigration 2784; natural resources; retrenchment, public works, civil service, superannuation; taxation and extravagance, 2785; taxes—income, business, consumers, sales; national policy based on special privilege; tariff, downward revision;

Sexsmith, Mr. Edward J.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
labour unions; strikes; high cost of living; prices, control of; agriculture, condition of; farmers in Parliament; partisan politics, cost of; prices of agricultural and manufactured products, 2787; combines; spread between producer and consumer; disappointing budget; protective feature of tariff; the amendment
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 743

Seymour Narrows, obstruction, 3333

Shale Deposits. *See* Oil

Shareholders. *See* Bank Act Amdt. bill; Banks and Banking

Shaw, Mr. Joseph T. (Calgary West)
Address in reply, 66. Gift from France of Vimy Ridge, 66; Parliament and economy; administration of national parks; four cardinal principles of taxation, 66-67; agriculture essential industry of Canada, 67; financial and economic depression in farming industry, 67-68; cost of grain production, 68; high transportation and insurance rates, 68-69; western grain route, 69; cattle industry and embargo; co-ordination of branches of Agriculture department; revision of Bank Act, 70; government immigration policy, 70-71; Near East crisis, government's action, 71; General Smuts at Imperial Conference of 1921; personal standing and obligation to constituents, amdt. to amdt., 72
Annual training, 864
Banff national park
Electric plant, 3436
Power rights, 496, 3750
Calgary Power Company, 3938
Springs and cave, 496
Water powers, 3420
Banff-Windermere highway, 3437
Bank Act, revision, res. Alberta legislature, 2084
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4089-4105; 4134-4160; 4509
Bank mergers, 4134, 4150
Interest at 7 per cent, 4103
Maximum rate, amdt. 4148, neg. 4148
Shareholders' audit, amdt. (Mr. Woodsworth) 4089
Bankruptcy Act M. (Mr. Casgrain) 1495, 1505

Shaw, Mr. Joseph T.—*Con.*
Brenner, Meyer, release from penitentiary, 1975
Business of the House
Rules, M. (Mr. Johnston) 1302
Supply, amdt. to amdt., 1302
Business profits tax, 4491
Cadet services, 877
Calgary
Power Company, privileges, 3750
Unemployment relief, 1681-3
Canada Grain Act, administration, 781, 4709
Canada-West Indies steamship service, 3377, 3389, 3397
Canadian Forestry Association grant, 3410-13
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, combine, 1395
Canadian national parks, automobile admission fee, 3943
Canadian National Railways
Coal, purchase of, qu. 4437
Alberta, qu. 1363. 4752
Employees' pensions, 288
Paris offices, 3650-74
Transportation combine, 1395
Canadian National Safety League, 3953
Canadian Press, Limited, 4712
Subsidy, 4728
Canadian representation in United States, 4664
Cheque tax, 3934
Chilled beef, 464
Civil Service Act
Grazing inspectors, appointment, 3253
Homestead inspectors, 3252
M. (Mr. Power) for repeal, 363, 382, 519
Special committee, 937
Civil Service bonus, 1664
Cost of living, increase, 1814
Civil Service Commission, 346
Combines
Bill, appointments, 2665
Transportation, 1395
Cost of living. *See also* Civil Service bonus
Freight rates and, 1958
Reduction, 1394
Criminal Code Amdt. bill
Betting information, 2282
Guessing competitions, 2282, 2283
Customs and excise, salaries, 3276
Dairy Industry Act Amdt. bill, 4253
Deputy ministers' salaries, increases, 4668
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 2360
Dominion lands and parks.
Automobile admission fee, National parks, 3943
Salaries, 3250

Shaw, Mr. Joseph T.—*Con.*
Egypt, British policy, 4662
Emigration to United States, 1393
Empire Forestry Conference, 3410
Grant, 3413
Experimental farms, 464
Freight rates, 1394
Crowsnest pass agreement, 1958
Railway rates, equalization, M. (Mr. Clark) 1956
Grazing inspectors, 3253
Halibut treaty, 4132
Harbours and rivers, 1001
Hayes, Mr. John J., dismissal, 1690
Hindu immigrants, franchise, 4645, 4664
Hoppe and Isenberg leases, cancellation, 3130, 4442
Hudson Bay railway, McArthur claim, 4690
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1396
Advances to, qu. 517
Results, 1105
Child, 1472
Estimates, 1387
Policy, 1392
Imperial Conference, 4645-63
Constitutional changes, 4664
Policy, 4662
Publicity, 4665
Indemnity of members, 4009, 4247
International Labour Conference, 1645-6
Interest rate. *See under this title,* Bank Act
Labour
Coal miners' strike, district 18, 1629
Industrial disputes investigation, 1629
Labour Gazette, 1622
Lack of Confidence vote, Mr. (Mr. Irvine) 213
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4225
Land speculation, 1395
Macphail, Miss, members and party funds, 4238
Merchants' Bank failure, 4150
Military properties, maintenance, 889
Morrison claim, Little Anse, 4724
Narcotic Drugs bill, 2123
Northwest Territories Act, procedure, qu. 1974
Oil-well drilling machinery, duty, 3917
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3572
Penitentiaries, 773
Pensions
Appeal boards, 683
European war and active militia, 2167, 3723
Legislation, 2519
Officials, conduct of, 4703

Shaw, Mr. Joseph T.—*Con.*
Pensions—*Con.*
Old age, 1649
Royal commission reports
Interim, 2167
Printing, 3401
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3401
Permanent force, 892
Petition of Right Act Amdt. bill, 3130
Physical training, 877
Political patronage, 3347
Postal rates, public libraries, 1809
Prince Edward Island car ferry claim, 4679
Privilege—Grain Growers Guide, 987
Public buildings, Saskatchewan, 4629
Public expenditure, East and West, 3436
Purchasing Commission, 3950
Authority for, qu. 2699
Railway rates
Attorney General, B.C. vs. C.P.R., 1917
Railway commission judgment, 1917
Redistribution, 4741
Renovated butter, 4253
Rideau canal, 4691
Riordan Pulp and Paper Company, taxes, qu. 1974
Rocky Mountain park
Hudson Bay Company claim, qu. 2418
Stipendary magistrate, 1739
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 778
Rural depopulation, 1394
St. Lawrence ship channel, 3340
Sales tax, public libraries, 1870
Scholarships, international, provision for, 878
Screenings, purchase of, 785
Senate and House of Commons bill, 4185, 4238-4247
Soldiers Civil Re-establishment bill, 3747, 3894
Soldier Settlement Board, extension, 1128
Sorel shipyard, dismissals, 3346
Speaker's rulings, discussion of, 4077
Tariff, high protection cost, 1394
Taxation, burden of, 1394
Tourist traffic, 3437
War, Canada's participation, 4663
Water powers, 3420. *See also under this title* Banff
Western provinces, conditions, 1396
Wolvin, Mr. Roy, Standard Shipping Company, 1704
Wrangel island, ownership, 3948
Yukon territory, administration of justice, 705

Sheard, Mr. Charles (South Toronto)
Grain dockage, qu. 3505
Port Arthur elevator, qu. 2612
Renfrew postmastership, qu. 204
Toronto harbour dredging, 1011

Sheep-Raising Industry. *See* Agriculture; Live Stock; Wool

Shells. *See* National Defence, Ammunition

Sherwood, Mr. H. Crossley, letter, 519

Shippigan, port, 2938

Ships. *See* Vessels

Shipping and Shipbuilding. *See also* Canadian Government Merchant Marine; Freight Rates, Shipping; Harbours and Rivers; Marine; Naval Service; Ports; St. Lawrence River Waterway; Steamship Services; Vessels
All-Canadian routes between East and West, 3273
Canada Steamship Lines, Limited. *See also that title.*
Shipping combine, 4278
War claims, qu. 3142
Canadian shipyards, closing, 1338
Cattle boats. *See also* Live Stock
Alleged unsanitary condition, 2613
Space, 2133
Certificates
Certificated masters on coasting vessels, 3971
Steamship. *See* Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bills
Dollar Shipping Company, 3273
Great Britain, 3072
Great Lake Transportation Company, lease of freighters, 3848
Harling, Thomas & Son, shipments via Panama canal, 3273
Hirtle, Schooner Carrie L., seizure, qu. 3323
Kirkwood line, 2175, 3846
Imperial Shipping Committee, qu. 3137
London Guarantee & Accident Company, qu. 1138
Ocean ports, 2898. *See also* Ports
Pacific Salvage Company, qu. 1763
Prince Rupert Dry Dock Company, bonds, qu. 1138
Rates. *See also* Freight Rates, Shipping; Immigration
Tramp steamers, 2127
Registrar. *See* Canada Shipping Act Amdts.
St. Lawrence river channel, 3343

Shipping and Shipbuilding—*Con.*
Shipping associations. *See* Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill
Shipping combines, 3845. *See also* Combines; Freight Rates
Ships purchased from foreigners, 3972
Standard Shipping Company, 4278
Steamboat inspection, 3360
Steamship services. *See that title*
Strikes. *See* Labour

Shire Horses, gift to Canada, 2207, 2253

Shortages. *See* Grain

Shorts. *See* Feeding Stuffs Act

Sick Mariners' Dues. *See* Health

Sifton, Sir Clifford
Coal supply, 1265
Clyde, the, mechanics from, 1204
Fuel supply, 788
Hudson Bay railway, 1047
Immigration, 1181-3
Importation of British workmen, 1186
"Man with sheepskin coat" 1204
Industrial and scientific research, 788
Lake grain rates, 4285
Standard of living, 1168

Silesia, partition of, 3995

Silks. *See* Custom Tariff; Treaties, French Treaty; Textiles

Siloam, schooner. *See* Vessels

Silver. *See* Mines and Minerals

Simpson, Mr. T. E. (West Algoma)
Murray Stewart, purchase of, 3356
Navigation, safeguards, qu. 812

Sinclair, Mr. John A. *See* Canadian National Railways, Directors

Sinclair, Hon. J. E. (Queen's, P.E.I.)
References to, 2996, 3012

Sinclair, Upton, press, capitalistic control, 2726

Singapore Naval Base, 2469, qu. 3506, qu. 3820, 3822, 4654

Single Member Constituencies. *See* Proportional Representation

Single Tax. *See* Land; Taxation

Single Transferable Vote. *See* Proportional Representation

Six Nations. *See* Indians

Skeena River. *See* British Columbia, Fishing Licenses

Sloan, Hon. William, Asiatic immigration, 1901

Smart, Mr. Bogue. *See* Immigration

Smith, Mr. A. H. *See* Drayton-Acworth Commission

Smith, Goldwin, protection, 3071

Smuggling. *See* Budget; Customs and Excise; Taxation

Smuts, General, 31, 72. *See also* Germany, Reparations; Imperial Conference

Snider, Judge, report, 1714

Snowden, Mr. Philip, British labour party, 2722

Social Agencies. *See* Labour, Unemployment

Social Service Council. *See* Race-Track Betting

Social Standards, work, popular attitude, 1189

Socialism, 123, 631, 2727. *See also* Labour
Macolm island Finnish settlement 1247

Society of Chemical Industries, 2069

Soft Drinks, tax on. *See* Confectionery and Beverages; Special War Revenue; Taxation

Soldier Advisers. *See* Soldiers Civil Re-establishment Bill

Soldier Settlement. *See also* Soldier Settlement Board
Carleton county, farms sold, qu. 1013
Fire insurance, 496
Lands
Reversion of, 3257
Taxation, 3256, 3260
Loans
Black, Mr. W. J., 2019
Expenditures and, qu. 2207
Missisquoi and Brome counties, 4012
Ontario, qu. 492
Questionaire sent out by Miss Macphail, 1845
Richmond county, farms sold, qu. 913
Wolfe county, farms sold, qu. 913

Soldier Settlement Board, 51. *See also* Immigration
Advances under act and cost, 1910, 2017
Advertising, 2023
Amounts due Dominion government, qu. 814

Soldier Settlement Board—*Con.*
Advice and assistance to immigrants, 1126
Edmonton, insurance, 3506
Estimates, 1910, 2017-30
Expenditure, 2986
Field supervisors, location of immigrants, 1089
Hebridean immigrants, 3252, 3596
Immigration, 170, 1179, 1255, 1406
Indian army officers, settlement in Canada, 1096
Land sales, alleged attempt to bribe supervisors, 1091
Legal expenses, 2018
Loans, 2018
Members, salaries and expenses, qu. 2180
Moss, Mr. H. H., illegal arrest, 2030
Peace river district, 1185
Salaries, 1910, 2017
Salvage cases, qu. 206, 2018
Staff, 2018

Soldiers. *See also* National Defence; Pensions; Returned Soldiers Insurance Bill; Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment
British soldier, deportation, 2254
Burial of destitute, 693, 695
Hospitals, 669. *See also* Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment
Imperial and foreign, treatment of, 691
In distressed circumstances abroad, 1456
National monument, Ottawa, 2685
Official advisers. *See* Soldiers Civil Re-establishment
Regimental funds, qu. 4010
Returned soldiers
Blake, Mr. Charles, Brandon, 4513
Branch banks and, 4122
Canadian legion, Victoria, B.C., res. 2942
Civil service. *See also that title*
Appointments, 1795
Dismissals, 1772
Employment, 1772
Clearing land, 1185
Deaths from tuberculosis, qu. 3134
Naturalization, 1379
Pensions, 2942. *See also* Pensions
Postmasterships and, 1799
Sheltered employment, 694
Vetcraft shops, 694
Treatment of, 2942
Unemployment, 2168
Relief, 689, 1679, 1681, 2168
Vocational training, 686

Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment
Department of, 113, qu. 282, 3893, 4075. *See also* National Defence; Pensions

Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment—*Con.*
Department of—*Con.*
Amalgamation with National Defence, 3893
Boyer, Dr., appointment, qu. 2418
Employers' liability compensation, 691
Estimates, 668
Expenditure, 2967, 3893
Reduction of, 23, 2032, 2987
Hospitals, 668, qu. 812. *See also that title*
Brant, closing, 1995, 4075, 4303
Euclid Hall, Toronto, closing, 4075, 4303
Imperial and foreign soldiers, treatment, 691
Interest, war service gratuity, 689
Joint industrial council, 1654
Medical advisory and appeal boards, 677, 696
Medical treatment and examination, 670, 687
Meighen, Right Hon. Mr., alleged statement, 670, 708, 2013
North Essex election, 2013
Operating expenses and working capital, 690
Pay and allowances, 687
Pensions, 3707. *See also that title*
European war and active militia, 2166. *See also* Pensions; Returned Soldiers
Salaries and contingencies, 668, 687
Toronto Soldiers' Comforts branch, qu. 3506, 3507
Mrs. Van Koughnet, 4726
Training, 687
Unemployment relief, 689, 1681, 2168
Vancouver office, appointments and dismissals, qu. 2297, 3085, qu. 3137, 3822
Vocational loans, 687

Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment Department Act Amdt. Bill
(Review and appeal tribunals; official soldier advisers; evidence on oath)
Res. 3648, 3745; 1r., 3748; 2r., com., 3892; 3r., 3895; Senate amendments, 4750
Sections and subjects discussed:
Appeals, review and appeal tribunals, 3892
Official soldier advisers, 3894
Power to take evidence on oath, 3895
Regulations, medical and appeal boards, 3892

Soldiers' Comforts Branch, Toronto, qu. 3506, 3507, 4725

Solicitor General. *See* Justice

Sorel
Postmaster, appointment of, qu. 1487

Sorel—*Con.*
Shipyard, 3343
Dismissals, 3344, 3374
Maintenance and operation, 3374

Souris, Man., public building, 4614

South Africa
Immigration policy, 1474, 1882
Senate, constitution, 1370

South America
Senates, constitution, 1373
Steamship service, 3377

Southampton, Ont. breakwater, 984

Soviet. *See* Russia

Spain
Senate, constitution, 1373
Trade with, 2397
Treaty with France, 2219

Spanish River Pulp and Paper Company, aerial forest patrol, 1776

Speaker, Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux. *See also* Deputy Speaker; House of Commons; Marcil
Rulings and statements of:
Acoustics of chamber, 4594
Adjournment
To await action of Senate, 4754
To discuss, etc., 1540, 2886
Against rule, unless urgent, 3589-90, 4441
Debate to be confined to matter at issue, 3599, 3601
Must not revive former discussion, 4296
No right of reply, 3595, 3603
Except by consent, 2896
Amendments. *See under this title,* Motions
Baker memorial, Joint commttee, 730
Bills
Drafting by law officers of House 494
First reading, explanation brief, 487
Not alterable except by authority of House, 3326
Reference to Private Bills Com. 4308
Second reading
More elaborate explanation, 487
Notice in writing, 3399
Principle only to be discussed, 3091
Third reading by consent, 4141
Time fixed for consideration, 4236
To be preceded by res. 4248
Trade, 331
Urgent and pressing, 4392

Speaker, Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux—*Con.*
Rulings and statements of—*Con.*
Business of the House, to-morrow, 3750
Chair to be addressed, 2921
Committees
Discussion of questions not referred, 3267, 3270
M. for not debatable, 4013
M. to print proceedings, 3399
Notice of motion to go into, 3582-3
Reference in anticipation of report, 3574-6
Reports, concurrence by unanimous consent, 1739, 1991
Special
Appointment, two days notice necessary, 572
Membership limited to fifteen, 937
Redistribution bill, reference, 488
Consent, unanimous, 3326
Conversation, 1872
Debate
Anticipated or repeated, 1271, 3326-30
Closed if mover answers question, 2523
Decorum, 406
Irregular, 1668
Matters under consideration by committees, 2930
Member
May not speak without consent after mover has closed, 1080
Must address Chair, 2921
Mover closes, 393, 421, 568, 1210, 2523, 4474
Notice of M. to go into com. 3582, 3583
Peace and tranquillity, 3557
Previous, references to, 1687
Reference should be in third person, 2921
Relevancy, 3327
Debates, official report of, bulky returns, 940
Duke and Duchess of York, congratulations on wedding, 2251
Acknowledgment of, 2338
Industrial group of Great Britain, message, 4436
Interruptions, 323, 406, 3557
Only by consent, member speaking, 3518, 3587
House of Commons
Estimates, 2691
Staff, 2691
Organization, 4592
Kennedy, the late Hon. W. C., letter from Mrs. Kennedy acknowledging sympathy, 281
King, His Majesty the, introduction of name in debate, 728

Speaker, Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux—*Con.*
Rulings and statements of—*Con.*
Lafortune, the late Mr. D. A., letter from Madame Lafortune acknowledging sympathy, 281
Language
"False" 3269
"Unmannerly" 3269
Leaders, latitude allowed, 3401
Legislation, anticipating, 667
Letters, reading, 2181
Library of Parliament, 2693
Members
May ask further question on orders of day by leave, 287
May not anticipate report of com, 3574-6
May speak only once, 2r. of bill, 273, 277
Moving res. exhausts right to speak, 1210
Must address Chair, 2921
Must not impute motives, 2573
New, introduced, 2837
Recognition of by Speaker, 1159
Referring to another, must use third person, 2921
Right of reply, 2896
Right to speak, 3589
Sitting may not interrupt without consent, 1546-9, 1996
To be fair to member speaking, 1155
Minister of National Defence, correct title, 495
Moose Jaw controverted election, 515, 615
Johnson, Mr. R. M., status, 202
Motions
Adjournment to discuss. *See under this title,* Adjournment
Amendments
Expanded negative, 3521
To be consistent with principle involved, 643
Anticipatory, 3267, 3326, 3870
Changing membership, special com., 2417
Debate closed, member may not speak without consent, 1080
Dropped, 3264
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 320, 341-42
Mover
Closes debate, 277, 393. *See also under this title,* Debate
Has no right to amend, 1528
Leave to withdraw, 1911
Right to speak exhausted, 1210
Non-debatable
For Com. of Whole, 4013, 4185
That Speaker leave chair, 3185, 4013, 4076

Speaker, Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux—*Con.*
Rulings and statements of—*Con.*
Motions—*Con.*
Non-debatable—*Con.*
That com., rise, 4185
When made by consent, 3326
Notice, 4295
In writing, 3399
Not given, M. must stand, 3084
Not in writing, put by consent, 1538
Not substantive, no right of reply, 3595
Objection, too late, 3981
Questions sub judice, not debatable, 1284, 1307, 1912
Redrafting, 816
Seconder, 1308
Special order, 3271
Sub-amendments, 3573
Substantive, right to reply, 2896, 3595, 3603
Unanimous consent, 345, 435, 572, 1739, 2047, 2639
When vote is taken, Speaker bound to read, 3580
Newspaper articles
Irrelevant, 4143
Reflecting on House, 4142
Orders of the day
Debate not permissable, 859, 3650, 4441
Members speaking twice, 3401
Press statements not to be quoted but synopsized, 667
Questions permissible but not debate, 734, 1309, 1925, 2898, 3400-01
Order paper
Errors, 487, 519, 4437, 4457
Not available on account of long sitting, 4744
Petitions
Irregular, 2885
Presentation by unanimous consent, 4525
Point of order, member speaking to, 322
Privilege, questions of
Committees, discussion of questions not referred, 3267
Contradiction of members' statements from outside, 3649
Matter properly before House, 3268
Remarks out of order, 709
Statement by consent only, 708
Questions
Allowed only by consent of member having floor, 212
Already answered, 2419, 2795
Answered by member speaking, 2523
Answered verbally to be preceded by asterisk, 3506

Speaker, Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux—*Con.*
Rulings and statements of—*Con.*
Questions—*Con.*
Asking, does not exhaust members' right to speak, 3589
Cost of living (Mr. Church) out of order, 3704
Excessive length, 622
Oral, without notice, 734
Orders of the day on, 734
Passed as orders for returns, 344, 939, 1139, 1386
Sub-judice, 1912
To be asked in third person, 3589
Railway Commission, appeal from, 1284, 1912
Relevancy, 309, 427, 1553, 3557
Restaurant, expenditure, 2692
Returns
Every member entitled to copy of, 940
Royal assent, 1809, 1818, 3829, 4755
Rules of the House, 3330
Rule 17A, debatable motions, 3583, 4014
Rule 17C, Thursdays and Fridays, 2640
Rule 115, urgent and pressing, 4308, 4392
Special com. on, 1299
Rulings
Appeals from, 4076
Senate amendments, 4592
Senate and House of Commons Joint Com. 2611
Sitting
Hour of, opening day of session, 1
Wednesday, unanimous consent, 99
Statements, indirect presentation of, 3649
Stewart, late Hon. J. A., letter from Mrs. Stewart acknowledging sympathy, 435
Supply, M. for, Rule 17C, 2640
Vacancies, 1763. *See also under this title,* Moose Jaw
Nicolet, 2178
Vimy Ridge Memorial
Letter from President of French Republic, 1538
Message from Governor General, 1631
Vote
May be taken if wish of House that Speaker do now leave chair, 4014
Method of taking, 434
Ways and Means Com., rule 17C, 2640

Speakman, Mr. Alfred (Red Deer)
Agricultural Conditions Com., report, printing, 2181
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4017
Charters, extension for one year, amdt. 4014

Speakman, Mr. Alfred—*Con.*
Business of the House
M. to adjourn, 3584
Rules, M. (Mr. Johnston) for Special Com. 1302
Calgary customs warehouse, 1023
Co-operative buying and selling, 1253
Copper bounty bill, 3236
Copyright Act Amdt. bill, 2287
Credit and industry, M. (Mr. Irvine) 639
Credits
Rural, 639
System, 1252
Dominion steamers and icebreakers, 3160
Economic conditions, 1250
Emigration to United States, 1253
Esquimalt dry dock, 2673
Hebridean immigrants, 3252
Treatment of, M. 3584
Homestead inspectors, 3252
Immigration
Hebridean, 3252, 3584
Policy, 1250
Selected, 1254
Soldier Settlement Board, 1255
Inland Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 4207
Institutionalism, excessive, 1251
International Institute of Agriculture, 599
Montreal Harbour Commissioners bill, 4508
Party system of government, 1254
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 4703
Protection, suggested remedy for conditions, 1253
Public buildings and local improvement taxes, 1022-3
Railway mail service, 1804
Railway rates, equalization, 1252
M. (Mr. Clark) 1966
Redistributon, 4741
Roads and bridges, 1014
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 777
St. John quarantine building, 4614
Sales tax, consumer and, 4423
School lands, purchase price, unpaid balance, 4204
Seed, purity of, 601
Settlers' relief, 3448
Soldier settlement, 2022-25
Steamship services, 2173
Tariff, more equitable to producers, 1252
Western provinces, conditions in, 1250
Winter trips, California, 1252

Special Delivery Letters. *See* Post Office

Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill. *See also* Budget; Taxation
Res. 2656, 3181, 3922, amended 4363; 1r., 4183; 2r., com., 4409; 3r., 4435

Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill—*Con.*
Sections and subjects discussed:
Books, failure or refusal to keep, 4434
Carbonic acid gas in cylinders, 2656, 3938
Cheque tax, 2656, 4363, 4409
Amdt. (Sir Henry Drayton) 3933; neg. 3934
Amdt. (Mr. Forke) 3934, ruled out of order, 3935
Amdt. (Mr. Neill) 3935, ruled out of order, 3936
Limitation of maximum, 3922
Confectionery and beverages, 2656, 3046, 3938
Duty paid value, definition, 4425
Excise stamp taxes, payment with postage stamps, 3938, 4435
Receipt tax, 2656, 4409
Exemption, 4423
Sales tax, 4181, 4409, 4425
Collection at source, 2656, 3938, 4411
Exports, 4364, 4418
Government or provincial sales, 4435
Imports, 4409, 4417
Licensed manufacturer, 4410
Producer or, 4364
Lumber, 4418
Magazines and periodicals, 4414-21
M. (Mr. Stevens) for com. of inquiry, 245, 915
Refund
Goods sold to provinces, 4435
To licensed manufacturers, 4418
Tinplate, 4418
Wholesale or jobber, 4410
Wines, excise tax on, 2656, 3937, 4425

Spectacle and Eyeglass Frames, 2653

Speech from the Throne. *See* Address; Governor General

Spence, Mr. David (Parkdale)
Audibility of debate,4572
Budget, 2976. Erratic and wasteful discussions; a business man's standpoint; amendment, 2976; tariff reduction and free trade; reciprocity; protection for tiller of the soil; oleomargarine duty; western conditions; "calamity howling"; secession talk, 2977; comparison of present and past conditions; improvement in agricultural position; cold storage, federal and provincial encouragement and assistance, 2978; St. Lawrence river waterway; water transportation; Welland canal; government by committee; avoidance of responsibility; committees of the

Spence, Mr. David—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
House, cost of; redistribution; soft drinks, tax on; cigarette duty; income tax penalties; Post Office department; postage stamps, use for special war revenue purposes; cheque tax; sales tax; newsprint; duty-free goods; banana trust; fruit, competition of foreign fruits; importation of, 2979; tariff commission; potato duty, 2980
Canadian National Railways, hotels, manager, qu. 1257
Cold storage, 187, 2978
Cold Storage Act Amdt. bill, 275-6
Experimental farms, 472, 473
Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill, 2200
Mediterranean steamship service, qu. 1488, 1636
Military expenditure, 876
Nova Scotia wharves, expenditure, 4572
Toronto
Customs house, 3282
Harbour improvements, 986
Viaduct and union station, 4449

Spencer, Mr. Henry E. (Battle River)
Agricultural instruction grant, 608
Alberta
Destitution, 1440
Natural resources, revenue, qu. 2515
Sales tax collections, qu. 2417
United Farmers of, 1440
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4057, 4083-4102
Bankruptcy Act administration, 780
Burrard Inlet bridge, 4708
Canada Grain Act, administration, 782
Cattle shipment to Great Britain, 4675
Central experimental farm, building, 4631
Credit and industry, M. (Mr. Irvine) 634, 635
Amdt. to extend bank charters for twelve months, 638
Canadian National Railways
Branch lines construction bill, 4199, 4323
Toronto office building, qu. 814
Davidson commission, war contracts, qu. 812
Emigration to United States, 1439
Freight rates and, 1440
Flax, cultivation of, 4378
Hebridean immigrants, 4706
Hector celebration, 4706
Immigration
Advertising, 1084
Canada Colonization Association, 1439
Grant, 1092
Estimates, amdt. to reduce, 1441

Spencer, Mr. Henry E.—*Con.*
Immigration—*Con.*
Organizations asking for increased, 1111
Policy, 1438
Population, loss of, 1439
Settlement in colonies, 1100
Income tax collections, western provinces, qu. 2206
Industrial disputes, settlement of, 1705
Interest rates in West, 1440
International Institute of Agriculture, 599
Justice, administration of, 4674
Labour Gazette, Mr. Ronald Hooper, 1626
Liberal platform of 1919, 3003
Live stock condemnation insurance, qu. 1972, qu. 2699
Mixed farming, 2773
Naturalization, mounted police and, 779
Old age pensions, 1649
Oliver-St. Paul branch railway, 4323
Opium and narcotic drugs, 700
Peace river district, railways, 1440
Public works, surveys, 1020
Railway construction, 1440
Rural mail, western provinces, 1802
Scales, inspection of, 810
Taxation, indirect, 1440, 3027
Toronto seed branch building, 4627
Vermilion town lots
Purchase, qu. 489, 1307
Rental, qu. 2417
West Ukrainian republic, M. (Mr. Campbell) 656
Western provinces, conditions, 1439
Wrecks, investigation, 3160

Spirituous Liquor. *See* Canada Temperance Act; Liquor

Sponagle, Col. J. A., port physician, Margaretville, N. S. qu. 2697

Sporting Mountain mail service. *See* Post Office

Spray Lakes lease. *See* Calgary Power Company

Spruce Bud Worm. *See* Forests and Forestry

Stability. *See* Tariff

Stamps. *See* Post Office; Taxation

Standard Shipping Company. *See* Freight Rates

Standard of Living, 1168. *See also* Cost of Living; Immigration

Standard Oil Company
Dividends, 2601

Standard Oil Company—*Con.*
Prosecution and fines, 2585

Standardization. *See* Agricultural Implements

Standards
Bureau of, 788
Canadian Engineering Association, 788

Stansell, Mr. J. L. (East Elgin)
Agricultural conditions, 1846, 3064
Agriculture, sacrifices, 3065
Budget, 3062. Congratulations to Finance Minister, 3062; sales tax, exemption drain tiles; cheque tax; stamp tax, notes and cheques; tariff policy of Conservative party; "out-Heroding Herod"; stability; definition of protection tariff and tariff for revenue, 3063; new Liberal doctrines; source in Montreal; failure of budget to balance; expenditure, increase of; expenditure and debt reduction; agriculture; condition of; speech of Minister of Agriculture; accredited herd system, 3064; tuberculin test; agriculture, needs of; sympathetic consideration of other interests; extreme attitude of Progressives; spirit of compromise; sacrifice, 3065; farmers and the tariff; provision for long-term loans; market facilities; Liberal party and tariff; failure to implement pledges; tariff reduction offset by increase in sales tax, 3066; disappointment of Progressive party; National Policy; problems of East and West, 3067
Cadet services, 878
Dairying industry, 1846
Emigration to United States, 1414
Farm mortgages, 1846
Immigration
Policy, 1412
Progressive party and, 1413
Ministers' and officials' travels, qu. 283, qu. 343
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3558
Proportional representation, M. (Mr. Good) 400
Rural mail carriers, remuneration, 1787
Sales tax, drain tiles, 3046, 3063
Tariff, immigration and, 1413
Western provinces, conditions in, 1415

Stationery. *See* Printing Bureau

Statistics. *See also* Immigration; Population; Trade

Statistics—*Con.*
Census figures, 43
Dominion bureau of, 788, 2032, 2034
Annual report tabled, 1539
Cost of living statistics, 1684
Staff
Temporary employees, qu, 938
Transfer from Labour dept, 1671, 2032
International labour office, 1631
Production, statement of, 2720
Wealth of Canada, estimated, 2719

Statutes, Quebec provincial, 1660

Steamship Combines. *See* Agricultural Conditions Com. report; Combines; Freight Rates, Shipping

Steamship Companies. *See also* Steamship Services
Immigration, 1201, 1462

Steamship Services, 3377. *See also* Canadian Government Merchant Marine; Shipping and Shipbuilding; Trade and Commerce
Advertisement for tenders, 3382-3
Canada-Great Britain, qu. 937
Canada-Newfoundland, 2171, 3377
Canada-West Indies, qu. 937, 3377. *See also* Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Charlottetown-Pictou, 2171
Extension to Great Lakes suggested, 2175
Freight rates. *See also* Freight Rates, Shipping
Control of, 2174
Railway commission and, 4003
Grand Manan and mainland, 2172
Halifax-Louisburg-St. Lawrence, 4701
Halifax-Newfoundland, 2173
Halifax-West Coast-Cape Breton, 2173
Inspection of, 2178
Mail carriage, 2172
Mainland and islands of Miscou-Shippegan, 2173
Mediterranean to, qu. 1488, 1636
Mulgrave-Canso, 2173
Mulgrave-Guysboro, 2173
Pelee island and mainland, 2174
Pictou-New Glasgow-Antigonish, 2174
Pictou-Souris-Magdalen islands, 2174
Port Mulgrave-Bras d'Or ports, 2174
Quebec-Natashquam-Harrington, 2175
Quebec or Montreal and Gaspe, 2176
St. John-Bay of Fundy-Minas Basin, 2176, 4004
St. John-Bear River, 2176
St. John-Digby, 2176
St. John-Westport-Yarmouth, 2176

Steamship Services—*Con.*
Sydney-Whycocomagh, 2178
Tariff and, 2923
Vancouver ports on Howe island, 4003
Vancouver-Northern ports British Columbia, 4003
Victoria-West coast Vancouver island, 4003

Steedsman, Mr. James (Souris)
Budget, 2835. Congratulations to Finance Minister; protective tariff, little relief; protected interests, nothing to fear; disappointment and discontent in West; agricultural conditions; cost of living and production; prices of farm products; lack of purchasing power; cost of transportation and distribution, 2835; Crowsnest pass agreement; Wheat Board; Manitoba legislature, attitude of; royal commission on freight rates and grain trade; rural credits and farm loans; natural resources; municipal taxation, prices in Canada and United States; tariff and prices; agricultural implements; protection unsound; revenue; direct taxation, 2836; inheritance tax; graduated income tax; amendment
Experimental farms, 469
Lake Killarney improvement, 999
Live stock industry, 468
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 1146
Seed inspection, 198
Taxation, direct, 2836
Turtle Mountain reserve, reforestation, 3413

Steel, the L. R. Company, Limited, qu. 1994

Steel. *See* Iron and Steel

Stefansson, Mr. Vilhjammer
Coal resources of Hudson bay, 1073
Reindeer and muskox in Barren Lands, 1073

Stenographers, members' qu. 518

Stevens, Hon. H. H. (Vancouver Centre)
Australia, trade treaty with, 1848
Bank Act, reference to speech on, 4031-4
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4032, 4081, 4089, 4099, 4125
Bank of Vancouver, qu. 4011
Beckett, Matt C., appointment and dismissal, 816
British Columbia
Claims against federal government, 708
Liquor. *See under this title* Canada Temperance; Liquor
Oil companies, 2505

Stevens, Hon. H. H.—*Con*
British preference
Canadian ports, direct importation, 3454
Goods imported via Suez canal and Hong Kong, 3454
Bureau of Standards, 788
Business of the House, private bills, posting, 4248
Canada Highways bill, 2338
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill, coasting regulations, 4235
Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, 2983
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2407-13, 2424. *See also under this title,* Liquor Act of 1922, 2407
Correspondence with Attorney General, British Columbia, 1032-38
Exceptions, 2409
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Expenditure and earnings, 1868
Vessels, earnings, 3324, 3399
Canadian National Railways
Advance, $73,000,000, 3610
M. to reduce by $2,000,000, 3681
Branch lines construction bill, 4186, 4341
Appropriations, 4342
Liquor transportation, 1868, 3324
Management, responsibility and powers, 3628
Paris offices, 3618, 3627, 3681
Amdt. that item stand, 3664; ruled out of order, 3667
Ruling, reference to, 3670
Securities, 4525
Canadian representation in United States, 4001
Cattle embargo, correspondence, 4184
Chinese Immigration Act Amdt. bill, 2308-37, 4537
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 529
Civil Service, salaries and bonus, qu. 204
Combines bill, 2524
Combines Investigation Act, 1910, prosecutions, 2575
Companies Act Amdt. bill, 4208-4217
Contrecoeur wharf, 950
Corruption-liquor purchases, 2410
Customs duty, goods passing from one Canadian port to another, 3272
Dairy Industry Act 1914 Amdt. bill, 4265, 4344
Deadman's island, qu. 1362
Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 788
Dominion Lands Act Amdt. bill
Homesteads, 4201
Pulpwood, permission to cut, 4206
Estimates, civil government, form of, 612, 780

Stevens, Hon. H. H.—*Con*
Exchequer court judgeship, 2500
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4271, 4541
Fiji islands, trade with, 1848
Freight rates
Railway Act Amdt bill, 54
Railway rates, equalization, M. (Mr. Clark) 1940
French treaty
Canned salmon, Japanese packed, 453
Favoured nation, 448
Fuel supply, 793
Geological survey, 2504
German reparations, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 322
Grain and grain trade, 3821
Elevators
Dockages, qu. 1484, qu. 1661
Earnings, 2042
Overages, 2043
Screenings, 2041, qu. 2697, qu. 3131
Revenue from, 2042
Grain Act, licenses, 2299
Marketing of grain, M. (Mr. Millar) 293, 304, 305
Shipment and handling, 2044
Granville island, taxation, qu. 1485
Grondines wharf, 959
Harbours and rivers
Expenditures in different provinces, 947
Nova Scotia, 941
Chimney Corner wharf, 942
Quebec, 950
Highway construction grants, 623
Hindu immigrants, franchise, 513
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1315
Endorsation of Imperial government and railways, 1328
Chinese, 2311-12. *See also under this title,* Chinese
Contingencies and general expenses, 1873
Lands
Orientals to, 511
Thirty-two year agreements for sale, 1317
Policy, 1315
Taxation and emigration, 1319
Immigration Act Amdt. bill, (Mr. Neill) 511, 857
Income War Tax Act Amdt. bill, 4495-98
Indemnity of members, 4241
Indians, 2124-5
Kitsilano reserve, 383
Industrial and scientific research, 788
Inland Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 4207
Interest rate, 4110
Irrigation Act Amdt. bill, 2138

Stevens, Hon. H. H.—*Con.*
Iron ore deposits, British Columbia, 2505
Lake Grain Rates bill, 4281
Lake of the Woods
Control board, expenses, 4001
Regulation bill, 4173-75
Liquor. *See also under this title,* Canada Temperance
British Columbia
Administration, 2410, 2424
Bootlegging
Attorney General and, 2407
Execution of murderers of policeman Lawson, 2407
Export, 2407
Warehouses, 3144
National railways, transportation on, 3324
Lowe, Dr. A. M., capture and maltreatment in China, 2695
Manitoba Pulp and Paper Company lease, 3256
Marine hospitals, 701
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, trip to Great Britain, 3290
Masters and mates, 2610
Narcotic Drugs bill, 2114-23
National Defence, pay of staff, 891
New York, appointment Canadian customs officer, 3272
Northern Pacific Halibut Fishery Protection bill, 4484
Officers, military, retired, 891
Opium and Narcotic Drugs Act, administration, 697
Ordnance lands, 3444
Ore-testing plants, 2506
Ostrea lake wharf, 943
Patents of Invention bill, 2066-77-87, 2131
Appeal to Exchequer Court, 2080
Domicile, election of, 2070
Pensions
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 774, qu. 1362
Unemployed pensioners, relief, 2169
Petroleum and Naphtha Inspection bill, 4248
Point Grey sandhead leases, 3671
Preston, Mr. W. T. R., report, 248
Prince Rupert civic employees, 2086
Proportional representation, 405
M. (Mr. Good) 416
Public Works Act, contract and tender, 951
Public Works, estimates, explanation, 961
Pugsley, Hon. William, appointment, 2500-02
Purchasing Commission, 4002
Renovated butter, 4265 , 4344
Rombough, Mr. R. M., 387

Stevens, Hon. H. H.—*Con*
Royal Canadian Mounted Police
Pensions, inadequacy, 774, qu. 1362
Scrip, qu. 1362
Sales tax, 4181, 4429, 4431
Drain tiles, 3183
Exemptions, 4431
M. for com. of inquiry, 245, 915, 928
Nursery stock, 4432
Tomato plants, 4432
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4241
Settlers' relief, 3448
Special War Revenue Act, M. for com. of inquiry, 245, 915, 928
Sponagle, Col. J. A., qu. 2697
Steamship services, 2171
Interprovincial trade, 2177
Terminal elevators and grain trade, 3821
Timber permits, qu. 203
Trade commissioners, 1847
Unemployment, order in council No. 220, 436
Vancouver harbour bill, 255-9
Vancouver harbour board, 387
Venereal diseases, 705
Yukon Act Amdt. bill, 4247
War claims, amdt. to reduce, 2502
Waterton lakes highway, qu. 2085

Stevenson, Mr. John A., article on immigration, 628

Stewart, Hon. Charles (Minister of the Interior; Minister of Mines; Superintendent General of Indian Affairs; Acting Minister of Immigration and Colonization)
Agriculture, depressed condition, 1083
Alberta Liberal convention, 2995, 2797
Alpine Club grant, 3414
Arctic explorations, 3944
New ship for, 4702
Banff National park, water powers, 3420, 3939
Banff-Windermere highway, opening, 3584
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4102
Barnjum, Mr. Frank J. D., 3412
Bienfait briquetting plant, 789, 2509-12, 3206. *See also under this title,* Fuel
British Empire exhibition, 1910
Appropriation, 3950
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, 4704
Budget, 2795. Tribute to Finance Minister, 2795; science of government; responsibilities and difficulties; promise and performance; tariff reduction; war debt, expenditure and taxation, 2796; inflation; agricultural conditions; depression of 1890-96; extravagance, ex-

Stewart, Hon. Charles—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
penditure and debt; per capita debt; natural resources, 2797; protection of industries; artificial silk; business depression, 2798; changes of government in Alberta and Manitoba; tariff reduction not warranted; difficulties due to other causes; world competition; moving in direction of tariff reduction; tariff stability does not mean finality, 2799; immigration; freight rates; railway labour, wages; deflation; emigration; co-ordination of immigration work; land settlement; unemployment, 2800; labour; unemployment; co-operation of government with railway companies; agricultural conditions in United States; immigration from United States; taxation, apportionment of; taxation of capital, 2801; necessary to attract capital as well as labour; natural resources, development of; mineral wealth, conservation of; coal and oil production; inheritance tax; balanced budget; railway debt and deficits; revenue from coal and oil in Alberta, 2802; amendment; income tax; land tax; inheritance tax; agriculture, condition and prospects, 2803
Buffalo, slaughter of, 3435-39, 4702
Burrard Inlet bridge, 4708
Calgary Power Company, application, 3939-40
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2413
Canadian Forestry Association grant, 3409
Canadian National parks and historic sites, 3406, 3432, 3939. *See also under this title,* Dominion Lands
Automobile admission fee, 3942
Water powers, leases, 3420, 3442, 3939
Cattle embargo, effect of removal, 1101
Chinese Immigration Act Amdt. bill, 768, 2308-2337, 2481, 4536. *See also under this title,* Immigration
Children, 2484
Immigration confined to certain classes, 2482
Merchants, 2482
Students, 2317
Wives, 2484
Civil Service Commission, appointments, 1086
Coal. *See also under this title,* Fuel
Alberta
Freight rates on, 1269

Stewart, Hon. Charles—*Con.*
Coal—*Con.*
Alberta—*Con.*
Production and revenue, 2802
Shipments to Ontario, 1163
Coal lands and mining rights, 2639, 3149
Hudson's Hope, 3203
Coast Range Steel Company, assistance, 2508
Commodity and agricultural products, prices, 1083
Conscription of fire fighters, 3410
Deflation, inequality of, 1407
Dominion Forest Reserves and Parks bill, 1256, 2060-86
Dominion lands
Contingencies, 3408
Pre-emptions and purchased homesteads, 1354
Reclamation by drainage, 3430
Dominion Lands Act, Amdt. bills
Coal lands and mining rights, 2639, 3149
Homesteads, 3982, 4201, 4364
Second, 3398
Dominion lands and parks, 3249. *See also under this title,* Canadian National Parks and Historic Sites
Estimates, 3406
Medicine Hat office, 3250
Taxes unpaid, 3257
Dominion Power board, 3427
Emigration to United States, 1082-93, 1322-30
Empire Forestry Conference, 3410
Estimates, preparation of, 3242
Exhibitions, 1454
British Empire, 1910, 3950, 4704
Exhibits for, 1468-9
Expenditure, 1468
Immigration, attracting, 1466
Staff and salaries, 1455-65
United States in, 1465
Farmers' credits, 1088
Forest protection, 3409-20
M. (Mr. Michaud) 820
Freight rates, 2799
Reduction of, 1101
Fuel Supply. *See also under this title,* Coal
Coal prices, control of, 3198
Coke ovens, 789
Fuel testing, 789
M. (Mr. Church) 1269-81
Peat experiments, 790, 3199, 3206
United States, 3203
Geodetic survey, estimates, 3245
Geological survey, estimates, 2504, 3197
Georgia pine, importation of, 3411
Grain, marketing of, M. (Mr. Millar) 309
Grazing inspectors, appointment, 3253

Stewart, Hon. Charles—*Con.*
Grazing leases, 3426
Hebridean immigrants, treatment of, 3591
Hindu immigrants, franchise, 503
Historic sites, 3406, 3432, 3939
Fort Edward, 3432-5
Homesteads. *See also under this title,* Dominion lands
Improvements, 3251
Inspectors, 3251
Hoppe and Isenberg leases, cancellation, 3146, 3227
Howat, Mr. Alex., detention at border, 2297, 2393, 2419, 2469, 3159
Hudson Bay railway, McArthur claim, 4687
Hudson's Hope, coal possibilities, 3203
Immigration, 2800. *See also under this title,* Chinese Immigration
Advertising, 1103, 1218
Alleged campaign against, 332
British Columbia, 1327, 1096
Canada Colonization Association, 1089, 1386, 1479, 1877
Agreement, signing, 1976
Terms, 1102, 1320
Endorsation of Imperial Govt. and railways, 1328
History, 1102
Minister's statement, 1089
Further statement, 1320
Officers, 1172
Directors and, 1327
Proposals of, memo, 1877
Railway contributions, 3400
Reorganization, 3400
Subsidy of $10,000 per month, 1092
Willison, Sir John, 1164, 1323, 1328, 1429
Child, 1099, 1469
Agencies, 1470
Domestic servants, conductresses, 1477-8
Empire settlement scheme, 288, 688, 1096, 1464, 1469, 1473, 1480
Grant, division of, 1475
European, 1170, 1316
Farm labourers, 1100
Winnipeg, 1976
Foster homes for children, 1099
Germany and Hungary, from, 1094
Great Britain, from, 1084, 1346
Officers in, 1879
Hebridean, 3591
Indian army officers, settlement in Canada, 1096
Interest rates on land purchases, 1088
Labour, restriction of, 1104
Leased land for American settlers, 1101
Literature, 1428
Maritime provinces, 1086

Stewart, Hon. Charles—*Con.*
Immigration—*Con.*
Minister's statement, 1082
Movement of population to United States, 1082
New Brunswick, 1200
Nominative system, 1360, 1478
Norway and Sweden, from, 1192
Ontario, 1085
London office, 1428
Oriental
Chinese, 1443. *See also under this title,* Chinese Immigration bill
Admission of, 1446
Children, 1445
Estimates, 1443
Legislation, forecast of, 502
Japanese
Japanese freighter with stowaways, 1454
Passages
Assisted, from Great Britain, 1100
Immigrant's family or friends, 1100
Loans, 1475
Prepaid, agreement with Imperial government, 2611
Policy, 1317, 1386
Propaganda embracing all Canada, 1098
Provincial government and, 1327
Publicity work, 1874
Quebec, 1085, 1104
Restriction of, 1170
St. John immigration building, 1457, 1464, 1908
Agreement with Canadian Pacific, 1458
Scotland from, 1095
Settlement in colonies, 1100
Statistics, 1881-1922, 1094
Swedish representative, visit of, 1095, 1192
Ukrainians, 1397
Western provinces, natural resources and policy, 1093
Immigration Act Amdt. bill, 502, 514
Immigration and Colonization dept.
Black, Mr. W. J., deputy minister
Appointment, 2664
Visit to Europe, 1476, 2084
Estimates, 1082-1110, 1317, 1386
Details of, 1482
Ingram, Mr., appointment of, 2664
May, Mr., appointment of, 2663
Outside service, salaries, 1082
Salaries and contingencies, 1873, 1909
Indians, 2124
Agents, 2146
Burke, Mr. J. Garry, appointment of, 2151
New Brunswick, 2154

Stewart, Hon. Charles—*Con.*
Indians—*Con.*
British Columbia, 2163
Cattle, beef production, 2159, 2162
Chieftainship, 2148
Condition of, 2126
Education, 2126
Appropriations for, 2164
Increased, 2145
Church organizations, work of, 2146
Edmonton school, 2149-2165
Morley reserve, 2150
Farming, 2156
Greater production, 2155
Indian Affairs, dept
Estimates, 2124, 2145, 2153, 2165, 4702
Reorganization, 2162
Salaries and contingencies, 2165
Medical service, 2160
Minister, statement of, 2145
Northern Ontario and Manitoba, hunting grounds, 2146
Nova Scotia, 4702
Potlatching, 2163
Reserves
Blackfeet, 2148-9
Caughnawaga, expulsion of halfbreeds, 2163
Grain production, 2156
Highways, 2153
Kitsilano, 383
Land, lease of, 2150
Hay, 2153
St. Lawrence river islands, 2164
Sioux, 2160
Treatment of, 2158
Tuberculosis, 2153
Interior, dept. of
Estimates, 1904, 3406, 3939, 4702
Salaries and contingencies, 1909, 3949
International boundaries, surveys, etc. 3246
Iron ore
Alberta, 2512
British Columbia, 2505, 2514
Reported discovery, lake Athabasca, 2513
Irrigation Act Amdt. bill, 1992, 2138, 2204, 2428-36, 2668-71, 3981
Irrigation, surveys and inspection, 3428
Kootenay flats, reclamation, 3431
Labour. *See also under this title,* Immigration
Cheap, 1118
Delegates from United States, detention *See under this title,* Howat
Northern Ontario and Quebec, 1086
Labrador gold discovery, reported, 2611
Gold rush, 1995
Lack of confidence, M. (Mr. Irvine) 238

Stewart, Hon. Charles—*Con.*
Lake of the Woods Regulation bill, 4172
Land. *See also under this title,* Dominion lands; Immigration
American immigrants, for, 1093
Free, available for settlement, 1087, 1090
Speculation, 1395
Taxation of, 1105
Larkin, Mr. James, detention, 1163, 1213, 1309
Liberal platform of 1919, 2994
Lignite Utilization Board, 2515. *See also under this title,* Bienfait
Live stock prices in West, 1101
Mackenzie river district, halfbreed claims, 3409, 3444
Manitoba Pulp and Paper Company lease, 3254
Maps, preparation of, 3443
Meyerscough, Mr. Thomas, detention, 2469. *See also under this title,* Howat
Migratory Birds Convention Act, 3443
Military hospitals, mental cases, 671
Mines department
Estimates, 2504, 3197
Explosives division, 2514
Salaries, 3207
Moose Mountain pleasure resort, 3408
National Parks and Reservations bill, 3131
Northwest territories
Administration, 3944, 4702
New ship, purchase and maintenance, 4702
Wireless telegraph system, 3944, 3948
Oil, 2802
Coutts Sweet Grass Company, 2508
Fuel, shale deposits, 2513
Oil companies, British Columbia, 2505
Southern Alberta, 2508
Ordnance lands, salaries and expenses, 3443
Ore-testing
British Columbia, plants, 2506
Machinery, 2509
Shipment to Ottawa, 2505
Peat. *See under this title,* Fuel
Printing, Interior department, 3443
Promissory notes, tax, 3924
Publicity agent in London, 4707
Pulpwood, prohibition of export, 3413
Quebec Battlefields Commission, 3406
Reforestation, Turtle mountain reserve, 3413
Relief of distressed Canadians, 1456
St. Lawrence river waterway, 3427
Saskatchewan, national parks, 3942
School lands. *See also under this title,* Dominion lands
Reversion of, 3445
Unpaid balance of purchase price, 4203
Seed grain advances, 3444, 4367

Stewart, Hon. Charles—*Con.*
Settlers' relief, 3447
Soldier Settlement Board
Advances and salaries, 1910, 2017
Advertising, 2023
Estimates, 2017-30
Expenditure, 2018
Land sales, supervisors, alleged attempt to bribe, 1092
Legal expenses, 2018, 2020
Loans, 2028
Moss, Mr. H. H., compensation, 2030
Telegraph and telephone lines, 4590
Topographical surveys, 2509, 3245
Towers, 2512
Tree-planting on prairies, 3412
Triplets, bonus for, inquiry, 3146
Water powers
Administration of, 3420
Banff National park, 3420, 3939
Dominion forest reserves and parks, 1256
Highwood river, 3427
Leases, 3422
Provincial jurisdiction, 3421
Publicity, 3421
Wheat, price of, 1101
Wrangel island, ownership, 3948
Yukon territory
Administration, 3943
Mining fees, 1636

Stewart, Mr. C. Wallace (Humboldt)
Air service, insect pest control, 597
Branch lines, construction bill, 4311-22
Cheque tax, 3934
Destructive insect pests, 597
Hudson Bay railway, M. (Mr. Knox) 1060
Income tax, fines, remissions, 3507
Labour, department
Annuities branch, 1677
Staff, 1677
Merchants' Bank inquiry, 3990
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2459, 3984
Noxious weeds, 2305
Paddle, Mr. J. W., claim of, 1834
Penitentiaries, 771
Rural mail carriers, compensation, 1833
Seed testing bill, 2305
Thunderhill branch line railway, 4311, 4315, 4322
Weights and measures, Peterborough, 810

Stewart, Mr. H. A. (Leeds)
Address in reply, 169. Near East crisis, 169; increase in commerce; trade conventions; removal of cattle embargo; immigration; Bank Act revision, 170; shipping rates combine inquiry; re-

Stewart, Mr. H. A.—*Con.*
Address—*Con.*
distribution; proportional representation, 171; Mr. Hoey's reference to Mr. Meighen, 171-172; Conservative party not dead or sleeping, 172
Bankruptcy Act, M. (Mr. Casgrain) 1527
Brockville rifle range, 889
Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, Sir Henry Thornton, 2983
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, lease of freighters, 3848
Canadian National railways, ties, qu. 516
Cornwall canal employees, qu. 3135
Hudson Bay railway, 4684
Immigration, medical inspection, 703
Income tax convictions, qu. 3582
Labour, jurisdiction, 1650
Military properties, maintenance, 889
Morrisburg-Waddington ferry, qu. 1029
Murray Stewart, steamer, qu. 386
National monument, Connaught place, 2685-88
Naturalization Act Amdt. bill, 2439-40
Old age annuities, 1639
Peat experiments, 3206
Public Works, salaries, 2685
Rideau canal, water power leases, qu. 622
Telegraph and telephone lines, 2683
Troops for Sydney strike, qu. 624

Stewart, the late Hon. J. A., 5, 7, 8, 166
Letter from Mrs. Stewart acknowledging sympathy, 435

Stewart, Mr. James, qu. 205

Stewart, Mr. Dan W., qu. 205

Stewart, Mr. T. J. (Hamilton)
Petawawa camp and Ontario elections, 3976

Stipendiary Magistrates. *See* Northwest Territories Act Amdt.
Rocky Mountain park, 1739

Stock. *See* Live Stock

Stock Growers' Protective Association, grant, 587

Stockyards. *See* Live Stock

Stornoway. *See also* Hebridens
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, speech, 2181

Stork, Mr. Alfred (Skeena)
Address in reply, 149. Skeena pioneer constituency, 149-50; Yukon telegraph lines; Queen Charlotte islands, 150; natural resources of Skeena; halibut fisheries;

Stork, Mr. Alfred—*Con.*
Address—*Con.*
Prince Rupert port, 151; railway traffic; visit of Montreal Board of Trade, 152; Grand Trunk Pacific, 153
British Columbia fishing licenses, 1550
Budget, 2733. Congratulations to Finance Minister; reciprocity, reception of announcement in Canada and United States; Chicago Tribune, comment; sugar, 2733; sales tax; copper bounty; machinery for manufacture of fish offal; British preference; direct importation; Canadian ports; Prince Rupert; reciprocity campaign in 1911; Fordney tariff, 2734; fishing industry and United States markets; use of Canadian ports by United States fishermen; collection of duty on purchases in Canada; United States wharf on Canadian soil; Canadian representative at Washington, 2375
Labour, right to organize, 2888
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2460
Orientals, 2461
Powell River Paper Company, 2888

Strikes. *See* Industrial Disputes; Labour

Stuart, Mr. John Cameron, qu. 2179

Students. *See also* Schools; Universities
Chinese. *See* Chinese Immigration bill
Medical, summer employment, 704
Scholarships, 878
Federation of Canadian students, res. 2486

Stumping Machines. *See* Customs Tariff Items

Sub-Judice Questions. *See* Speaker

Subsidies. *See* Bounties; Cold Storage Act Amdt. bill; Dry Dock Subsidies Act; Steamship Services

Suez Canal, Goods imported via Hong Kong 3454

Sugar. *See also* Budget; Customs and Excise; Customs Tariff Items
Beet, excise duty, abolition of, 2644, 2706, 2742, 2989, 3229, 4393
British preference, 2651
British tax on, 2754
Canada-West Indies steamship service, 3390
Combine, 2563, 2576, 2584, 2586, 3069
Women and, 2576
Customs drawbacks, 2655, 3502

Sugar—*Con.*
Customs duty, 2820, 2825, 2981, 2987, 3017, 3034, 3060, 3069, 3082, 3479
Dumping clause, 2646, 3046
Reduction of, 2645, 2646, 2744, 2968, 3049
Refiners' protection, 2987
Gambling in, 3058
Jam manufacturers, 3477
Price, increase of, 2646, 2734, 2889, 2933

Sullivan, Mr. Arthur W., 381

Superannuation. *See* Canadian National Railways, Grand Trunk, Gratuities, Civil Service; Judges; Pensions

Supplementary Estimates. *See* Estimates

Supreme Court, general rules and orders, 1659

Supply. *See also* Interim Supply
Committee of, 456, 575, 668, 859, 941, 993, 1082, 1163, 1213, 1315, 1386, 1443, 1464, 1538, 1619, 1637, 1668, 1694, 1740, 1764, 1811, 1837, 1873, 2017, 2124, 2145, 2392, 2489, 2494, 2610, 2671, 3160, 3272, 3330, 3406, 3610, 3706, 3760, 3798, 3824, 3830, 3938, 3985, 4554, 4594, 4638

Supply Bills. *See* Appropriation Acts

Supply, Committee of
Bills. *See* Appropriation Acts
Concurrence, 4732, 4735
Estimates. *See that title*
Subjects and items discussed:
Agriculture
Agricultural instruction grant, 607
Agricultural produce marketing agent, 4675
Cattle
Shipment to Great Britain, 4675
Embargo, expenses, 3989
Dairying, 609, 3283
Dehydration of fruits and vegetables, 4674
Destructive Insect and Pest Act, 595, 3988
Experimental farms, 456
Fruit, 598
Health of animals, 575, 587, 3989, 4675
International Institute of, 599
Publications, 598
Salaries and contingencies, 610, 3303, 4674
Stockgrowers' Protective Association grant, 587
Suppression of foul brood in bees, 4675
Alpine Club of Canada, 3444
Auditor General, 3897, 4003

Supply, Committee of—*Con.*
Subjects and Items discussed—*Con.*
Air Force. *See under this title,* National Defence
Annuities. *See under this title,* Labour
Banting, Dr. F. G., annuity, 4676. *See also under this title,* Insulin
British and Foreign news service, 4712
Burrard Inlet Tunnel and Bridge Company, 4708
Business Profits War Tax Act, 3949
Canada Grain Act, administration, 781, 2035, 4709
Canada Highways Commission, 2489, 3173
Canada Temperance Act, administration, 2495
Canadian Athletic Team, Olympic games, 4706
Canadian Engineering Standards Association, 788
Canadian Forestry Association, 3409
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 3798, 3824-30
Canadian National parks and historic sites, 3406, 3432, 3938, 3948,
Canadian National Railways, 1764
Advances
$73,000,000, 1619, 3610, 3676, 3789
$13,099,493.34, 1752, 3376
$ 1,700,000, 3376
$ 1,550,000, 4692
Branch lines, purchase of, 3646
Peace river railway survey, 4698
Prince Edward Island car ferry claim, 4676
Transcontinental, Fortin & Moffat claim 3646
Canadian National Safety League grant, 3953
Canadian representative in United States, 4001
Canadian Press, Limited, 4735
British cable service, 4727
Canadian telegraph service, 4727
Canals. *See also under this title,* Railways and Canals
Isle Perrot bridge, St. Anne's lock, 3646
Rideau, 4691
Trent, improvement, 3647, 4691
Welland, construction, 3760, 4690
Chief electoral officer, 4001
Civil Service
Bonus, 1664, 1811
Commission, salaries and contingencies, 668, 3986
Commissioner of Taxation, 3949
Customs and Excise, 3272
Debates, Official Report of, 2691

Supply, Committee of—*Con.*
Subjects and Items discussed—*Con.*
Deputy ministers' salaries, increases, 4667
Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 788
Dominion lands and parks, 3406, 3938, 4702
Dominion lands, contingencies, 3408
Outside service, salaries, 3249
Dominion Power Board, expenses, 3427
Dominion statutes, revision, 779
Edmonton elevator, 4716
Empire Forestry Convention, 3410
Exhibitions, 1910, 1454
British Empire, 3949, 4704
Canadian traveling exhibition in France, 811, 4711
External Affairs, salaries, 3987
Finance, charges of management, 3987
Fuel supply
Advisory fuel committee, 4691
Fuel and power resources, investigation, 3427
Geodetic survey, 3245
Geological survey, 2504
Government publications, 1712
Governor General's cars, repairs, 4691
Gratuities to Grand Trunk officials, 1664
Halifax grain elevator, 4713
Harbours and rivers, 941, 993
Alberta, 1001, 4589
British Columbia, 1002, 2671
Manitoba, 993, 4589
New Brunswick, 945, 4587
St. John, 2676, 4610
Nova Scotia, 941, 4554, 4635
Morrison, Mr. T. D., claim, 4722
Ontario, 981, 2690, 4588, 4594
Port Arthur and Fort William, 2675, 4610
Toronto harbour improvements, 2678, 4610
Prince Edward island, 945, 4586
Quebec, 950, 4588
Champlain dock, 2675
Health, department of, 697, 2167
Marine hospitals, 701
Medical examination of immigrants, 702
Medical research laboratories, 703
Opium and Narcotic Drugs Act, 697
Proprietary or patent medicines, 700
Quarantine, 702
Salaries and contingencies, 2170
Hector celebration, 4705
Highways. *See under this title,* Canada Highways
Housing, loans to provinces, 4704
Hudson Bay railway
Construction, 4680

Supply, Committee of—*Con.*
Subjects and Items discussed—*Con.*
Hudson Bay Railway—*Con.*
McArthur, J. D. & Company, refund, 3647, 4686, 4689
Port Nelson terminals, 3647
Hydrographic survey, 3336
Immigration and Colonization, 1082-1135, 1163, 1213, 1315, 1386, 1443, 1464, 1873, 1909
Imperial Conference, 4638
Imperial Economic Conference, 4638
Expenses of delegation, 4666
Income War Tax Act Amdt. bill, 3949
Indians, 2124, 2145, 2165, 4702
Industrial and scientific research, 788
Insulin, discovery and supply, 703
Insurance branch, salaries, 3987
Interior, department, 4702
Cory, Mr. W. W., deputy minister, 4667
Dominion Astrophysical observatory, 3242
Dominion observatory, 3242
Engraving maps, etc., 3443
Irrigation, surveys and inspections, 3428
Ordnance lands, 3443
Reclamation of Dominion lands by drainage, 3430
Salaries and contingencies, 1098, 1909, 3949
Interim Supply. *See that title*
Justice, department, 4667
Administration, 705, 4674
Bankruptcy Act, administration, 780
Litigated matters, expenses, 779
Penitentiaries, 706, 768
Salaries, 780
Labour, 1621
Annuities Act, administration, 1639
Canada Gazette, 1707
Employment offices, 1630
Industrial Disputes Act, 1627, 1702, 1716
Joint industrial councils, 1654
Salaries, etc., 1668, 1694
Technical Education Act, 1637
Lake Grain Rates Commission, 4710
Lake of the Woods Control Board, 4001
Laurier, Sir Wilfrid, monument, 1017
League of Nations
Canada's contribution, 3990
Expenses, Canadian delegates, 3989
Legislation
House of Commons, 4674
Committees, expenses, 2691, 4674
Sergeant-at-Arms, 2691
Senate, salaries, etc. 2694, 3949
Library of Parliament, 2691
Lord Selkirk Association, grant, 4704

Supply, Committee of—*Con.*
Subjects and Items discussed—*Con.*
Mackenzie river district, half-breed claims, 3444
Marine and Fisheries
Agencies, rents and contingencies, 3351
Building fishways and clearing rivers, 3362
Canned and pickled fish, inspection, 3375
Deep sea fisheries, development, 3364
Detroit river traffic regulation, 3357
Distressed seamen, relief, 3332
False Creek bridge, 3375
Fish culture, 3367
Fishery officers and guardians, 3361
Fisheries protection service, 3361
Hopper barge construction, 3350
Ice-breaking, Thunder Bay, 3359
Life-saving service, 3335
Lighthouses and lightkeepers, salaries, 3351
Live Stock inspection, 3334
Maintenance and repairs of lighthouses, 3353
Marine biological board, 3371
Marine signal service, 3358
Meteorological service, 3360
Navigation
Construction of lights and aids to, 3357
Obstructions, navigable waters, 3332
Schools, 3331
Ocean and river service, 2610, 3375
Maintenance of steamers, 3160
Wrecks, investigation, 3160, 3330
Patrol of northern waters, 3360
Pickled fish, inspection, 3367
Pilotage
Administration of, 3358
Pensions to pilots, 3359
Radiotelegraph service, 3337
River St. Lawrence ship channel, 3375
Salaries and contingencies, 3373, 3375
Sorel shipyard, 3343, 3374
Steamboat inspection, 3360
Tidal and current survey, 3338
Unforeseen expenses, 3334
Wireless stations, 3337
Wrecking plants, subsidies, 3334
Merchants Bank inquiry, expenses, 3990
Migratory Birds Convention Act, 3443
Mines and Minerals
Assay office, Vancouver, 3207
Explosives division, 2514
Mines and Geological Survey, 2504, 3197
Salaries and contingencies, 3207

Supply, Committee of—*Con.*
Subjects and Items discussed—*Con.*
National Defence, 1740
Ammunition, 884
Annual drill, 4635
Arsenals
Lindsay, 803
Quebec, 884
Bonus, 1751, 1772
Cadet service, 877
Canadian air service, 1748, 1774
Clothing and necessaries, 883
Desbarats, Mr. G. J., acting deputy minister, 4673
Engineer services and works, 4638
Grants to associations, 889
May, Miss H. M., grant, 900
Military properties, maintenance, 889
Militia services, annual drill, 859
Naval Service, Royal Canadian navy, 900, 902
Northover, Major, H. R., 4635
Ordnance lands, arms, etc., 890
Pay of staff, 890
Permanent force, 892
Salaries and wages, 900, 901
Schools of instruction, 900
War claims, adjustment, 900, 1745
Warlike stores, 900
National Gallery of Canada, 1018, 2688
National monument, Connaught place, 1020, 2685
Naturalization Act, administration, 2495
Northwest territories
Administration, wireless, etc., 3449, 3948
Wireless station, Mayo, 4702
Paradis, Mr. Telesphore, claim, 4691
Paris agency, expenses, 4001
Pecuniary Claims Convention with United States, 779
Penitentiaries, 706, 768
Pensions
District boards of review, 4703
European war and active militia, 3706
Fenian raid, 3742
Northwest rebellion, 3742
Pension Commissioners, salaries, 2168, 3742
Port Colborne elevator, 4690
Post office
Mail service, 1778
Miscellaneous, 1832
Salaries and contingencies, 1814
Prince Rupert Dry Dock Company, claim, 4708
Printing, publications, 811
Printing bureau, 1710, 1730
Miscellaneous printing, 1716

Supply, Committee of—*Con.*
Subjects and Items discussed—*Con.*
Public printing and stationery, retiring allowances, 3949
Public archives, bonus, 4707
Public buildings, 1022
Archives, 1730
Law, late Bowman B., tablet, 1020
Manitoba, 4628
Maritime provinces, 4614
Montreal ordnance stores building, 1022
New Brunswick, 4613
Nova Scotia, 4612
Ontario, 1022, 4615
Ottawa, new departmental, 1729
Architects, compensation, 4633
Parliament buildings, 1716
Prince Edward Island, 4614
Printing bureau, new building, 1730
Quebec, 4614
St. John immigration building, 1457
Quarantine station, Partridge island, 1021
Water supply, 1022
Saskatchewan, 4629
Terrebonne, Quebec, 2690
Public Works, 4594
Dredging, 1009, 4590
Graving docks, locks, etc. 2681
Harbours and rivers. *See under this title,* Harbours and Rivers
Roads and bridges, 1014, 4589
Salaries, 2684
Telegraph and telephone lines, 2682, 4590
Pulpwood Commission, 4709
Purchases, government, supervision of, 3950, 4001
Purchasing Commission, 4704
Radiotelegraph service, wireless stations, 3374
Railway Commissioners, Board of, 3188
Railways and Canals, 3650. *See also under this title,* Canals
Arbitration, litigation, etc. 3195
Contingencies, 3377
Intercolonial pension allowances, 3195
Printing and stationery, 3197
Prince Edward Island railway, pensions, 3195
Salaries, 3195
Surveys and inspections, 3648, 4691
Relief of distressed Canadians abroad, 1456
Roof coverings, investigation, 4703
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 774, 1163
Royal Canadian Navy, 900-2

Supply, Committee of—*Con.*
Subjects and Items discussed—*Con.*
St. Lawrence ship channel, 3339
Sorel shipyard, 3374,
Surveys and investigations, 3647
Secretary of State
Public archives, 3985
Salaries, 2392, 2494
Seed, feed and fertilizer control, 599
Seed grain advances, 3444
Settlers' relief, Alberta and Saskatchewan, 3447
Soldier Settlement Board, 1910
Advances and salaries, 2017
Moss, Mr. H. H., compensation, 2030
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 668, 4703
Department, salaries, 687
Interest, war service gratuity, 689
Medical advisory and appeal boards, 696
Medical examination of pensioners, 670
Operating expenses and working capital, 690
Pensions, European war and active militia, 2166
Sheltered employment, burial expenses, etc., 693
Treatment, 687
Unemployment relief, 689, 2168
Vocational loans, 687
Vocational training, 686
Steamship services, 2171, 3377, 4003, 4701.
Topographical surveys, 3244
Trade and Commerce, 3377, 4701
Bounties, petroleum, 780
Canada Grain Act, 781, 2035, 4709
Commercial intelligence service, 1837
Mail subsidies and steamship subventions, 2171
Patent and Copyright branch, 2035
O'Halloran, Mr. G. F., salary increase, 4673
Salaries and contingencies, 2031
Steamship services. *See under this title,* Steamship Services
Terminal elevators, maintenance, 810
Treaties, negotiation of, expenses, 3989
War claims, adjustment, 2495
Water powers, surveys, etc. 3420
Weights and measures, inspection, 810
Yukon territory, government of, 3943

Surveys. *See also* Dominion Lands; Geodetic Survey; Water Powers
Base lines, townships, lakes, rivers, qu. 1866
Prairie provinces in, qu. 1866
Public works, 1020
Railway, 4691. *See also* Railways
Peace River district, 4698

Surveys—*Con.*
Topographical, 2509, 3244
Boundary posts and towers, 2512
Expenditure, qu. 1865

Sutherland, Mr. Donald (South Oxford)
Agriculture department
Deputy minister's salary, 611
Estimates, 3284
Salaries and contingencies, 611
Agricultural conditions com. 3271
Agricultural instruction grant, 607-8
Administration, 3284
Agricultural products, imports, qu, 617, 1426
Alderson claim, 584
Ammunition, 887
Anglo-Saxons, a colonizing race, 1426
Bacon, grades of, 593
Bayfield harbour, 981
Business of the House
Chair, ruling of, 4720
Questions passed as orders for returns, 940
Canada Grain Act, administration, 785
Canadian National Railways, Paris offices, 3693
Cattle. *See also under this title,* Live Stock
Embargo, removal, correspondence, 4133
Shipment, 3317
Civil Service
Hours, 1427
Reduction of expenditure in Great Britain, 1803
Political partisanship, 286
Cold storage, 188
Warehouses, 191
Cost of living statistics, 1684
Dairying industry, 609
Dairy produce graders, appointment, 3289
Restrictions, 3153
Dairy Industry Act Amdt. bill, 3153
M. to discharge order, 3325
Daylight saving, farmers and, 1427
Debates, official report of
Missing pages, 887-8, 1081
Supply, undiscussed items, 3292
Emigration to the United States, 1431
Exhibitions, 1468
Experimental farms, 464-486
Ontario, 465
Farm labour, 1427
Feeding stuffs
Adulteration, 604
Conference, 604
Feeding Stuffs Act, 604
Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill, 4538
Halifax grain elevator, 4716
Hamilton-Brantford highway, 2494

Sutherland, Mr. Donald—*Con.*
Health of animals, 584
Compensation for slaughter, 486
Hog grading, 593
Government publications, agriculture, 1428
Grain, dockage, 785
Group government, 1427
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1102, 1104, 1428, 1478
Financial support, 1429
North Atlantic Trading Company, 1092
Child, 1472-5
Domestic servants, and, 1100
Empire settlement scheme, 1474
Literature, 1428
Ontario, 1098, 1428, 1475
Policy, 1425
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1630, 1716
Labour
Department, statistics, 1682, 1684
Organized, dictation of, 1426
Technical Education Act, 1637
Lindsay arsenal, 883
Live stock. *See also* Cattle
Breeding at experimental farms, 465
Export trade, 193
Visit of Canadian commissioners to South America, 1213
Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill, 192
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, qu. 384
Activities of, 3292, 3308
Address to South Oxford Liberals, 594, 3292, 3309
Agricultural instruction grant, 608
Appointment, 3308
Order in council, 3294
Political patronage, 3316
Salary, 3286
Trips
Florida, 3309
Great Britain, 3308
Matane harbour improvements, 972
Mill feeds, adulteration, legislation, 2795. *See also under this title,* Feeding Stuffs
National Defence, ammunition, 1744
Naval service, 909, 1744
Nova Scotia miners' strike, 84, 1716
Oleomargarine. *See also under this title,* Dairy Industry Act
Butter and, 386
Manufacture of, 3153
M. (Mr. Carroll) 3575
Sub-amdt. (Mr. Good), 3572
Ontario grain elevators, 4716-20

Sutherland, Mr. Donald—*Con.*
Order in council, P.C. 223, 815
Peat experiments, 790
Penitentiaries, 772
Port Burwell harbour works, 983
Dredging, 1012
Post office
Political patronage, 3316
Rural mail delivery, 1803
Remuneration, competitive system, 1803
Privilege, Redistribution Com. 1660
Pulpwood, export, royal commission, 4709
Quebec arsenal, 887
Reciprocity agreement of 1911, 2975
Redistribution, special committee, 1660
Privilege, 1660
Report, 4740
Welland, Lincoln and Haldimand, 667
Sales tax, 1427
M. (Mr. Stevens) for com. of inquiry, 927
Tariff changes, 1427
Tuberculin test, 3302
War loans, delivery of dividend cheques, 1804
Warner, Mr., reference to, 1425

Swan, Mr. E. C., St. Croix harbour, 2900

Sweden
Immigration from, 1095, 1191, 1216
Senate, constitution of, 1373

Switzerland
French treaty, 3035. *See also* Treaties, French Treaty
Immigration, 3591
National Council, constitution of, 1373
Silks, export to Canada, 2397
Trade with, 2397
Watches and clocks, imports from, 2214

Sydenham Hospital. *See* Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment

Sydney Strike. *See* Labour, Strikes

Sydney-Whycocomagh steamship service, 2178

Taché, Mr. J. de L., General Librarian, Debates, missing pages, 1081

Taché, Sir E. P., Senate, elective, 1367

Tadoussac, Que., postmaster, qu. 3139

Taft, Hon. Howard G., payments to, qu. 1157

Tagore, Mr. Rabindranath, civilization, 2729

Talbot, Mr. Onésiphore. *See* Canadian National Railways, Directors

Tampa Exhibition. *See* Exhibitions

Tank Cars, transportation of, qu. 1361

Tariff. *See also* Address; Agriculture; Budget; Customs Tariff; Reciprocity; Trade; Treaties, French Treaty, Italian Treaty; United States. *For items discussed see* Customs Tariff Items
Aggregate tax paid in 50 years, 2793
Agricultural implements, 2743, 2756, 2975. *See also that title*
Industry, cost per employee, 2975
Agricultural conditions and, 1355, 1907
All countries increasing, 2819
Amdt. (Mr. Forke) 2717
Amdts. of Liberal opposition 1920 and 1921, 3020
Average rate, 22, 89, 2838
Bituminous coal, duty on, 1275-8
British preference. *See also that title*
Increase, 2718
Percentage of duties to general rate, 2776
Budget of 1922, net increase of duty, 3034
Canada not self-contained country, 3061
Canadian and United States, duties, comparison, 2958. *See also* United States
Changes in, 2702, 2853, 3488, 3895
Date on which effective, 3504
Under pressure of organized effort, 1427
Class privilege, 2728, 3069, 3074
Combines and, 2533, 2586, 2714
Anti-combine clause, 2534
Reduction of duties, 2522, 2528, 2561, 2583
Commission of 1920, 3028
Report voluminous, 3024, 3028
Conservative policy appropriated by Liberals, 2974
Consistency, 3072
Copper and creosoting industry, discrimination, 3231
Downward revision, 2786, 2831, 2945, 2907, 2968
Drawbacks, raw material, qu. 1864
Dumping clause, 2535, 3072
Duties, combines and, 2608
East and West, 2753
Economic warfare, 3053
Emigration and, 1093, 1440, 2737, 2823. *See also* speeches on Immigration
Equal to that of United States, 1246
Farmers, difficulties and, 2916, 3065
Favoured nation treatment. *See* Treaties, French, Italian
Finality, 2648, 2772, 2799, 2841, 2912, 3052. *See also under this title,* Stability
Fordney-McCumber. *See* United States
Goods shipped from one Canadian port to another, 2519

Tariff—*Con.*
High, 2924, 2980
Revolt against, 1859
Home markets, 2849
Immigration, effect on, 1113-4, 1119, 1133, 1222, 1413, 1416, 1424. *See also* speeches on Immigration
Implements of production, reduction, 2718, 2858, 2951, 2955. *See also under this title,* Agricultural Implements
Industries and, 3024
Intermediate and preferential. *See* Treaties, French
Investigation of industries, 2955
"Invisible tariff" 3000
Issue from 1878 to 1896, 2974
Items. *See* Customs Tariff Items
"Jacking-up," 3074, 3907
Labour, right to organize, 2893
Laurier-Fielding, 3030
Liberal party and, 2221, 3008. *See also that title*
Budget, protective, 2818
Platform, 1919, 2872
Pledges, 2951, 2952, 2994
Policy, 3007
Liberal and Conservative parties 2854
Joint product of, 2852
Not much difference between, 3018
Limitation to tariff income and turnover, 2859
Lower, competition, 2861
Luxuries, 2015
Macdonald, Sir John, of, 2756
Magazines and periodicals, 826
Manufacturers and, 2812
Minimum, 440
Minister of Finance, attitude on, 2838
Moderate, 2856, 2857
More equitable to producers, 1252
National policy, 2786. *See also that title*
Necessaries of life, 2955
Reduction of duties, 2718
No relief from, 2835
No surrender of Canadian markets, 2746
Not political but economic question, 2818
Oleomargarine, 3529
Ontario and, 1240
Other matters of greater importance, 2959
Parliamentary committee, 3028
Patents, Trade Marks and Copyright Act, 2293, 2294
Per capita tax, 3026
Permanent tariff commission, 2754, 2980, 2955, 3028, 3069
Portage la Prairie, district board, res., 3039

Tariff—*Con.*
Preferential. *See* British Preference; Imperial Conference; Treaties, French, Italian
Prices of agricultural and manufactured products, 1403. *See also* Prices
Production costs, 1394
Progressive party and, 2745
Prohibitive, 2850
Prosperity and, 2398
Protection, 2787, 2854. *See also that title*
Revenue and, 2778, 2835, 2957, 3048, 3063
Public ownership, 2905
"Purely and simply protective", 2908
Railway deficit and, 2905
Raw materials, free trade in, 2858
Reciprocity, 3080. *See also that title*
Reductions, 38, 100, 1420, 2813, 2944, 2972, 2976, 3048, 3066, 3077, 3082
Liberal party and, 2847
Recent, 3010
Resolutions, 2650, 3454, 3895, 3963
Changes in, 3046, 3082
McMaster, Mr., free food and implements of production, 2996
Revenue, 2839, 2850, 2854, 2905, 3063, 3069
"Same old", 2981
"Say-so" of beneficiaries, 2956
"Scientific" 3069
Seward, late William Henry, speech, 2916
Special committee, 2955
Special privileges, 2786
Specific duties, 2215
Stability, 2648, 2657, 2703, 2717, 2718, 2741, 2755, 2772, 2775, 2787, 2799, 2806, 2809, 2819, 2835, 2841, 2853, 2912, 2966, 3011, 3028, 3052, 3053, 3064, 3066, 3068, 3071, 3303, 4031
Genoa Conference, res. 3053
League of Nations, res. 3054
Steamship subsidies and, 2923
Substantial reduction in, amdt. (Mr. Forke) 2717
Tariff act of 1897, 3014
Tariff Commission, evidence, 2296
Tinplate industry, 2400
Trade commissioners and, 1840, 2923
United States and, 3010. *See also* United States
Unjust tax, 3062
Valuation of goods for customs, 90
War taxation, 2985
Weapon, 3477, 3907. *See also* Treaties, French
Western Canada and, 1887, 2747, 3062
Undue burden, 2781
Who pays? 2839

Tariff—*Con.*
Wood, Mr. H. W., Alberta, opinion, 2853. *See also* Budget
Wool, 2866
Woollen goods, reduction, 2990
Woollen industry, 3458
Protection, M. (Drummond) 928

Taxation. *See also* Agriculture; speeches on Budget; Customs Tariff; Customs and Excise; Income War Tax Act Amdt. bill; Inland Revenue; Protection; Special War Revenue; Tariff
Agricultural implements, 1850. *See also that title*
Apportionment of, burdensome to poor, 2789
Automobile, qu. 1993, 2841. *See also that title*
Banff hotel, 3435
Bank drafts, 3925, 3928
Beverages. *See under this title,* Confectionery and Beverages
Bill of exchange, 3923
Budget, failure to balance, 2831
Building prices and, 2165
Burden of, 1348, 1355, 1394, 1403, 1880, 2831. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget
Business profits, 2786, 2789, 2998. *See also* Business Profits War Tax Act Amdt. bill
Notes given in payment, 4489
Riordan Pulp & Paper Company, arrears, qu. 1974, 4490
Taxes collected, due and unpaid, qu. 1157
Unpaid, 4440, 4489
Business Profits War Tax Act 1916, administration, 3949
Cheque tax, 23, 121, 332, 2706, 2859, 2948, 3034, 3929, 4409, 4423
Embossed cheques regulations, qu. 492
Exemption up to $500, 2826
Inequality of, 3063
Maximum
Limitation of, 2847, 2877, 2979, 3922
Reduced to $1, 2656
Passed back to farmers, 3039
Payment with postage stamps, 1815, 3927
Responsibility for payment, 2877
Who pays? 3039
Cigarettes. *See* Customs and Excise
Collection, 89. *See also under this title* Income; Sales Tax
Methods, 2213, 2786
Commission, 4039
Commissioner of, salary, 3949, 4669
Confectionery and beverages, 2644, 2656, 2707, 3046

Taxation—*Con.*
Confectionery and beverages—*Con.*
Carbonic acid gas in cylinders, 3938, 4182
Soft drinks, tax on, qu. 624
Tax, revenue, qu. 624
Consumer, 2789. *See also that title*
Consumption tax. *See under this title,* **Sales tax**
Cost of living and, 2839. *See also that title*
Crude, 2788
Debt and, 2964
Depreciation and renewal allowance, 1711
Difficult and irritating, 2804, 2859
Direct, 2836, 2956, 3000, 3010, 3035
Results, qu. 281
Dominion lands, taxes unpaid, 3257
Dominion, provincial and municipal, 2641
"Enormous" 2963
"Excessive" 1345, 1391, 1394, 2712
Excise. *See* Customs and Excise; **Inland Revenue; Special War Revenue**
Use of postage stamps for. *See under this title,* Postage Stamps
Exemptions. *See under this title,* Income, Children; Sales Tax; Receipt Tax
Experiments in, 2788
Express money orders, 3923
Extravagance and, 2785
Farmers paying taxes, 4224. *See also that title*
Four cardinal principles of, 66-67
Granville island, qu. 1485
Great Britain in, 1854
Reduction of, 2712
High, 2583, 2747, 2857, 3010
Exodus to United States, 2823
Implements of production, 2718. *See also* Agricultural Implements
Income, qu. 281, 1195, 2859. *See also* Income War Tax Act. Amdt. bill
Agricultural forms, 4498
Based on fallacious doctrine, 2913
Bonds exempt from, qu. 342
Bonds, interest rate and, 4494
Burdensome to urban tax-payer, 2745
Capital, 3027
Diverted from industry by, 2914
Children, exemption for, 2128, 2880, 3038, 4502
M. (Mr. Archambault) 1382
Collections, 2658, 2998
Cost of, qu. 733
Total, 2825
Community of property, 2880, 3038
Convictions, qu. 3582
Deductions, for educational and charitable donations, 3954
Dividends, 2881
Duplication, 2859

Taxation—*Con.*
Income—*Con.*
Exemption. *See also under this title,* Children
Small incomes, 2728, 4493
Up to $5,000 for head of family, 3038
Widows, 2934
Farmers, payments by, qu. 1259, 1486, 2845
Federal, provincial and municipal, 2825, 2859
Fines, qu. 2180, 3507
Fox-breeding industry, 590
Graduated, 2706, 2788, 2837, 2914, 3073
Great Britain, 2788
Reduction, 2913, 3072
Income and investment discouraged, 2914
Incomes earned and unearned, 2745, 2788
Unearned, 2718, 2858, 2880, 2954, 2967, 3026
Dividends, 3038
Increase, 2658, 3010
"Intolerable nuisance," 2914
Moose Jaw office, qu. 2699
Penalties, 2979
Protest from people who do not pay, 2786
Revenue and production, lessening of, 2913
Revenue, cost of collection, farmers, qu. 1259, 4224
Rich not bearing fair share, 2788
Scale of, 2985
Steeply graded, 2728
Taxes collected, due and unpaid, qu. 1157
Total assesment, qu. 2393
United States, reduction, 2913
Vancouver offices, qu. 912
Western farmers, 1889
Western provinces, collections, qu. 2206
Yorkton office, qu. 384
Income War Tax Act, administration, 3949
Increase of, 1121, 1822, 1854, 2712, 2784, 2987, 2997
Indirect, 1440, 2789, 3027, 4423
Inequitable, 2728, 2788
Inheritance, 1383, 2728, 2788, 2792, 2802, 2803, 2810, 2825, 2837, 2909, 3026, 3073
Inland revenue, use of postage stamps for. *See under this title,* Postage Stamps
Land values, 1105, 1118, 1178, 1344, 2728, 2745, 2778, 2803
Unearned increment, 3016
Liberal platform, 2003
London Spectator, statement of, 1122
Luxuries, 915, 2003, 2706, 2710, 2718, 2742, 2745, 2789, 2853, 2858, 2989, 2997, 2999, 3073, 3910
Excise tax on, 2779
Tax collections, qu. 2393

Taxation—*Con.*
Manitoba
Agricultural production and, 1404
Unpaid taxes, 1251
Municipal, 426, 2641, 3445
Burdensome, 2836
Unpaid, 2768, 2769, 2953, 2961
Natural resources, 2729
Necessaries of life, on, 2710, 2728, 2736, 2754, 2789, 2999
New, 2857, 2997, 3078
Not wanted, 2914
Per capita, 1121, 3026
Post office money orders, 3923
Postal rates, 1780
War rate, 2745
Postage stamps, use for excise taxes, 1815, 1818, 1820, 2979, 3927, 3938, 4435
Prices, increase of, 2716. *See also* Prices
Promissory notes, 3063, 3923
Provincial amusement tax, 2826
Railway deficits and, 2905, 3006
Receipt tax, qu. 282, 2643, 2656, 2705, 3034, 3923, 3934, 3935, 3938, 4423
Evasion of, 2706, 2826
Exemption up to $500, 2826
Inequity of, 2826
Payment in postage stamps, 1815
Revison of, 4409
Reduction of, 2749
Relief from, 3038
Responsibility for, 2920
Revenue, 2745
Revenue and postage stamps, 1815, 1818
Revenue stamps, selling cost, 1819
Sales tax, qu. 281, 1427, 2656, 2742, 2789, 4181 4183, 4425. *See also* Budget; Special War Revenue Act Amdt. Bill
Alberta collections, qu. 2417
Amendment, 3031
Automobiles, qu. 1993
Books and book bindings 1870
Canadian National Railways, qu. 1157
Carbonic acid gas, 3938, 4182
Collection, qu. 285, qu. 938, 2840
At source, 2643, 2656, 2840, 2998, 3031, 3038, 3938, 4181
Change in method, 2734
Domestic goods, 2840
Foreign goods, 2840
Complexity of, 2642
Confectionery and beverages. *See under this title,* Confectionery
Contracts affected, 2750
Cost of living, 2839
Increase, 1813
Date of taking effect, 2657, 3046

Taxation—*Con.*
Sales tax—*Con.*
Domestic and foreign goods, 2804
Drain tiles, 2742, 3046, 3063, 4183
Duty-free goods, 2979
Exemptions, qu. 491, 2643, 2998, 3031, 3063, 4431
Drain tiles, 3046. *See also under this sub-title,* Drain Tiles
Newsprint, 2999, 3046
Raw wool, 2998
Rulings as to, qu. 708
Tomato plants, 4432
Exports, 4364
French treaty, 2279, 2280, 2299
Furs, 2742
Imports, 4409
Increase in, 2213, 2804, 3033, 3066, 3078
Jobbers, 4410, 4433
Licensed manufacturer or producer, 4364
Lumber, 4418
Magazines and periodicals, 4415, 4421
Manufacturers, licensed, 4410, 4433
Michigan Central bridge, remission, qu. 1257
Middleman, encouragement, 2805
M. (Mr. Stevens) for com. of inquiry, 915
Necessaries of life, 2999
Newsprint, 2979, 2999, 3046
Nursery stock, 4432
Origin of finished articles, 2840
Passing on, 2750, 2912, 4411, 4416
Prime Minister's speech in 1921, 2997
Profiteering, 2997
Proposed change, petition against, 2958
Public libraries, 1870
Pyramiding, 915, 2823, 2859, 2912, 2998, 3036, 3031, 3033, 4423
Regina Photo Supply Company, qu. 518
Simplification, 3082
Suggested abolition of, 1230
Summer trade, 2912
Tomato plants, 4432
Union Jack, 4514
Wool, 2742
Workability, 2786
School land taxes, 3445
Schools closed from inability to pay, 1388
Unpaid, 4205
Single tax on vacant land, 1105, 1344. *See also under this title,* Land
Sixty-seven per cent paid by consumer, 2789
Suggested conference on, 67
Tariff and, 2859, 2839, 3068
"Taxed to death," 2826, 4493
Taxes, banks' refusal to pay, 4099

Taxation—*Con.*
Tax reductions, 2642
Tax sales,
Alberta, 4062
Manitoba, 2961
Travellers' cheques, 3923
Turnover tax, 2841, 2859, 2916
Unpaid, 637, 1388, 3257, 3445, 4205
Unimproved land. *See under this title,* Land
War, 2788, 2985, 3028
War profits, 2788, 2985
War taxes, collection by Post Office dept. 1815
Western farmers unable to meet, 1202, 2781

Tax-Exempt Bonds. *See* Bonds

Technical Education Act. *See* Labour

Technical Positions. *See* Civil Service

Telegraphs and Telephones. *See also* Radiotelegraphy; Wireless
Battleford-Isle la Crosse, 1017
British cable service, Canadian Press, 4727
British Columbia-mainland, 1017
Canadian National Telegraphs, qu. 707, 2471
Fort Qu'Appelle-Humboldt, qu. 383
Great North Western Telegraph Company, qu. 707, 2471
Land and cable telegraph lines, 2683
Manitoba, 2285
Northwest territories, 3944
Nova Scotia, 4590
Prince Edward Island, 2682
Radiotelegraph service, 3337
Ste. Anne-St. Charles telegraph lines, qu. 3138, qu. 3262
St. Charles-Peribonka telegraph line, qu. 3262
Vancouver island district, 1017
Verrault, Mr. Gedeon, dismissal, qu. 3140
Wireless stations, 3337
Yukon telegraph system, 150, 3945
Revenue, qu. 2206, qu. 2417

Temiscouata forest fires, 4010

Temperance. *See* Canada Temperance Act

Temporary Employees. *See* Civil Service

Terminal Elevators. *See* Grain and Grain Trade

Terminal Facilities. *See* Canadian National Railways; St. John

Terrebonne public building, 2690, 4614

Territories Act Amdt. *See* Northwest Territories

Testing of Seed. *See* Seed Inspection

Textiles. *See also* British Preference; speeches on Budget; Customs Tariff Items; Treaties, French Treaty
Clothing, British preference, 3032
Collars and cuffs, duties 3048
Cottons
British preference, 3463
Cotton manufacturers, combine, 2534
Duty, 3035, 3048. *See also* Treaties, French
For manufacture of pneumatic tires, duty, 2654, 3487
French treaty, 1987
Dominion Textile Company
Combine, 2563
McSweeney, late Senator, statement, 3464
Securities and dividends, 3463
Stock, 1853
Embroideries. *See* Treaties, French Treaty
Freight rates, 1964
Knitting industry, artificial silk and, 2958
Laces, 3035. *See also* Treaties, French Treaty
Linen, 3897
Profits, 3464
Silks. *See also* Treaties, French Treaty
Artificial silk
Duty, 2820, 2990, 3017, 3035, 3489
Industry, 2658, 2703, 2798, 2853, 2931, 2958, 2964, 3069, 3075, 3492
Knitting industry and, 2958
Tops or waste or artificial fibre silk, drawbacks, 3896
Yarns and fabrics, 2654
Duty, 2704, 3046, 3488, 3489
Imports of, 445, 2397
Silk cloth woven in the gum, duty, 3489
Silk industry, 2397, 2853
Canadian, 2397
French treaty and, 1977
Textile industry, 3466
Velvets and velveteens, duty, 3035, 3488
Woollen industry, 3458. *See also* Wool
Blankets, duty, 3048
British preference, 2958, 2989, 3034, 3458, 3459
Clothing, 3048
Competition from Great Britain and France, 2958
Duties, 3048
Drawbacks and, qu. 1994
Legislation to assist, qu. 4184
Marking of, 2973
Penmans, stock quotations and dividends, 3463
Preferential tariff and, 3458
Prices, 2990, 3459

Textiles—*Con.*
Woollen industry—*Con.*
Protection of, M. (Mr. Drummond) 928
Woollen goods, manufacture of 2866
Yarn, 3489, 3896

Thetford Mines, strike, 2207

Thomas, Mr. A. J. *See* Canadian National Railways

Thomas, Mr. J. H., 46

Thomson Line, ocean freight rates, 2127

Thompson, Mr. F. G., Winnipeg, 856

Thompson, the late Right Hon. Sir John, copyrights, 2140

Thompson, Mr. T. H. (East Hastings)
Cold storage companies, 191
Cold Storage Act Amdt. bill, 2055
Field crop competitions, 600, 602
Montreal cold storage, qu. 1488, qu. 1633, qu. 2204
Welland canal construction contracts, qu. 1489

Thornton, Sir Henry Worth, 103, 126, 284. *See also* Canadian National Railways
Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, director, 2983, 3845
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Cattle shipments, space, 3040
West Indian service, 3379
Capital expenditure, 3811
Criticism of, 3640
Fuel supply, evidence, Senate com., 1919
Hudson Bay railway, 4683
Immigration, 1167
Reported statement, 2795, 2844
Western provinces, conditions, 2962

Thoroughbred horses. *See* Race Track Betting

Three Rivers Harbour Commissioners Bill
(Improvement and management of harbour)
Res. 3399, 3963; 1r., 2r., com., 3965; com., 3r., 4207

Thurston, Mr. John J. (Victoria, Ont.)
Canada Colonization Association, 1878
Dominion arsenal, Quebec, bonus, 1752
Lindsay market scales, 208

Tidal and Current Survey. *See* Marine

Tilley, Mr. W. N., K.C.
Grand Trunk arbitration, qu. 730, qu. 1029
Payments to, 1154, qu, 1661

Timber. *See also* Dominion Lands Act; Export Act Amdt. bill; Forests and Forestry; Lumber
Areas, limits of, 4206
Available supplies, 818
Creosoted, qu. 813, qu. 1137
Permits to cut on Dominion Lands, qu. 203, 3398, 4206. *See also* Dominion Lands Act Amdt. bill
Shortage, 2711

Timber Wolves, destruction of live stock, 597

Times, The, London, Hudson Bay railway, 1059

Timiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway, 1071, 3056

Tinplate Industry, 2751
Establishment in Toronto, 2819
Sales tax, 4418
Tariff uncertainty, 2819

Titles, Honours and Decorations
Abolition of, 210
Banting, Dr., 4645
M. (Mr. Ladner) 1285, neg. on div. 1299
Amdt. (Mr. Neill) 1292
Nickle resolution, 1286-98

Tobacco. *See also* Customs and Excise; Customs Tariff Items
Bootlegging in, 2989
Cigarettes
Bootlegging, 3230
Consumption, qu. 516
Customs duty, 2644, 2652, 2706, 2850, 2913, 2929, 2979, 2988, 4392
Excise duty, 2655, 2825, 3229
Tax on, 2657
Cigars, consumption, qu. 517
Duty, 2913, 2988
Experimental stations, 459, 465
Harrow, 466
Home-grown, 4209. *See also* Inland Revenue Act Amdt. bill
Imports, qu. 1258
Revenue, loss of, 2913

Tobin, Mr. E. W. (Richmond and Wolfe)
Accredited herd system, qu. 206
Richmond county, qu. 813
Wolfe county, qu. 813
Canadian National railways, mileage and cost 914
Haney, Mr. M. J., 3355
Lightkeepers' salaries and allowances, 3353
Public debt, 1896, 1911, 1922, qu. 914
Public expenditure, 1896-1922, qu. 914
Revenue, 1896-1923, qu. 913

Tobin, Mr. E. W.—*Con.*
Soldier settlement
Farms in Richmond county, qu. 913
Wolfe county, qu. 913
War expenditure, 1914-1922, qu. 914

Tobique Reserve. *See* Indians

Todd, Mr. Walter, decision, question not referred to com. 3267

Tolmie, Hon. S. F. (Victoria City)
Accredited herd, system, 578, 3302
Animal diseases, inspection, 2202
British Columbia liquor laws, 2411
Prices, 2411
British Empire exhibition, 1873
Budget 2861. Congratulations to Finance Minister; government coming round to protection; unfair to Canada to cut down tariff; United States and oriental competition; copper bounty; Trail smelter; amendment; inclusion of planks from Liberal platform of 1919; agricultural conditions; disorganized markets, 2861; profitable and unprofitable lines of agriculture; single-crop farming; mixed farming with live stock as basis; prices low and crops high; plugging up the leaks; marketing of live stock; policy and prices; no advantage in breeding scrub stock, 2862; dairying industry; unprofitable herds; yield and cost; Nappan experimental station; experiment with scrub cows; value of industry to country; export markets; Canadian butter in Great Britain, 2863; competition of Denmark, Holland and New Zealand, 2863; butter grading; hog and export bacon industry; types and weights; Wiltshire sides; Danish bacon, competition of, 2864; prices at Chicago and Toronto; bacon from corn-fed hogs; breeding, feeding and marketing, 2865; sheep and wool industry; woollen manufacturing industry; marketing of lambs, 2866; wheat screenings as feed for lambs; inferior stock, loss from; animal contagious diseases; tuberculosis; hog cholera; research work; internal parasites; tuberculin test, 2867; immunization from tuberculosis; human tuberculosis; work of Dr. Watson; glanders; agricultural products, distribution; cheaper transportation and equalization of freight rates; Pacific coast trade; Panama canal, 2868; export

Tolmie, Hon. S. F.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
markets; oriental trade; co-operative selling; farm credits; agricultural education; better farming methods; Central experimental farm; immigration, exclusion of Asiatics; better understanding between farmer and city-man, 2869; no time for pessimism; pioneering; Bruce county in early days; summary of proposed policy
Buffalo
Slaughter of, 3440
Tuberculosis 3440
Business of the House, supply, relevancy, 4719
Campbell, Mr. Orin, claim, 626
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2411
Chinese immigration bill, 2316
Merchants, 2316
Cold storage, 186
Compensation for slaughtered animals, 485
Dairy Industry Act 1914 Amdt. bill
Butter substitutes, 3151
"Manna" 3152
Renovated butter, 4251, 4255
Dairying industry, 2864, 3296
Butter, pasteurization 3298
Deputy ministers' salaries, 4672
Deputy Minister of Agriculture, salary, 4672
Destructive Insects and Pests Act, 595
Exhibitions, 1454
Experimental farms, 476-485
Fishery cruiser, Victoria, 4708
Freight rates, equalization, M. (Mr. Clark) 1922
Fruits and vegetables, new varieties, registration, 2397
Health of animals, 578
Tuberculin test, 578, 2867
Tuberculosis eradication, 3989
Indians cattle, 2159
Iron deposits, Vancouver island, 2514
Liquor
British Columbia plebiscite, 2441
Prices, 2441
Live Stock Acts Amdt. bill, 193, 2202, 2292
Live stock industry, 476, 589. *See also under this title,* Health of Animals
Veterinary inspectors, 3989
Masters and mates, examination, 2610
Migratory Birds Convention, 3443
Nicomen island, protection, 626
Oleomargarine
Dairying industry and, 3296
M. (Mr. Carroll) 3510
Manufacture 3152
Paternal legislation, 727

Tolmie, Hon. S. F.—*Con.*
Pensions, European war and active militia, 3707
Prince Rupert Dry Dock Company, claim, 4708
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 723
Renovated butter, 3151, 4255
Seed testing bill, 278, 2305
Watson, Dr., chief pathologist, Agriculture dept., 579, 2868

Tomato Plants. *See* Customs; Taxation

Topographical Surveys. *See* Surveys

Toronto
Breakwater protection, 984
Canadian National Railways
Approaches and terminals, 4193, 4198
Electric lines, 2393
King and Yonge streets property, qu. 814, qu. 1663, qu. 1994, 2819, 2481, 3224, 3399, 3629, 3642
Casualty clearing building, 4621
Customs house building, 3277, 4621, 4624
Fuel supply, 3200
Harbour improvements, 984, 985, 1011, 2678, 3076, 3774, 4444, 4445, 4562, 4578, 4610
Level crossings, 2477
Penny bank of. *See* Penny Bank
Post office building, 1780, 3277
Postal receipts, increase, 2819
Postal revenue, 1779
Postal station "A" building, 4624
Restaurants, profiteering, 2586
Seed branch offices, 4621
Soldiers' Comfort branch, qu. 3506, 3507
Soldier Settlement board, 2029
Street railway system, 2475, 3056
Tin-plate industry, 2819
Toronto island breakwater, 984
Toronto Transportation Commission, 1703
Union station, 3620, 4325, 4335, 4442
University of, scholarships, 878
Viaduct, qu. 206, qu. 517, 2477, qu. 4011, 4306, 4325, 4441, 4442, 4447

Toronto Eastern Railway, 2475

Toronto Suburban Railway, qu. 280, 2181, 2475, qu. 2612, 3324

Tourist Traffic. *See* Canadian National Parks

Tower. *See* Parliament buildings

Tracadie Lazaretto, 702

Trade. *See also* Address; Customs and Excise; Imports and Exports; speeches on Budget; Tariff; Trade and Commerce; Treaties, French, Italian
Anglo-Canadian, fostering of, qu. 284
Annual report, 1910
Australia, with, 1848, 2964, 3476
Balance of, 2922
Bankruptcy, 648. *See also* Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill
Canadian representative at Washington, 2735
Canadian Trade Index, 2217
China and India with, 1840
Commercial rivalry and industrial war, 2717
Competition, Great Britain and Germany, 2752
Conditions, analysis, 2984
Cuba with, 308, 1840
Enlarged, advantages of, 2910
Export, 1838. *See also* Imports and Exports
Fiji islands, 1848
France with, 437. *See also* Treaties, French treaty
Grain. *See* Grain and Grain Trade
Great Britain, with, 437. *See also* British Preference
Increase in, 2784
International 2923
Interprovincial, 2177, 2748
Italy with, 2395. *See also* Treaties, Italian
Japan with, 1449
Pacific coast, 2868
Percentage of imports and exports, 2843
Oriental, 507. *See also* Vancouver Harbour bill
Potatoes in, 308. *See also* Vegetables
Reciprocity with United States, 2650. *See also that title*
Russian trade mission, 986
Spain with, 2397
Steamship services. *See that title*
Switzerland, with 2397
Trade commissioners, 1837
Tariff and, 2923
Trade returns, incomplete, 2269, 2301
United States with, 2649, 2746. *See also* Reciprocity
West Indies, 3382
World competition, 2799

Trade and Commerce Department
Bounties, administration 780
Canada Grain Act, 781, 2035, 4709
Commercial intelligence service, 1837
Trade commissioners, 1840
Commissioner of patents, duties, 2065
Consular and commercial agents qu. 284
Elevators, terminal, maintenance, 810

Trade and Commerce Department—*Con.*
Estimates, 780, 1837, 2031, 3377, 4003, 4701
Exhibitions, 1467
Mail subsidies and steamship subventions, 2171. *See also* Steamship Services
O'Halloran, Mr. George F., Commissioner of Patents, 4673
Patent and Copyright branch, salaries, 2035
Salaries and contingencies, 1837, 2031
Staff, 2031
Trade, annual report, 1910
Trade commissioners and agents, 856, 1837
Weights and measures, inspection, 810

Trade Mark and Design Act Amdt. Bill
(Registration of industrial designs)
1r., 331; 2r., 2063; com., 2293; 3r., 2294

Trades and Labour Council. *See* Labour

Trades Union Congress. *See* Labour

Trahan, Mr. Arthur (Nicolet)
Resignation of, 2178

Trail, B.C., smelter, 2861, 2944

Transportation. *See also* Canadian National Railway; Freight Rates; Hudson Bay Railway; Railways; St. Lawrence River Waterway
Coal, 1247. *See also* Coal; Fuel Supply
Equalization of rates, 1253. *See also* Freight Rates
Gaspe, 1243
Improvement of, 2745
Inadequate. *See* Vancouver Harbour Bill
Peace river district, 1433, 1440
Problems, 126. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget
Reduction, cost of, 1400
Shipping combine, 1134
Steamship companies, immigration and, 1193, 1201. *See also* Immigration
Water, 2979
Western Canada, 1440
Wheat, cost of, qu. 385. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade

Travellers' Cheques, tax. *See* Taxation, Cheque

Treaties. *See also* Conferences
Anglo-Japanese treaty, 1449, 2399
Australia, with, 245, 1848. *See also* Australia
Belgium, 246
Canada-West Indies, 3378
French Treaty, 9, 97, 436, 2657, 2815, 2832, 2964, 4457
Advantages and disadvantages, 2238

Treaties—*Con.*
French Treaty—*Con.*
Agricultural implements, 2001
Agricultural products, 1978, 2210, 2235
Aluminum, 1989
Analysis of, Mr. Chaplin, 1978
Anchovies and sardines, 2008
Automobiles, 1982, 1990, 1996, 2236
Bacon, ham and pork products 1978
Balance of trade, 2204, 2221
Boots and shoes, 1990
Bottles, 2218
Braids and cords, 2213
Brandies, 2643, 2742, 2999, 3478
Brass and copper ware, 1981
British preference, 2005
Bronze powder, 1979, 1998, 2002, 2006, 2016, 2270
Canadian Trade Index, 2217
Canadian Bronze Powder Works, Valleyfield, 1998, 2017
Cosmos Chemical Company, Port Hope, 2217
Brushes, 2214
Building materials, 1982
Butter, 2273
Buttons, 2214, 2234
Canadian Manufacturers' Association, 2209
Canadian ports. *See under this title.* Direct Importation
Cement, 1984
Cereals, 1984, 2006
Chemicals, 1980-5
Coal tar derivatives, 1986
Cobalt products, 2263, 2300
Competition, unfair, 2300
Condensed milk, 1984
Consumer, relief to, 3049
Consideration of
Inquiry, 1740
Postponed, 2128
Convention approved, 2255
Cotton manufactures, 1987, 2218, 2263
Cutlery, 1988
Dairy products, 1984
Direct importation, through Canadian ports, 1772, 2303, 2949
Duty, reductions in, 438, 2710
Eggs, 1978
Electrical apparatus, telephones, 2214
Electric lamps, incandescent, 1980
Embroideries, 2008, 2211, 2214, 2999
Engines and machinery, 1981-8
Favoured nation, 439, 443, 2005, 2007, 2014, 2210, 2213, 2219, 2232, 2234, 2241, 2271, 2395, 3035
Feathers and ornaments for hats, 3035
Fish, fresh and preserved, 1978, 2006, 2235

Treaties—*Con.*
French Treaty—*Con.*
Flour, 1978
France
Exports to, 2213
Friendly relations with, 2216
Trade with, 2209, 2255
French Consul General and, 2229
Furniture, 1982-9
Furs, 1981
Handkerchiefs, 2214, 3035
Hen feathers, 1978
Horses, 1978
Household necessaries, 441
Imports and exports, 1977, 2230
Inconsistent laws, 2303
Iron and steel, 1985-8, 2001
Japan, 2214
Trade concessions to, 450
Laces, 3035
Lard, 1978
Liberal platform, 2211
Linen yarns and thread, 1981
Live stock, 1983, 2211
Luxuries, 444, 450, 2003, 2011, 2014, 2213, 2221, 2259, 2742, 2989, 2999, 3035, 3910
Machinery and parts, 441
Manufacturers and, 2236. *See also under this title,* Canadian Manufacturers
Meats
Cured, 1978
Fresh, 1984
Preserved in tins, 1978
Millinery, 3035
Minimum tariff, 440
Modus vivendi of 1921, 2218
Musical instruments 1982
Pianos and organs, 1990, 2237
Neighbouring countries, concessions to, 450, 2131, 2215, 2219, 2273
Oleomargarine, 1984
Paper and paper products, 1987
Paper board, 1981
Perfumery, 3035
Potatoes, 1984
Poultry, 1983
Revenue, loss of, 2014, 2209, 2235
Ribbons, 3035
Rubber, manufactures of, 1990, 2237
Sales tax, 2279, 2299
Sewing machines, 2237
Silks, 448, 2209, 2215, 2221, 2255, 2264, 2266, 2300, 2397, 2398, 2742, 3035
Specific duties, 2215
Spelter, 1979
Summary of, 2232
Switzerland, imports from, 2213, 2255

Treaties—*Con.*
French Treaty—*Con.*
Tabled, 54
Tariff and, 438, 2710, 4074
Tariff weapon, 3907-10
Treaty of 1907, 2004-29
United States, 2011
Concessions to, 449
Trade with France, 1991, 1997, 2213, 2218, 2229, 2276, 2396
Treatment, Unnited States and Canada, 441
Velvets and velveteens, 3488
Watches and clocks, 2214
Wheat, 1978
Wines, 438, 442, 1977, 1997, 2010, 2209, 2225, 2302, 2643, 2710, 2999, 3035, 3937
Wood, manufactures of, 1982-9
Zinc, 1979
French Treaty Bill, res. 331, 436-456; 1r., 456; M. (Mr. Fielding) for 2r., 1910; withdrawn 1911; renewed 1977; discussion, 1977, 1995; 2r., on div. 2250-51; com. 2251-55-90-99; 3r., 2347
Halibut Fisheries Treaty with United States. *See also* Northern Pacific Halibut Fisheries Protection bill
Approval of, res. 4440, 4455; agreed to, 4480
Correspondence, 1032, 1212
Tabled, 1256
Joint res. of parliament, transmission, 4736
Lapointe, Hon. Mr., visit to Washington, 857-8
Procedure, 4437
Inquiry as to, 4132
Rider inserted by United States senate, 1308
Signing of, 734, 858, 1308, 4457, 4480, 4664
Italian Treaty, 9, 2394, 2701, 2815, 2832
Consideration postponed, 2304, 2347
Direct importation, 2401, 2949
Favoured nation treatment, 2394
Border states, 2395
France, 2395
Italy, trade with, 2395
Relief to consumers, 3049
Signing of, 2403
Tabled, 89
Italian Treaty Bill, res. 331, 2394; 1r., 2395; 2r., com., 2395; 3r., 2437, 2701
Negotiatiton of, expenses, 3989
Peace treaty
Enemy property custodian, qu. 1486
International Labour Conference, 1441
Light thrown on causes of war, 2725
Orders in council, 767
Postal Treaty with the United States, 2, 4529

Treaties—*Con.*
Rush-Bagot, negotiations, qu. 2700
St. Germain, 653
Switzerland, 2398
Trade, 437. *See also under this titlte,* Australia, French, Italian
United States. *See also* Reciprocity, United States
Treaty of 1818, 2906
Reciprocity treaty of 1854, 2910
Versailles, qu. 279, 1631-2, 3994. *See also* Germany, Reparations; War Claims
Labour, right to organize, 2889, 2895
Modification of, 4653

Tree Planting. *See* Forests and Forestry

Tremblay, General. *See* Quebec Harbour Commission

Trent Canal. *See* Canals

Trenton
Emigration from, 2823
Wool-combing industry, 2823, 2827, 3461

Trial by Jury. *See* Immigration Act Amdt. bill; Yukon Act Amdt.

Trials. *See* Justice
Eskimos, Hershell Island. *See* Northwest Territories Act

Triplets, bonus for, inquiry, 3145

Troops. *See* National Defence
Use of in labour troubles. *See* Labour

Trout-Fishing. *See* Marine and Fisheries

Trueman, Mr. W. H., K.C., Winnipeg, appointment, 1868

Truro park, 3440

Trustees. *See* Bankruptcy Act

Trusts. *See* Combines

Tsur, Hon. Chilien, 1447. *See also* Immigration, Chinese

Tuberculosis. *See also* Health; Hospitals; Live Stock; Pensions
Animals, 462-486. *See also* Live Stock; Animal Contagious Diseases
Tuberculin test, 2867, 3284, 3300
Attributable to military service, 3850
Bovine and human, 2868
Buffalo, 3439
Cattle, 2131-38. *See also* Live Stock, Health of Animals
Eradication, 3989
Dairy products, 3299

Tuberculosis—*Con.*
Immunization from, 2868
Indians, 2152
Live stock, 2867
Condemnation insurance, qu. 2699
Military hospitals, 670
Pension obligation and, 3850
Returned soldiers, deaths from, qu. 3134
Serum, 2868
Tuberculous Veterans Association, petition, 4536

Tugboats. *See* Vessels

Tupper, Sir Charles
French treaty, 1991
Title, 1295

Turkey, threatened war with, 2815. *See also* Near East Crisis

Turkeys, dressed, importation, qu. 1139

Turnover Tax. *See* Taxation

Turtle Mountain reserve, 3413

Tutankhamen, King, 755, 1761
Inheritance tax, 2788

Two Months' Supply. *See* Interim Supply

Typewriters. *See* Customs Tariff Items

Tyrrell, Mr. J. W., Hudson Bay region, 1072

Ukrainians. *See also* West Ukrainian Republic
Immigration, 1396, 1883
Settlement of, 1341

Uncleaned Screenings. *See* Grain, Elevators

Undesirable Classes. *See* Immigration Act Amdt. bill

Unearned Income. *See* Taxation

Unemployment. *See* Labour; Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment

Unification. *See* Canadian National Railways

Unimproved Land. *See* Land; Taxation

Union Act, 1364, 1365

Union Bank. *See* Banks and Banking

Union Jack, sales tax, 4514

Union Label. *See* Labour

Union Nationale Française, immigration, 1877

Union of South Africa. *See* South Africa

Unions. *See* Labour

Unit of Representation. *See* Redistribution

United Farmers of Alberta
Economic group organization, 3003
Freight rates, 3190
Immigration, 81, 1440

United Farmers of Manitoba, 1462

United Farmers of Ontario
Combines and trusts, 2584
Immigration, 1191
Proportional representation, 425

United Mines Workers of America. *See* Labour; Howat

United States. *See also* Reciprocity; St. Lawrence River Waterway
Administration, cost of, 1155
Agriculture
Economic organization, 1857
Encouragement of, 1390
Agricultural conditions, 642, 2829
Agricultural implements, duty free, 3017, 3062
Agricultural products, 2751
Markets for, 2810, 2869
Alien enemy property, custodian, 2496, 3823
American Expeditionary Force, mental tests, 1219
American legion, 2444
Annexation, 93
Asiatic immigration, exclusion, 1194
Banking system, 4083
Bankruptcy law, 3092
Bean-growing industry, 2981
Boots and shoes, duty, 2856, 3016, 3062, 3499
Borrowings from, 93-94
British debt, 2879, 2918
Budget, 3341
Building boom, 1129, 3004, 3017
Cabinet officers, number of, 3043
Canadian exhibitions in, 1454
Canadian grain, adulteration of, 3649
Canadian ports, use by United States fishermen, 3361, 4480
Canadian railways, ocean ports in, 1754-5
Canadian representation, 4001, 4664. *See also that title*
Canadian tariff policy and, 3010
Canadians in, 43. *See also* Emigration
Carrie L. Hirtle, seizure, qu. 3323
Cattle, export to, 1410, 2871
Chinese immigration, 2313, 4349
Coal, 3203. *See also that title*
Anthracite and lignite, duty, 3493
Embargo on, 1265, 1279
Exports from. *See* Coal
Purchased for railways, 1277
Strikes and labour unions, 2786
Supplies from, 1262

United States—*Con.*
Coloured population, 2316
Combines, grand jury system, 2585
Competition from, 2861. *See also* Treaties, French Treaty
Conditions following Civil War, 1122, 1232
Congressional library, 2693
Copyright, 2140. *See* Copyright Act Amdt. bill
Cost of living, 1812
Customs duties, per capita, 2738
Debt, per capita, 2956
Duties against, reduction by order in council, 2649
Emergency tariff, 2847. *See also under this title,* Fordney-McCumber
Effect upon Canadian export, 2847
Emigration of Canadians to, 21, 1082, 1085, 1975. *See also* Emigration
European reconstruction, 4654
Exports, 1838
Pulpwood to, 4347. *See also* Export Act Amdt. bill
Fair Tariff League, 3070
Farmers' bloc, 2791
Federal Reserve Bank, 3059, 4124, 4407
Federal reserve system, 4069
Fishing industry, 2940
Fish, market for, 2906, 2946, 3002
Fishing schooner, Siloam, capture, 2207
Fishing vesels, purchase of bait, 3705
Halibut fishery treaty with. *See* Treaties, Halibut
Modus vivendi, 2906, 2940, 3361
Use of Canadian ports by, 3361, 4480
Flour, ocean rates, 2127
Ford, Henry, presidential candidate, 2908
Fordney-McCumber tariff, 172, 2649, 2708, 2748, 2818, 2823, 2857, 2869, 2909, 2919, 2940, 2946, 2958, 2977, 2993, 2997, 3011, 3013, 3035, 3052, 3061, 3098
Cattle, 3293
Coal, 1275
Farmers' gains and losses, 3070
Pacific coast fisheries, 2734
Power of president to vary, 3902
France, trade with, 1991, 1997, 2011, 2209, 2213, 2222, 2276, 2396. *See also* Treaties, French
Free list, agricultural products, 2910
Free trade, 1403, 2738, 2746, 3013
Freight cars, interchange, 4697
French Canadians in, repatriation, 1462
French treaty. *See* Treaties, French Treaty
Grand Trunk lines, 3197
Grain prices, 297-8. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade

United States—*Con.*
Grain shipments through United States ports, 3763
Great Lakes disarmament, correspondence, 1307
Harding, late President, world peace, 2911
Highways, 3437
Hirtle, Carrie L., seizure, qu. 3323
Hogs, corn-fed, 2865
Immigration and, 1248
After Civil War, 1885
Agencies in, 1875
Obstacles to,, 1416
Policy, 1885
Imports and exports, 2821, 2928, 3061
Income tax, 2986, 4503
Exemptions for children, 1383
Reductions, 2913
Industrial development, 2751
Industrial organization and competition, 2992
Inflation, 2800, 3004
Influence in Canada, 2934. *See also* Magazines, M. (Mr. Hocken)
Interstate Commerce Commission, 3059
Fuel investigation, 1279
Internationl boundaries, survey and demarcation, 3248
Japanese organizations, 2444
Labour delegates, detention at border, 2296, 2419, 2469, 2347, 2393
Labour demand, 1129. *See also under this title,* Emigration
Lake of the Woods water powers. *See that title*
Levels, qu. 2700
Liquor laws, 4295
Illicit traffic, alleged, 2208
McKinley tariff, 2910
Magazines and periodicals, 826
Manufactured products, 2751
Market for, 2856
Migratory Birds Convention, 3443
Movement of population to. *See* Emigration
National Reserve bank, 4145
Naturalization, 2443
Oriental problem, 2443
Oriental propaganda in, 1896
Pecuniary Clains Convention, 779
People from, stopped at border, 1167. *See also under this title* Labour delegates
Ports
Adulteration of Canadian grain, 3649, 3961
Competition. *See* Vancouver Harbour bill
Ocean, 2898
Postal rates, decrease of, 1779
Postal treaty, 4529
Potatoes, export to, qu. 621

United States—*Con.*
Prices, comparison of, 2742, 2916
Prosperity, 2657
Protection and, 2751
Pulpwood, export to, 3413, 3416. *See also* Export Act Amdt. bill
Railway system, 3057
Unification, 1618
Railways
Earnings, flour transportation, 2960
Grain shipments, diversion to, 2898
Reciprocity, offer to negotiate, 2649, 2650, 2707, 2806, 2829, 2831, 2843, 3847, 2905, 2917, 3454, 3473
Chicago Tribune, comment, 2733
Reciprocity agreement of 1911, 2718
Standing offer, 3016
Relations with, 2905
Rural credit system, 642, 2829, 2930, 4043, 4046, 4130, 4298
Rural depopulation, 2829
Rural mail delivery, 1781
Rush-Bagot treaty, negotiations, qu. 2700
St. Lawrence river waterway, 3208, 3705, 3762, 4513. *See also that title*
Self-interest, 2918
Senate, constitution of, 1373, 1378
Silk industry, 2397, 2400
Strikes, 1629
Sugar boycott, 2734
Surplus, 2823
Tariff 1113, 1119. *See also under this title,* Fordney-McCumber
Change of sentiment, 3013
Emigration and, 1093
Tinplate industry, 2400, 2751
Trade relations with, 2649, 2746. *See also* Reciprocity
Agents in Canada, qu. 284
Negotiations with, 3074
Revival, 2650
Unemployment, decrease of, 2650
Wages in, 1165. *See also under this title,* Emigration; Labour
War and, 2918
Washington, Canadian representative at, 2735. *See also* Canadian Representation
Welland canal construction, 3762
Wharves, built on Canadian territory, 2735
Wheat, duty, 2993

Universities. *See also* Education
Bank directors and, 4025, 4073
Capitalistic system and, 2725
Graduates emigrating to the United States, 2732
Independent thought stifled, 3074

Universities—*Con.*
Medical students, summer employment, 704
Scholarships, 878
Toronto, 878

Unopposed Motions for Paper
Accredited herds (Mr. Caldwell) 626
Agriculture dept. employees (Mr. Bouchard) 815
Alberta Drainage Company (Mr. Kellner) 3144
Arctic islands and northern Quebec (Mr. Parent) 814
Banff park, power rights (Mr. Shaw) 496
Banff springs and cave (Mr. Shaw) 496
Bank returns (Mr. Coote) 3264
British Columbia claims (Mr. Stevens) 708
Campbell, Mr. Orin, claim (Mr. Tolmie) 626
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, sale of vessels, (Sir Henry Drayton) 3705, 3822
Canadian National Railways
Equipment orders, (Mr. Meighen) 2701
Grand Trunk, United States terminals (Sir Henry Drayton) 815
Lifting of steel, (Mr. Kennedy, Edmonton) 1664
Orders in council (Sir Henry Drayton) 815
Regulations (Mr. MacLaren) 496
Canadian Pacific Railway, Quebec terminals (Mr. Parent) 815
Cattle trade with Great Britain (Mr. Meighen) 208
Civil Service
Appointments and promotions (Mr. Manion) 330; (Mr. Meighen) 208
Dismissals (Mr. Hanson) 856
Positions exempted (Mr. Irvine) 914
Customs and Excise, legal work (Mr. Black, Yukon) 856
Disallowance of Nova Scotia legislation (Mr. Hanson) 208; (Sir Henry Drayton) 249, 208
Dryden and Marshall, Messrs. (Mr. Maybee) 3705
Eastern Lands Development Company, (Mr. Lapierre) 626, (Mr. Carruthers) 1635
Euclid Hall and Brant House, closing (Mr. Church) 4303
Export liquor warehouse licenses (Mr. Stevens) 3144
Freight rates, shipping, coastal regulations (Mr. Coote) 2613
Government printing, Winnipeg (Mr. McMurray) 3144
Grand Trunk arbitration (Mr. d'Anjou) 1307
Halibut fishery treaty (Mr. Meighen) 1032

Unopposed Motions for Paper—*Con.*
Hayes, Mr. John J., dismissal (Mr. Irvine) 1868
Hudson Bay railway (Mr. Meighen) 208
Immigrant supplies, Quebec (Mr. Charters) 496
Lewis, John L., correspondence (Mr. Meighen) 250
Liquor, export, revenue, etc. (Mr. Good) 3704
Lindsay market scales (Mr. Thurston) 208
Margaree river salmon fisheries, (Mr. Hanson) 2700
New Brunswick export houses (Mr. Caldwell) 815
Newspapers and printing companies, contracts, (Mr. Black, Yukon) 1974
Nicomen island, protection (Mr. Tolmie) 626
Nipissing Indian reserve (Mr. Lapierre) 1307
North Oakville post office (Mr. Anderson) 914
Nova Scotia miners' strike (Sir Henry Drayton) 914
Orders in council
Canadian National Railways (Sir Henry Drayton)815
P. C. 223 (Mr. Sutherland) 815
P. C. 1566 (Mr. Black, Yukon) 249
Oriental immigration (Mr. McQuarrie) 1307
Ottawa river water storage (Mr. Parent) 815
Printing contracts, newspapers, etc. (Mr. d'Anjou) 2298
Purchase of bait for fishing vessels (Mr. Forke) 3705
Railway lands, purchase or sales (Mr. Boys) 1739
St. Lawrence river waterway (Mr. Church) 3705
Sardine herring fishery (Mr. Duff) 2518
Six Nations Indian reserve (Mr. Senn) 1307
Soldier settlers, fire insurance (Mr. McMurray) 496
Sporting Mountain mail contract (Mr. Hanson) 856
Sydenham hospital (Mr. Ross, Kingston) 626
Technical and professional officials (Mr. Martell) 815
Testing of dairy cattle (Mr. Caldwell) 1307
Thompson, Mr. F. G., Winnipeg (Mr. Black, Yukon) 856
Toronto Suburban railway (Mr. Church) 2181
Trade commissioners (Mr. Putnam) 856
Vermilion town lots (Mr. Spencer) 1307
Wheat board, correspondence (Mr. McConica) 626
Winnipeg coal purchases (Mr. McMurray) 496

Unrest, Industrial. *See* Labour

Urban Population, loss of. *See* Emigration; Population

Vacancies. *See* Auditor General; House of Commons

Valcartier Camp Ground. *See* National Defence

Valleyfield, Canadian Bronze Powder Works, 1998, 2017

Valuation for Duty. *See* Customs

Vancouver (city)
Assay office, 3207
Bank of, failure, qu. 4011
Board of Trade,
Carvell, Hon. F. B., 1869, 1910, 3189
Freight rates, equalization, 1953
Bridge, 1008
Deadman's island, qu. 1362
Duty on goods passing from one Canadian port to another, 2519, 3272
False Creek bridge, 3375, 4708
Granville island taxation, qu. 1485
Immigration
Chinese, 1444. *See also* Chinese Immigration bill
Immigration sheds, 1447, 1896
Income tax offices, qu. 912
Japanese freighter with stowaways, 1451
Labour department, 1678
Orientals, business competition, 504, 1902, 2311
Point Grey sand head leases, 3671
Producers' Dairy Company, 2526
Proportional representation, 401
Second Narrows bridge, qu. 1258
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment employees, dismissals, qu. 2297, 3085, qu. 3137, 3822
Stanley park, foreshore protection, 1008
Vancouver Creosoting Company, Limited, 3231
Vancouver Island Milk Producers' Association 4266

Vancouver (port). *See also* Vancouver Harbour Bill
Ballantyne pier, 257, 258
Dry dock, 1002, 2671
Elevator, 1057, qu. 1487, 3769
Addition to, qu. 517, qu. 621
Facilities, 53. *See also* Vancouver Harbour Bill
Improvements, 2033
Grain shipments, 69, 1034, 3769
Harbour, 83, 110, 1002
Harbour commission, 387, qu. 912
Kitsilano reserve and, 383
Vacancies, 1372
Port development, 1051

Vancouver Harbour Advances Bill
Res. 198, 255; 1r., 269-270; 2r., com., 3r., 332

Vancouver Island, iron deposits, 2514

Van Koughnet, Mrs., Soldiers' Comfort Branch, Toronto, 4727

Vegetables. *See also* Root Vegetables; Treaties, French Treaty
Canadian Council of Horticulture, 2307
Canned, imports, 445
Competition from United States, 2977
Dehydration of, 4674
Freight rates from Maritime provinces, 626
Potatoes
Acreage and production, 2934
Diseases, 595
Duty, 2651, 2707, 2959, 2980, 3017, 3035, 3075, 3474
Free trade in, 2820
Freight rates, 137-138
French treaty, 1984
Grading, 598. *See also* Root Vegetables
Growers, 137
Imports, qu. 617, 2820, 2959
Inspection, 598
New Brunswick, 2763
Potato-growing industry, 308
Prices, 2820
Prince Edward Island, 131, 2763
Reciprocity in, 2993
Seed, inspection of, 2306
United States
Competition, 2977
Exports, qu. 621
Wharfage tolls, 975
Root vegetables, sale and inspection, 937
Tomato plants, customs duty, 4432

Velvets. *See* Customs Tariff Items; Treaties, French Treaty

Veniot, Premier, St. John river wharves, qu. 1488

Vermilion, Alberta, town lots, 1307
Purchases, 489
Rental by government, qu. 2417

Verret, Mr. Hector, retirement, 1826

Versailles, Treaty of, 46. *See also* Germany, Reparations; Treaties
International Labour Conference, 1631

Vessels. *See also* Canadian Government Merchant Marine; Marine; Shipping
Acadia, 1044, 3336
Alaskan wreck of, 1212, 1659, qu. 1763, 3160
Algerine, qu. 1763

Vessels—*Con.*
Arctic, 3944, 4012
Bayfield, 3336
Bonaventure, 1044
Boethic, 1044
Canadian, Chinese sailors on, 2334
Carrie L. Hirtle, seizure, qu. 3323
Cartier, 3336
Challenger, 1742
Crews, 2670. *See also* Immigration Act Amdt. bill
Dredge No. 12, qu. 1487
Eureka, 1364
Fishing. *See* Fish and Fisheries
Foreign. *See* Canada Shipping Act Amdt.
Gleeful, tug, qu. 1763
John D. Hazen, 3160
Lady Grey, 3160
Lambton, loss of, qu. 812, 3354
Lillooet, 3336
Llandovery Castle, loss of, 1745
Malaspina, 2207
Marvale, wreck, 3333
Mikula, icebreaker, qu. 1384, 2614, 3160
Minto, 1044
Montcalm, 2614, 3160
Monte Grappa, foundering, qu. 912
Murray Stewart, tug, qu. 203, qu. 386, 3354
Reliance, qu. 812
Restless, 3336
Siloam, seizure, 2207
Space for cattle. *See* Live Stock, Shipments
Stanley, 2614
Taibu Maru, 859
Trader, wreck of, qu. 1763
Tuscan Prince, wreck of, qu. 1763
Wireless equipment, 3355

Vetcraft Shops. *See* Soldiers

Veterans' Associations. *See* Pensions

Veterinary Surgeons, drugs. *See* Narcotic Drugs

Veto. *See* Disallowance

Vickers Company
Cancellation of contract, 1746
Hydro-planes, 1748
War claim, 1745
Canadian Vickers, qu. 2205
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 3780
Hopper barge construction, contract, 3350

Victoria, B.C.
Dominion astrophysical observatory, 3242
Dry dock, 1002

Victoria, B.C.—*Con.*
Harbour, dredging, 110, 1014
Old post office building, taxes, 1024
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment employees, qu. 3137

Victoria, vacancy. *See* Cape Breton North and Victoria

Victorian Order of Nurses, grant, 3954

Vien, Mr. Thomas (Lotbinière)
Ammunition, 886
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4079-4124
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3087, 3089
Business of the House, Speaker's rulings, 4076
Canadian National Railways, deficits, 4190
Common law of Great Britain, 2894
Copper bounty bill, 4375
Editorial Committee, French publications, 1670
French translation and printing, 1489, 1670
Halibut fishery treaty, 4467
Imperial Conference, 4639
Indemnity of members, 4237
Labour, right to organize, 2894
Macphail, Miss, members and party funds, 4237
Petition of right, fiats, 3222
Powell River Paper Company, 2894
Public ownership of railways, 4191
Race track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 713, 716, 737
Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt. bill, 4237-46

Ville Marie wharf, 981

Vimy Ridge Memorial Site, 2, 3, 12
Gift of by France, 65, 2832
Accepted, 180
Agreement, 181
Joint res. of parliament, 811, 3819
Message from his Ecellency the Governor General, 1631
President, French Republic
Letter from, 1538
Joint res. to, 811

Vincent, Mr. J. U., 1806

Vocational Training. *See* Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment

Vote, Lack of Confidence. *See* Lack of Confidence

Voting in Divisions. *See* House of Commons, Divisions

Wages. *See* Cost of Living; Labour

Wainwright Buffalo Herd, 2773, 3407, 3941
Slaughter of, 3435, 3439, 4702

Waldron, Mr. Gordon, United Farmers of Ontario, 425

Walker, Sir Edmund, immigration, 1343

Wallace, Mr. J. A. (Norfolk)
Animal Contagious Diseases bill, 2133
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4027
Cold Storage Act Amdt. bill, 2056-9
Health of animals, 581
Historic sites, 3432
Port Dover, Ont., Fathers Dollier and Galinee, 3433
Income tax, revenue, cost, etc. qu. 1259
Life-saving station, Long Point, lake Erie, 3335
Oleomargarine, drawback on materials, 3503
Public expenditure, apportionment, 4560
Radiotelegraph stations, lake Erie, 3338

Want of Confidence. *See* Lack of Confidence, M. (Mr. Irvine)

Wanipigow River dam, 1000

War. *See also* Germany, Reparations; National Defence
British expeditionary force 3885
Burdens, 2967, 2981. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget
Canada's participation in, 4655. *See also that title;* Imperial Conference
Canadian expeditionary force, enlistments, qu. 1031
Causes of, 2725
Claims. *See* War Claims
Conditions following, 1231. *See also* Immigration
Debt, 2797. *See also* Pubic Debt
Capital levy 2722-28
Expenditure 2915, 2920
Naval 110
Responsibility for 3078
1914-1922, qu. 914
French-Canadians, bravery 2935
Glorification of, 2686
League of Nations and, 3993
Loans. *See that title*
Material, sale of, 2986
Medals 1743
Medical supplies, purchase of, 2921
Middlemen, 2921
Monuments and Memorials. *See* Monuments and Memorials; Vimy Ridge
Pensions. *See that title*

War—*Con.*
Profiteering, 2585, 2981
Profits, taxation of, 2788, 2985
Reparations. *See* Germany
Responsibility for. *See* Germany
Retired officers, serving in. *See* Militia Pension Act Amdt.
Revenues collected during, 2985
Rhineland occupation, cost of, qu. 2696
Scandals, 2815
Davidson commission, qu. 812
Taxation, 2788, 3028. *See also that title*
War profits tax, 2788, 2985
United States and, 2918

War Claims. *See also* Alien Enemy Property; Germany, Reparations
Adjustment of, qu. 1486, 1745
Canada Steamship Lines, Limited, qu. 3142
Canadian claims against Germany, 2496
Canadian Pacific Railway shares, 2496
German claims against Canadians, 2496
Investigation, statement of categories, 2500
Llandovery Castle, sinking of, 1745
Massey-Harris Company, settlement of, 2497
Militia services, 900
Statement of expenditure, 1747
Naval service, 900
Pugsley, Hon. William, appointment as commissioner. *See* Pugsley
Secretary of State, 2495
M. (Mr. Stevens) to reduce vote, 2502, neg. 2504
Statement of, 2496
Vickers, contract, cancellation, 1746

War Measures Act, Oleomargarine, 3528. *See also* Oleomargarine; M. (Mr. Carroll)

War Revenue Act. *See* Special War Revenue

War Service, Repatriation. *See* Naturalization Act

Ward, Mr. W. J. (Dauphin)
Budget, 2959. "Annual family squabble"; zigzag course of debate; arguments for and against protection; more important matters than the tariff; freight rates; suspension of coasting regulations, 2959; increase of lake grain rates; the "shipping barons"; discrimination by Canadian boats in favour of United States lake ports; milling in bond; United States railway earnings from transportation of flour, 2960; Crowsnest pass agreement; saving in railway rates absorbed by shipping

Ward, Mr. W. J.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
companies; western agricultural conditions and demands; talk of secession; tax sales in Manitoba, 2961; conditions in Saskatchewan; what is the matter with western Canada? mortgaged farms; remoteness from tidewater; high interest rates; increased dependence upon agricultural prosperity; gratuities to Grand Trunk and Canadian Northern directors and officials, 2962; cattle shipments to Great Britain, space and rates; public debt; taxation; interest payments; New York loan, April 1922; the spectre of debt; doing business with borrowed money, 2963
Canadian National Railways, retiring gratuities, 1483, qu. 1632, 1687, 2962
Unorganized districts, road-building, 3258
Welland canal construction, 3789

Warehouses. *See* Canada Temperance; Customs; Grain; Liquor

Warlike Stores. *See* National Defence, Ammunition

Warner, Mr. D. W. (Strathcona)
Agricultural conditions, 1423
Alberta coal
Freight rates, 3009
Resources, 1282
Civil Service Act, M. (Mr. Power) 549, 555
Climatic conditions of West, 1423
Copper bounty bill, 3240
Edmonton Indian school, 2165
Emigration to the United States, 1422
Experimental farms, 467
Farm labour, 1424
Forest protection, 3418
M. (Mr. Michaud) 825
Fuel supply, 795
M. (Mr. Church) 1282
Hog grading, 592
Hudson Bay railway
Alberta coal, transportation, 1283
M. (Mr. Knox) 1055
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1425
Policy, 1421
Speeches, adverse effect of, 1423
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Carroll) 3513, 3516, 3519, 3539
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 758
Reference to, 1425
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 1151

Warner, Mr. D. W.—*Con.*
Rural mail delivery, western provinces, 1791
Tariff, immigration and, 1424
Tree-planting, 3418
Vancouver harbour bill, 266
Wheat-growing, 1423

Washington. *See also* United States
British Ambassador at, 858, 4457. *See also* Treaties, Halibut
Canadian representative at, 2735, 3017, 3085, 4001, 4664
Congressional library, 2693
Disarmament conference, 2911, 4000
Visit of Canadian ministers to, 3823

Waste Paper, disposal by government departments, qu. 1028, 1713

Water-Borne Traffic. *See* Freight Rates, Shipping; St. Lawrence River Waterway

Water Powers. *See also* Fuel Supply; Hydro Electric; Lake of the Woods; St. Lawrence River Waterway
Administration of, 3420
Alienation of, 3422
Canadian national parks, 3442, 3939. *See also under this title,* Dominion Forest Reserves
Banff, 3750, 3939
Carillon rapids, 659
Cedar rapids, 659
Development of, 3422
Dominion forest reserves and parks, 1256
Dominion Power Board, 3427
Eastern townships, 1248
Electric power, exportation, 658
Export duty, 2828
Suggested prohibition, 1272
United States to, 1266
Fuel supply, 3203. *See also that title*
Hudson Bay railway, 1040, 1065
Hudson Bay region, 1072
Grass river, 1065
Jurisdiction, 665
Lac Seul. *See* Lake of the Woods
Lake of the Woods, 3421, 3425, 4163. *See also that title*
Control Board, expenses, 4001
Leases, 3421
United States citizens to, 3426
National policy, development of, 1270
Nelson river, 3421
Niagara district, 3782
Niagara falls, 3940
Ottawa river, qu. 1974
Peace river district, 1433

Water Powers—*Con.*
Provincial ownership and jurisdiction, 3421
Railway electrification, 3422
Resources, 2750
Revenue, 2969
Rideau canal, qu. 622
St. Lawrence 2682
St. Lawrence river waterway, 3782
Surveys and investigations, 3203, 3420
Expenditure, 2969
Water Powers board, 3420
Water powers of the world estimated, 1270
Winnipeg river, 1214, 3421. *See also* Lake of the Woods

Waterhen Lakes, drainage, 3431, qu. 4303

Waterton Lakes
Highway, qu. 2085
Park, 3435

Waterways. *See* Canals; International Joint Commission; St. Lawrence River Waterway
Canadian National Railways and, 3057
St. Lawrence river. *See that title*

Watson, Dr. glanders, treatment of, 579, 2868

Ways and Means, Committee of, 2640, 3084, 3229. 3231, 3454, 3705, 3895, 3963, 4162, 4181
Bounties on manila fibre and copper bars or rods, 3231
British preference, 3454
Budget speech, 2640
Customs tariff resolutions, 3454-74
Inland Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 3229
Interim supply, 1539, 3705
Motion for, discussion, 3222
Notice of, 179
Supply bill, 4735
United States, reciprocity, 3454

Waugh, Mr. R. D., Saar Valley Commission, 3145, 3995

Wealth of Canada
Estimated, 2719
History of, 2728

Webb, Sydney, report, 2545
Sydney and Beatrice, Decay of Capital and Civilization, 2726

Wedge, Mr. George, employment, qu. 2697

Wednesday Sittings. *See* House of Commons

Weed Seeds. *See* Feeding Stuffs Act Amdt. bill; Seed

Weekly Liner Committee. *See* Freight Rates, Shipping

Weights and Measures
Cartage charge 810
Inspection 810
Peterborough district, qu. 492, 810

Welland Canal. *See* Canals

Welland, Haldimand, Lincoln Counties. *See* Redistribution

Wells, Mr. H. G., Civilization and the War, 2722

Well-Drilling Machinery. *See* Customs Tariff Items

Welsh Coal. *See* Coal; Fuel Supply

West Indies
Fish markets, 3002
Steamship service with, 3377
Trade, 3382. *See also* Canadian Government Merchant Marine
West Indies delegates, 3392

West Ukrainian Republic. *See also* Ukrainians
M. (Mr. Campbell) 651, withdrawn, 658

Western Canada. *See* Western Provinces

Western Canada Colonization Association. *See* Immigration, Canada Colonization Association

Western Grain Standards Board. *See* Grain, Marketing

Western Provinces. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget; Freight Rates; Grain and Grain Trade; Immigration; Natural Resources. For individual provinces. *See their respective titles*
Agricultural conditions, 1196, 1201, 1439, 1880, 1889, 2766. *See also* Address; Agriculture; Banks and Banking; Budget; Immigration; Railways; *and under this title,* Conditions
Examples of successes and failures, 2767
Questionnaire and answer, 2772
Animal Contagious Diseases Act, administration, 2132
Bad farming, 1889, 2781, 2812
Branch lines construction, 4185
Conditions in, 1213, 1221, 1246, 1347, 1349, 1352, 1388, 1396, 1398, 1402, 1415, 1854, 1883, 1890, 2747, 2811, 2845, 2961, 2977, 3002, 4038, 4062, 4222

Western Provinces—*Con.*
Conditions in—*Con.*
"Calamity howlers", 2811, 2977
Christison, Mr. J. N., 1891
Goosen, Mr. Peter, 1892
Spence, Mr. George, 1891
Winter trips to British Columbia and California, 1252
Extravagance, 1889
Farm mortgages, 2962
Farmers' earnings, 2813
Field crops, 2846
Financial distress, 1890
Freight rates, 3190
Grain shipments. *See* Freight Rates; Grain; Vancouver Harbour Bill
Grievances, 3056-62
Immigration. *See that title*
Industries, 1889
Lack of, 4047
Interest rates, 1088. *See also* Banks and Banking
Mixed farming, 2772
Municipal taxation unpaid, 2768
Municipal and provincial extravagance in building, 1890
Natural resources, 1121, 2782, 2836, 2972
Needs of, 3000
Petroleum bounties, 2648
Redistribution, 4738
Remoteness from tidewater, 2962
Representation on Railway Commission, 3192
Ridicule and intimidation, 2813
Rural income tax-payers, 2845
Rural mail delivery, 1790
Rural shareholders of banks, 2846
Saline lake deposits, 3198
Secession talk, 2808, 2814, 2961, 2977, 3067
Settlement of due to railways, 2833
Solidarity, 3062
Surveys in, qu. 1866
Tariff and, 1424, 2747
Taxation, undue burden on, 2781. *See also* Taxation
Thornton, Sir Henry, statement, 2962
Transportation, 4222. *See also* Freight Rates; Grain
Treatment, 4191
Understanding with manufacturers, 3023
Unrest, alleged condition of, 4514
Wealth "stream drying up" 2757

Weyburn Security Bank. *See* Banks and Banking

Wharves. *See also* Harbours and Rivers; Public Works
Interest on investment, 976

Wharves—*Con.*
New Brunswick, transfer to federal government, 946
Revenue, 976
United States, built on Canadian territory, 2735
Wharfage tolls, 975

Wheat. *See* Grain and Grain Trade

Wheat Board. *See* Grain and Grain Trade

Wheat Stem Saw-Fly. *See* Agriculture; Insect Pests

Wheeler, Mr. Seager, 278

White, Mr. J. F. (London)
Agricultural implements, standardization, 809
British preference, woollen goods, 3470
Budget, 2964. Debt and taxation; expenditure; retrenchment in civil government; raisins and dried currants; duty; Australia, trade with; French treaty; artificial silk industry; hemp bounty; binder twine, discrimination against manufacturer, 2964; history of binder twine industry; price advance following abolition of duty; production, imports and exports, 2965; home and export prices; tariff stability; knowledge as to conditions of investment; reciprocity proposals; amendment, 2966; income tax; unearned income; indemnity of members; socialistic doctrine; Abraham Lincoln on rights of capital, 2967
Firebrick duty, 3482
Fuel supply, 809
Old age annuities, 1639
Opium and Narcotic Drugs Act, 697
Penitentiaries, 771
Pensions, disability entitling to, 679
Post offices, grade 3, qu. 4300
Printing bureau, new building, 1737
Proportional representation, M. (Mr. Good) 423
Radiotelegraphy, 3374
St. Lawrence river waterway, 3781
Tobacco imports, duties, qu. 1258
Unemployment relief, 690
Welland canal construction, 3781

White, Mr. James, salary, 4667

White, Sir Thomas, Reciprocity, "Noble Eighteen", 2908

White Mud River, fishway, 3362

White Star Dominion Line
Immigration, 1193
Ocean freight rates, 2127

Whitley Councils. *See* Civil Service

Whitney, Sir James, hydro-electric development, 1267

Wholesale Grocers. *See* Combines Bill

Widows, Pensions. *See* Pensions

Wild Life Sanctuaries. *See* National Parks and Reservations Bill

Wiley Estate. *See* Yukon

Williams-Taylor, Sir Frederick, 4019

Willison, Sir John. *See also* Immigration, Canada Colonization Association
Canada Colonization Association, 1323, 1328, 1429
Retirement from, 1164
Reminiscences, quotation from, 1182

Wilson, Mr. C. C. (Wentworth)
Hamilton-Brantford highway, qu. 624, 2492
Ontario projected highways, qu. 624

Windermere Highway. *See* Banff-Windermere

Windsor, N.S.
Dredging, 1010
Historic sites, 3406

Windsor, Ont., emigration, 1404

Wines. *See* Budget; Customs and Excise; Liquor; Treaties, French Treaty

Winnipeg
Coal purchases for public buildings, 496
Elmwood postal station, 4628
Emigration from, to United States, 1975
Fort Osborne barracks, 4628
Government printing, 3144
Winnipeg Saturday Post, qu. 3323
Grain sample market, qu. 345
Institutions and services of, 1214
Liberal Association, immigration, 1429
Lord Shaw, statement on immigration, 2833
Minto street armoury, qu. 2084
Proportional representation, 392, 411, 412, 433. *See also that title*
Stockyards, 2762
Ukrainians, resolution. *See* West Ukrainian Republic
Unemployment, 41-42, 435, 1124, 1215, 1644, 1883
Mayor, representations from, 1658

Winnipeg—*Con.*
Water powers, 3421, 3425. *See also* Lake of the Woods
Winnipeg Free Press, emigration, 2790

Winnipeg-St. Croix projected railway, 2898

Winnipeg River, 1214. *See also* Lake of the Woods

Wireless Telegraphy, 3337. *See also* Radiotelegraphy; Telegraphs and Telephones
Hudson Bay route, 1046
Industrial Group, Great Britain, message from, 4436
Navigation and, 3333
Northwest territories, 3944-5
Vessels, equipment, 3355-6
Wireless stations, 3374
Mayo, 4702

Wolves. *See* Animals, Wild

Wolvin, Mr. Lee H., 4281. *See also* Freight Rates, Shipping; Lake Grain Rates

Wolvin, Mr. Roy, 1704. *See also* Freight Rates, Shipping; Lake Grain Rates

Women
Civil Service, in, 1772
Dominion Council of Health, representation, 3649
Farm, 1844
Pensions, 1651. *See also that title*
Representation in parliament. *See* Macphail, Miss
Rights of. *See* Bankruptcy Act

Women's Labour League, 2718

Wood, Mr. E. R., 60

Wood, Mr. H. W., statement on budget, 2771, 2853, 2946

Wood, Mr. W. F., income tax conviction, qu. 3582

Wood. *See also* Lumber
Staves, duty, 3487

Woodbridge, Ont., postmaster, 1821, 1828

Woods, Mr. R. J. (Dufferin)
Bacon, grading, 593
Budget, 2846. A dual policy, 2846; tariff; slow movement of Liberal party toward reduction; reciprocity; market for agricultural products; effect of United States emergency tariff on Canadian exports; cheque tax; limitation, inequitable, 2847; agricultural

Woods, Mr. R. J.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
implements, tariff; speech of Mr. Meighen session of 1910-1911, "ramparts of gold"; protection increased by rise in price, 2848; boots and shoes, duty on; Canadian manufacturers, monopoly of home market and free access to United States; agricultural conditions, home markets practically worthless to farmers; world competition in agricultural products, 2849; tariff for revenue; duties too high to produce revenue; cigarettes; industrial centralization; disappearance of small manufacturing establishments, 2850; manufacturers, beneficiaries of cheaper production; reciprocity agreement of 1911; Liberals who opposed reciprocity, the "Noble Eighteen"; Sir Thomas White; manufacturers support government that will protect them; class legislation; Progressive group out for equal rights; tariff joint product of Liberal and Conservative parties, 2851
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2410
Ontario Temperance Act, 2410
Race-track betting, M. (Mr. Good) 740
Rural mail carriers, 1789
Seed inspection, 197
Titles, M. (Mr. Ladner) 1294
Wines native, prohibition of manufacture, 2411
Woollen industry, M. (Mr. Drummond) 934

Woods, Lake of. *See* Lake of the Woods

Woodsworth, Mr. J. S. (Centre Winnipeg)
Address in reply, 41. Omissions in speech from Throne; no lessening of burden of taxation; unemployment situation, 41; statements from organizations and municipalities, 41-42; immigration scheme; land settlement plan; past immigration policy, 43; financial condition; commercial treaties, 44; Near East crisis; Canada's national status; Mr. J. A. Hobson on imperialism, 45; British policy in foreign affairs; Lloyd George; ex-Premier Nitti of Italy, 46; Trades Union Congress at the Hague, 46-47; necessity for permanent peace, 47
Agricultural produce marketing agent, 4676
Annual drill, 866, 4636
Assiniboine river, damage by floods, 994,999
Autonomy, Canadian, 45, 4651

Woodsworth, Mr. J. S.—*Con.*
Bank Act Amdt. bill, 4018, 4084-87, 4144-61
Bank premises, value of, 4085
Lawful association, amdt. 4084, neg. 4085
Officials, right of organization, amdt.. 4161, neg. 4161
Shareholders' audit, amdt. 4087, neg. 4090
Banting, Dr. F. G., 4439
Belle River harbour, 4608
Brandon, damage by flood, 999
British and foreign news service, 4712
Budget, 2718; amendment, Mr. Forke; free trade; greater economy in public administration; social readjustment; perpetuation of National Policy; tariff on implements of production, 2718; Liberal party promises forgotten; taxation of necessaries of life; raisins; Women's Labour League, telegram, 2718; Sir Wilfrid Laurier on protection; Montreal Unemployed Workers' Association, statement; legislative and administrative machinery; over-organization; economic resources; estimated wealth of Canada, 2719; natural resources; gold, one per cent of national wealth; annual production; manufacturing industries, production costs and profit; capital invested; provincial and municipal debts, 2720; per capita debt; unemployment, anxiety and general dissatisfaction; labour, viewpoint of; doctrine of free trade; industrial and economic changes; free trade England; unemployment and social difficulties; labour and socialism; British National Labour party, policy, 2721; suppression of capitalistic system; resolution introduced in British House of Commons; Lloyd George and British socialism; H. G. Wells, sinking of ship of civilization; Dr. J. J. Tompkins of St. Francis Xavier University, Catholic social principles, 2722; face to face with serious crisis; industrial revolution; individualistic production; the farmer; transportation systems; internationalism, 2723; thinking in terms of the parish rather than of the world; status of the worker; freedom and the introduction of the taxing system; agricultural and industrial workers; concentration of capital; John Maynard Keynes, "The Economic Consequences of the Peace"; markets, 2724; buying power; war, causes of; combinations and trusts;

Woodsworth, Mr. J. S.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
financial control; monopoly of credits; economic and social consequences of capitalism; control of educational agencies, 2725; Upton Sinclair, Capitalistic Control of the Press; control of government; federation of British industries; Canadian Manufacturers' Association; Sidney and Beatrice Webb, Decay of Capital and Civilization; wealth and poverty; privileges and monopolies, 2726; wage slavery; serious economic conditions; industrial democracy; socialism and state socialism; railways; spheres of federal and provincial control; coal mines; production for the use and not for profit, 2727; financial systems; labour platform; natural resources; public ownership and operation of public utilities and large scale industries; nationalization of banking system; abolition of class privilege; capital levy for war debt; taxation inequalities; History of Canadian Wealth; private property; natural resources; ownership and taxation of, 2728; conscription of men and wealth; new epoch in history; Rabindranath Tagore on civilization; radical changes necessary, 2729
Business of the House
Audibility, 4593
Supply, relevancy, 4602
Canada Gazette, 1709
Canada Colonization Association. *See under this title,* Immigration
Canada-West Indies
Steamship service, 3378
Treaty, 3379
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Advance, 3844
Competition with subsidized steamship services, 3384
Vessels, sale of, 3813
Canadian National Railways
Board, labour representation, 3636
Coal, Maccan and River Hebert mines, 1027
Management, responsibility and powers, 3635, 3699
Paris offices, 3699
Shopmen, resolution, 1338
Capital levy, 2728, 2909
Capital for settlers, 1089
China, civilization of, 2486

Woodsworth, Mr. J. S.—*Con.*
Chinese Immigration bill, 2338, 2485
Children, 2484
Merchants, 2484
Wives, 2484
Civil Service
Bonus, employees unmarried or without dependents, qu. 1257
Salary revision, 1793-4
Underpaid, 4672
Combines
Coal situation, 254
Legislation inquiry, 254
Combines bill, 2551
Criminal Code Amdt. bills
Betting information, 2282
Sedition, 616
Deputy ministers' salaries, 4672
Disallowance of Nova Scotia statute, 2389
Doukhobors, 1340
Eight-hour day, 1643
English and French-speaking people harmony, 1341
External Affairs department, 3588
False Creek bridge, 4708
Farm labourers Winnipeg, 1976
Farm lands, prices, 1087
Freight rates on coal, 1345
Fuel supply, exploitation, 1344
German reparations, M. 280, 311
Governor General
Cars, repairs, 4691
Expenditure, 4627
Hansard, distribution of, 1715
Hector celebration, 4636, 4706
Hemp bounty bill, 4377, 4380
Hindu franchise, 4650-1
House of Commons
Estimates, 2691
Restaurant, 2692
Sergeant-at-Arms, 2691
Howat, Mr. Alexander, detention at border, 2296, 2347, 2393, 2419, 2469, 3155
Immigration
Canada Colonization Association, 1336, 3637
Reorganization, 3324, 3400
Child, 1342
Chinese. *See also under this title,* Chinese Immigration
Exclusion, 2485
Students, 2485
Naturalization, 2196
Policy, 1336
Immigration Act Amdt. bill, 2433
Deportation without trial, 2433
Imperial Conference, 4650
Agenda, opportunity for discussion, 3453

Woodsworth, Mr. J. S.—*Con.*
Imperial Economic Conference, agenda, 3453
Imperial federation, 4651
International Labour Conference, 1643
Joint control of industry, 1655
Labour. *See also under this title,* Immigration
British Empire Steel Corporation, 1704-6
Control, etc, 1655
Delegates from United States detention. *See under this title,* Howat
Estimates, reasons for decrease, 1638
Immigration and, 1339
Industrial councils, 1654
Industrial disputes, public utilities, 1703
Miners' wages and price of coal, 1345
Organizations, federal and provincial jurisdiction, 2892
Right to organize, 2891
Bank officers and employees, 4084, 4161
Penitentiaries and, 772
Representation in parliament, 397, 3555
Strikes and unemployment, 1631
Labour Gazette, printing, 1712
Lake of the Woods regulation bill, 4176
Land policy, 1344
Land tax, 1344
Larkin, Mr. James, detention, 1163, 1212, 1309
Lausanne Conference, 54
Law, the late Bowman B., tablet, 1020
League of Nations, 3993
Library of Parliament, 2693
Magazines and periodicals, M. (Mr. Hocken) 844
Mennonites, 1341
Meyerscough, Thomas, detention at border. *See under this title,* Howat
Military expenditure, 866
National monument, Connaught place, 1021, 2686
National Policy, permanency, 4652
Naturalization Acts Amdt. bill, 2195, 2455-57
Naturalization, Mounted Police and, 779
Nova Scotia steel workers, strike, 1643
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3871
Pensions
European war and active militia, 3716
Old age, inquiry, 733, 1646
Royal commission, interim report, 2167
Post office employees, salaries, 1794
Powell River Paper Company, 2891
Printing bureau employees, 1623
Proportional representation, M. (Mr. Good) 396, 419
Railway electrification, 3425
Rideau hall expenditure, 4627
Roberts, Mr. J. H., imprisonment, 1660

Woodsworth, Mr. J. S.—*Con.*
Royal Canadian Mounted Police
Duties, seven-day week, 4514
M. for disbandment, 816, 1139, 1151
Naturalization, and, 779
Reorganization, 776
Rural credits, 4146
Rural mail carriers, remuneration, 1793
Russia, relations with, 3401
Russian trade mission, 986
Saar Valley Commission, 4652
Settlers' relief, 3448
Singapore naval base, 2469
Sydney steel strike, 287, 1643
Taxation, excessive, 1345
Toronto seed branch building, 4621
Trial by jury, 2433
Ukrainians, 1341
Unemployment. *See also under this title,* Labour
Insurance, 1638
Provision for, qu. 732
Resolution passed in 1922, 436
Relief, foreigners, 1883
Value of time lost, 1685
Winnipeg, 1124-5, 1644
Conference on, 1659
Union label on Labour Gazette, 1623
United States industries and Canada, 4380
Vickers, qu. 2205
War, glorification of, 2686
Water powers
Lake the Woods, 3425
Policy, 3424
Publicity, 3421
Public and private ownership, 3425
Winnipeg, 3421
Waugh, Mr. R. D., Saar Valley Commission, 3145
Winnipeg, Minto street armoury, qu. 2084

Wool, 2866. *See also* Agriculture; Budget; Customs Tariff; Live Stock; Textiles
Bounty on, 2866
Duty on, 447, 2866
Imports, qu. 617
Raw wool, exemption from sales tax, 2999
Sales tax, 2742
Wool-combing industry, qu. 1973, 2823, 2827, 2866
Trenton mill, 3461

Woollen Industry. *See* Textiles

Workmen. *See* Labour

World's Moral Ideas, International conference, 1205

Wrangel Island, ownership, 3360, 3948

Wrecking Plants, Pacific Salvage Company, qu. 1763

Wrecks. *See* Marine; Vessels

Writers. *See* Copyright Act Amdt. bill

Yarmouth, N.S., dredging, 944, 1011

York, Duke and Duchess, Congratulations on wedding, 2251, 2338

Yorkton Income tax office, qu. 384

Yorkton Enterprise, emigration to United States, 1404

Young, Arthur and Company. *See* Civil Service

Yukon Territory
Administration
Congdon, Mr. F. T., qu. 3131
Correspondence, 2299
Justice, 705
Road construction, 3943
British Empire exhibition, mineral exhibit, qu. 3143
Council, 3943
Indemnity, 3943
Egg inspector, qu. 2516

Yukon Territory—*Con.*
Extent of, 87
Gold output, 88
Governor General, visit of, 85
History, 85-89
Klondike, 86
Mineral resources, 85-86
Mining fees, 1636
Quartz-mining, 249
Naturalization, 2459
Population, 3943
Telegraph system, qu. 1662, qu. 2417, 2683, 3945
Revenue, qu. 2206
Timber protection, qu. 2205
Trial of Eskimos. *See* Northwest Territories Act Amdt.
Wiley estate, administration, qu. 3131

Yukon Act Amdt. Bill
(Right to appeal from interlocutory judgement; jury trial; mining claims, property or location)
1r., 767-8; 2r., 4247; com., 4247; 3r., 4248

Young, Mr. C. T., qu. 1739

Zavitz, Dr., introduction of Mandeschuri barley, 483

Zinc. *See* Treaties, French Treaty